DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRD SESSION—TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT

---

11 GEORGE VI, 1947

VOLUME VI, 1947

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE THIRD DAY OF JULY, 1947,
TO THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF JULY, 1947, INCLUSIVE

BEING

VOLUME CCLIX FOR THE PERIOD 1875-1947

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME



OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1948

VICTORIA
PUBLIC LIBRARY

STACKS
R328.7102
C212dc
1947 v.6

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Thursday, July 3, 1947

The house met at two o'clock.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT

Second and final report of special committee on Dominion Elections Act.—Mr. Cote (Verdun).

STANDING COMMITTEES

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS—CHANGE IN PERSONNEL

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved:

That the name of Mr. Winters be substituted for that of Mr. Baker on the select standing committee on industrial relations.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING ORDERS—CONCURRENCE IN SEVENTH REPORT

Mr. E. O. BERTRAND (Prescott) moved:

That the seventh report of the standing committee on standing orders presented on Tuesday, July 1, be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

MOTOR VEHICLES—EXPORT PRICES

Mr. CAOUETTE:

What are the export prices to persons who sell motor cars manufactured by (a) the Chrysler Corporation; (b) General Motors Corporation (c) the Ford Motor Company?

Mr. MAYHEW: No information.

*POSTAL SERVICE—MAIL DELIVERY, ROUYN AND NORANDA

Mr. CAOUETTE:

What steps have been taken to establish a letter carrier delivery in the twin cities of Rouyn and Noranda?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): I should like to give a verbal answer to this question. The twin cities of Rouyn and Noranda, if treated as one postal area, or in other words served by one post office, would have a sufficient number of calls to warrant a letter carrier delivery service, and in the event of that service being established the patrons would enjoy a drop letter rate of postage throughout the whole community served by the one office. Neither the Rouyn public building nor the building housing the Noranda post office is large enough to accommodate the necessary letter carrier staff. The question of providing a new building to take care of the needs of the combined area is under consideration, but progress is difficult due to the uncertainty as to whether the suggested arrangement would be acceptable to both communities. In the meantime we can do nothing further.

POSTMASTERS—SUPERANNUATION

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many postmasters as of this date are making monthly payments or contributions to the superannuation plan?
2. Are deductions made from their salaries to provide superannuation?
3. If so, what is the toal amount deducted each month?
4. Has any action been taken to make the scheme applicable to all postmasters?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier):

1. 2,252.
2. Yes.
3. $10,051.49.
4. The matter is under consideration.

These answers cover only postmasters of revenue offices who do not come under the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

IMMIGRATION—DISPLACED PERSONS—DOCTORS

Mr. THATCHER:

1. Has the province of Saskatchewan or any other province made any application to bring doctors to Canada from D.P. camps?
2. If so, what decision was made by the department?

GUYSBOROUGH COUNTY, N.S., MAIL CONTRACTS

Mr. LOW:

1. Were any mail contracts let in Guysborough county, Nova Scotia, recently?

83166—320

REVISED EDITION

VICTORIA

2. If so, on what routes?
3. Were tenders called?
4. If so, what were the names and addresses of all who tendered, and the amount of their respective tenders?
5. Who was the successful applicant or tenderer?

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUGGESTED SATURDAY SITTINGS—MORNING SITTINGS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I believe I should make some report to the house with regard to the meeting I had last night in my office with the leaders of the different parties, and the whips. The meeting was called to consider the plan of work for the remainder of the session, and to see if we could come to some agreement as to procedure which would enable parliament to prorogue at the end of next week at the latest.

Hon. members will recall we had hoped it might be possible, following the procedure adopted a couple of weeks ago, to prorogue at the end of the present week. However that has not been possible, although I must say that the work accomplished since that time under the arrangement then made has been exceptionally good. If hon. members will continue to cooperate as they have during the last few weeks, I believe that with some slight precautionary measures we ought to be reasonably sure of proroguing before the end of next week—although of course the time at which we prorogue rests with the house itself, more particularly with the opposition.

Mr. GRAYDON: Not entirely; if the right hon. gentleman had been here last night—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have sat both in opposition and on the government side. I know that if it wishes so to do, the opposition can hold up measures for a long time. However, what I wish to inform the house is that a suggestion was made by the government that this week we should sit on Saturday, beginning at eleven o'clock in the morning and continue to six o'clock with an adjournment from one to two o'clock, and that if this were agreed to the government would not suggest further sittings in the morning until possibly Wednesday of next week, if we felt such sittings were necessary in order to conclude the business before the end of the week.

As the house realizes, the government does not wish to bring pressure upon any section of the house. On the other hand we have a responsibility in respect of the business of the house as a whole, and up to a certain point must act upon that responsibility. I understand hon. members of the Progressive Conservative party, the Social Credit group and all hon. members on this side are prepared to sit on Saturday of this week at eleven o'clock in the morning, and to continue the sitting until six o'clock in the evening. Some members of the C.C.F. group take exception to sitting on Saturday. I am not making a motion today because I do not wish to make this question of procedure the subject of a vote in the house if this can possibly be avoided. What I would ask is whether members of the C.C.F. group, knowing that all the rest of the members of the house are favourable to sitting on Saturday from eleven o'clock in the morning until six o'clock in the evening, would not reconsider between now and tomorrow the position they now take. I believe if a favourable agreement can be reached as to this, so far as next week is concerned it will not be necessary to consider morning sittings until on toward the middle of the week. If that is not possible, and if we find we are not going to make the progress we hope to make, the government will have to consider whether we should not begin morning sittings earlier next week.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, this group has considered carefully the request made. We are of the opinion that we already have morning sittings or their equivalent; that is, we are already sitting the extra two hours which on other years we put in from eleven to one. We do not believe we should put our own convenience before the proper conduct of the business of the house. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) mentioned a minute ago that the Progressive Conservative opposition and members on the government side of the house were agreeable to sitting on Saturday. I would add that they were not agreeable last night either to facilitating or expediting the business of the house. My observation was that it was government members who held up the house for four hours, without accomplishing anything.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If the hon. member would cut that time in half, perhaps he would be correct.

Mr. MacINNIS: I am stating the same time as stated by the minister himself last night.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The reference to four hours which I made was the time taken up by members on all sides of the house, and the hon. member certainly knows that.

Mr. MacINNIS: That is what I am saying, too; it was four hours wasted, and the major portion of it was wasted by members on the government side of the house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MacINNIS: My understanding is that there is considerable difference of opinion at least among members on this side of the house—

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacINNIS: —as to whether or not they would like to sit Saturday morning.

Mr. FLEMING: Speak for yourself.

Mr. MacINNIS: Well, one member on this side says "hear, hear" and another says "speak for yourself", which goes to prove that there is a difference of opinion. There is very little difference of opinion in this group, but I understand the same difference of opinion holds with the Social Credit group.

That is our position. We are quite willing to facilitate and expedite the business of the house when we see that there is an attempt on all sides to do so.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF POSITION WITH RESPECT TO UNITED STATES FUNDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Mr. Speaker, having regard to the importance of the question may I ask the Minister of Finance if he will consider, before prorogation, making a statement to the house and country about the situation in connection with American exchange?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): I will give consideration to the question, but I doubt if I can add anything to what I said a short time ago.

HIGH WATER AND FLOODS

REPORT AS TO DAMAGE TO TORONTO ISLAND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Public Works when the report of the government's engineer on the Toronto island floods will be tabled.

Hon. ALPHONSE FOURNIER (Minister of Public Works): My information is that we will have it in two or three days.

REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE IN RECONSTRUCTION OF DAMAGED AREAS IN MANITOBA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. S. ZAPLITNY (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply. In view of the very serious damage to crops, live stock and bridges caused by recent floods in the area around Dauphin, as well as other parts of Manitoba, will the minister state what steps the government is prepared to take, in cooperation with the government of Manitoba, to assist in the work of reconstruction in these flooded areas?

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that any representations from the government of Manitoba have been made to the federal government. If they are, careful consideration will be given to the relative responsibilities.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Will the minister undertake in every way to assist in obtaining priorities on timber and steel for the repair work? A serious situation has developed in that area, and only today I have received requests for help in obtaining priorities.

Mr. HOWE: In respect of disaster in any part of Canada it has been the practice of the department to give the highest priority on requirements for rebuilding. I can assure the hon. member that requests for priorities will receive consideration.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

REQUEST FOR FURTHER STATEMENT ON FLAG TO BE USED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, the other evening the Minister of Public Works stated, when the subject of flags for public buildings was under discussion, that both the Canadian ensign and the union jack were distributed and the caretaker could choose either. On Dominion day no union jack appeared on this building. Will the minister make a further statement?

Hon. ALPHONSE FOURNIER (Minister of Public Works): The other night I read to the committee the policy of the government which was laid down in an order in council passed in September 1945. I stated at that time that the public buildings were flying the Canadian ensign.

Mr. CHURCH: The Prime Minister said that parliament would decide.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MEETING IN CAMERA OF STANDING COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to ask either the Minister of External Affairs or the hon. member for Cochrane whether invitations will be extended to all members of the Senate and the House of Commons or just to the members of both committees on external affairs to attend the meeting of that committee to be held on Tuesday morning next?

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Although the hon. member had no opportunity to give me advance notice of his question I am glad to be able to say something here about this sitting of the external affairs committee which is to be held in camera, and to which much more importance has been given in the reports published in the press than is warranted.

My understanding was that a feeling was expressed by members of the committee that they would like to have an opportunity of getting frank expressions of opinion from the officials of the Department of External Affairs which they would not feel free to state for publication. It was suggested that that might be done in one of the ordinary meetings of the committee which would be held in camera, as committees of this house frequently have met in camera for the purpose of thinking out loud and without having reports of their proceedings published. When that became known it was suggested that the members of the committee of the other place would also like to have that kind of meeting, and because of the large volume of work to be attended to between now and prorogation it was suggested that the two bodies might meet together.

The question was subsequently put whether other members of either house could attend. There certainly can be no objection to that. As to whether there should be any invitation to other members who might wish to attend, I do not think that is necessary. It has become known that there is to be this meeting in camera where opinions can be expressed without committing anyone to them, where there can be frank discussions of what would appear to be desirable with respect, for instance, to the timing of the deposit of letters of ratification of peace treaties and such matters. I do not think that there should be any invitation to members of the houses of parliament who are not members of the committees, but I am sure that as far as the officers of the Department of External Affairs are concerned they will not have the slightest objection to any member of this house who is interested being present.

Mr. GRAYDON: I was not suggesting that invitations should be given out, but I have seen conflicting reports in the press with respect to the meeting that was to be called and who were to be there, and I thought we should have some clarification.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I think some of the gentlemen of the press have really attached more importance to this than is warranted. They seemed to feel that there was an implied connection between a session of the committee in camera and the negotiations which have been going on in Paris in connection with the so-called Marshall plan. As far as I know there is no connection whatsoever between them. Had there not been a word said outside of Canada about international affairs for the last month, this meeting in camera would no doubt none the less have been suggested as a convenient way of discussing a little more frankly than one does in a public forum the timing of Canadian actions and the reason for that timing.

Mr. CHURCH: Is there to be any public discussion of external affairs in this house this session? This is the 104th day of the session, and there has been none so far. At these secret meetings they just talk about nothing and do nothing.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The estimates of the Department of External Affairs will be before the house very soon, and it will depend upon my hon. friend and other members of the house whether there is any discussion.

Mr. CHURCH: Hon. members will not attend a secret meeting; I will not.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Following the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, as a member of the committee on external affairs I want to make it clear that it was not the committee that suggested a secret session. The mystery, if any, resulted from the government's action.

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (Cochrane): It was not through government instigation that this happened. As chairman of the committee, perhaps I could state what happened so that parliament may be seized of the exact situation. It was suggested by Mr. Pearson that a special meeting should be held in camera by the external affairs committee at which time information could be given to the members of that committee which would be most

informative and instructive. There was never any lead given by the government in that connection.

Mr. CHURCH: The committee should be abolished. It has done nothing all session.

SOIL PIPE

SHORTAGE IN TORONTO AREA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. J. McILRAITH (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply): Yesterday the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Timmins) asked a question with regard to the production of soil pipe. His question was as follows:

Having regard for the shortage of soil pipe in the city of Toronto, has the government taken any action to increase production?

Major action has been taken to stimulate increased production of cast iron soil pipe and fittings during the latter part of 1946 and the first six months of 1947 as follows.

Arrangements are in operation to channel sufficient pig iron to enable the producers to operate at plant capacity. Arrangements have further been completed for a continuing flow of pig iron to meet increased production facilities during 1947. Price increases have been granted to the industry to compensate for increased costs of production.

Assistance has been given to individual producers in obtaining necessary equipment from War Assets Corporation which could not be obtained elsewhere or in time to facilitate early increased production. A submission by a major producer to expand production facilities at their plants for the production specifically of cast iron soil pipe and fittings was approved and a programme has been in operation since the first of January which provides an incentive bonus on increased production over and above the base rate established as normal production capacity at the end of 1946.

Results of these actions, by way of increased production throughout the industry, showed up early in the year. The total production of cast iron soil pipe and fittings in 1946 was approximately 2,100 tons per month, or slightly over 25,000 tons. The production during the first five months of 1947 averaged approximately 2,800 tons per month, or at the rate of 33,600 tons per year. With further expansion of facilities, it is estimated that approximately 35,000 tons will be produced in Canada during 1947, or a 40 per cent increase over 1946.

INCOME WAR TAX ACT

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the senate to Bill No. 269, to amend the Income War Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

ARMY BENEVOLENT FUND

ESTABLISHMENT FROM ARMY CANTEEN AND OTHER SERVICE FUNDS—PROVISION FOR BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence) moved the second reading of Bill No. 410, to establish a benevolent fund from army canteen and other service funds.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. CLAXTON: Mr. Chairman, before this clause carries I think a short statement should be made. On February 26 of this year I moved for the appointment of a special committee to look into the question of the disposition of canteen funds. Those funds originated through profits made in the sale of various supplies through canteens and through other similar sources entirely related to the Canadian Army. The committee was set up and I think hon. members will have observed with satisfaction the composition of the committee in that nine of its members had served in the second world war, twelve in the first world war, and three in both wars. This was not the first committee set up to deal with canteen funds. A committee had been set up on August 30, 1941, under the chairmanship of Mr. J. M. Macdonnell, then in private life but now the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario. A parliamentary committee was created by resolution of this house on March 24, 1942, and it had a great number of meetings under the genial and efficient chairmanship of the Deputy Speaker who is now presiding over this committee of the whole, the hon. member for Brantford City. That committee made its report on July 22, 1942. Generally speaking, army canteen funds have since been administered by the regimental funds board in accordance with the reports of these committees.

The funds with which we are now concerned originated, as I have said, entirely from profits made through the sale of supplies through army canteens. As members know, members of the armed services in most places and in practically all units had opportunities to purchase at low cost additional comforts, and sales, small overhead and low costs led to the accumulation of very considerable profits. Some of these were expended by the units during the war. There is now left in the possession of the government the sum of $8,134,934. It is expected that that will be further increased by an amount of approximately one million dollars, so that the canteen funds with which we are concerned in the present bill total something of the magnitude of $9,000,000, a very considerable sum.

The committee held thirteen meetings. It made a unanimous report on June 12, 1947. It is not unusual, Mr. Chairman, for committees to make unanimous reports, but I think it is rather unusual that a committee should have held all its meetings, as I believe this one did, without any divisions and without any votes. That reflects great credit on the non-partisan spirit of full cooperation with which members from all parts of the house took part in the work of this committee. I think I speak for members of the committee and for members of the house when I say that it was in no small measure due to the tact and skill of the chairman that this very happy result followed.

The report of the committee proposed the adoption of a bill which had been drafted under direction of the committee and which was annexed to the committee's report. That bill is virtually word for word the bill which is now before the house. The government has accepted the report of the committee and puts forward this bill not only as the bill of the government but it hopes with the full support of the committee and of members in all parts of the house.

The bill itself provides for the establishment of the fund and describes the origin of the various sums which go to make up the fund.

By section 4 the bill would establish a board consisting of five members appointed by the governor in council, of whom one is to be nominated by the Canadian Legion and another by the National Council of Veterans Association in Canada, and it contains this very interesting provision:

> No member of the board shall hold or occupy a position in the public service of Canada.

It obviously was the intention of the committee that the board should be operated in as independent a fashion as possible, and with a view exclusively to the best interests of the veterans.

The bill goes on to create a committee for each province and sub-committees where they are needed. It provides for no remuneration for members of the board or committees but provides for a per diem allowance, and travelling expenses where that is agreed to by the board. Provision is made for the appointment of a secretary whose salary is as set out in the bill.

The important provision, Mr. Chairman, is that made in section 9 of the bill, which reads:

> There shall be paid out of the fund to or for the benefit of veterans or their dependents or the widows or children of deceased veterans such amounts as the board may from time to time determine.

The purpose of the benevolent fund which is to be established by this bill is that it be administered and paid out for the benefit of veterans and their dependents. Subsection 2 of section 9 lays down certain principles which the board is to follow. These have been prepared by the committee in general terms so that the board will not be hamstrung, but will be guided in the application of the funds.

The remaining sections of the bill deal with matters of procedure. One important provision of the bill is that the board is to report to the minister who is defined as the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Consequently with the adoption of this measure and its enactment, this will cease to be a matter of direct concern to the Department of National Defence with which I am concerned, but will be the responsibility of the Minister of Veterans Affairs. This is in accordance with the policy put forward by the government and approved by parliament, that as far as possible all matters having to do with veterans should be the responsibility of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

As I have said, the report mainly provides for the enactment of a bill, but there is one additional proposal recommending that the government put forward legislation to coordinate the work of the Canadian naval service benevolent trust fund, the army benevolent fund board and the Royal Canadian Air Force benevolent board and establish a committee which would insure as far as possible that the funds were administered on a uniform basis.

As hon. members are aware, the corresponding fund which came into being in connection with the profits earned from expenditures of members of the Royal Canadian Navy is dealt with by the Royal Canadian naval benevolent board which was created by P.C. 42/10672 on November 23, 1942. The naval benevolent fund was incorporated by dominion charter in July, 1945. The Royal Canadian Air Force benevolent fund is of an earlier origin, in that it was

founded in 1934 and incorporated by dominion charter in July, 1944. These two funds have separate boards. It is the recommendation of the committee that as far as possible all these should be administered so as to secure uniform results. I am not speaking for the government on this, but I can assure the committee that that recommendation will have their most serious consideration, and as far as the Department of National Defence is concerned we shall use our good offices to see that as far as we possibly can there is close cooperation among the three funds.

The report itself refers to one thing to which I think I should make reference. It says:

> In this connection the committee is gratified to be able to report that, probably for the first time since the termination of world war I, all veteran organizations of national scope in Canada have collaborated in the preparation of a joint brief and have been unanimous in their recommendations.

This result is warmly appreciated. It is also fair to say that the recommendations of the committee are in substantial accord with all the submissions put before the committee, whether by organizations or individuals. Accordingly it is the view of the government that the bill, having received sound consideration and widespread support, should receive the favourable consideration of the house. Its object is to provide machinery for the careful expenditures of money created by the expenditures of the men and women of the army. It is designed to do that in a way which they themselves would like to see it done; that is, for the benefit of those of their number and their dependents who are in necessitous circumstances. It represents a true spirit of comradeship and an attitude of unqualified cooperation.

Mr. MUTCH: If I have learned one thing as chairman of the committee whose report is being discussed at the moment it is that if you have something to say you should make it direct and brief. But no matter how important the considerations before us or how great the urge to get through, there is always time to take a moment or two to be courteous and to give expression to that courtesy. If the remarks of the minister as applied to the committee of the whole were justified, and I think they were, then I as chairman of the committee should like at this moment to express publicly to the committee my appreciation of the fine spirit of industry and of cooperation manifested by the members of the committee on canteen funds. If the remarks of the minister directed toward me were in any way justified, I should like to say publicly that much of the efficiency, expedition and thoroughness of the work of that committee was due to one who is not a member of the committee, the capable secretary who was supplied to the committee, whose interest and knowledge of veterans affairs is the equal of that of any hon. member of the committee, and exceeds that of most of us. It is a bit unusual, but on behalf of the committee I should like to pay a word of tribute to Mr. Burgess, who was an able assistant to that committee.

Since the bill which the committee reported has come before the house intact I do not want to be in the position of placing any logs or stones in the path of its progress. Therefore, again expressing my appreciation of the work of the committee and expressing to the minister the appreciation of the committee for his kind words, I shall allow the committee to discuss the bill.

Mr. BROOKS: There is not very much that needs to be said regarding the bill. I simply wish to confirm what has already been said by the minister and by the hon. member for Winnipeg South. The committee was unanimous in the report. The work of the committee was congenial. Perhaps that was due to the chairman. I am not going to take away from him any credit which has been given to him, except to say we all felt that our duty was to do our best for the returned men. I also think that we have learned a lot from the experience of handling the canteen funds of the first great war. We had the experience of having before us as witnesses men who had worked on these canteen funds since the first great war, and they helped us materially.

As the minister said, we also had representatives from the different returned men's organizations. Taking it all in all, there was no reason in the world why we should not bring in a unanimous report. The only matter on which perhaps there was any difference of opinion was regarding the air force and navy benevolent funds. They did not come within the terms of our reference; but as the minister has pointed out, we made a recommendation in that connection. I feel it was the general opinion of the committee that at some future date the matter should receive careful consideration by the government, possibly with the idea in view of placing these funds in the same position as the army benevolent fund, or the bill which is now before the house. Further than that I have nothing to say except that we were

unanimous. We feel that the recommendations in this bill are good, that they will redound to the benefit of the returned men, and personally I see no reason why they should not receive the unanimous support of the house as they did in the committee.

Mr. PROBE: I wish briefly to support the remarks which have been made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South and the hon. member for Royal. A good deal of the credit for the work of the committee and the unanimity of the report is due to the fact that the submissions of the Legion and the other service men's organizations were concise and to the point, and based on actual experience of the work of the canteen fund committee following the first great war. There was of course a limitation in the terms of reference to the committee which prevented us from going into the matter of some uniformity of policy with respect to the disposal of canteen funds of the other two service organizations, the air force and the navy. I was glad that the minister referred to the fact that the committee has made a reference to the need for such legislation, and I trust it will not be forgotten, because the service men of all these organizations have an equal right to be considered twenty, thirty, forty or fifty years from now, or until that time when all canteen funds are exhausted.

There is a special feature of this bill which I think should be called to the attention of this committee. There is written into the bill itself a limited guarantee for some educational benefits to the children of needy veterans. These educational benefits are not placed on a competitive or scholarship basis, from the standpoint of academic standing, but rather on the basis of need, and therefore it will make it possible for needy children, especially of the deceased veterans, to receive an education which they might not otherwise be in a position to acquire. If there is one criticism of the veterans' charter it is the fact that while the returned man himself is looked after, and to a limited extent the widows of men killed in action, we have not held the federal government responsible for the passing on to the child of such education as would likely have been its right had the father lived to provide it.

I am glad it is specifically emphasized in section 9 of this bill that the educational rights of the children of needy or deceased veterans will be looked after. There is another thing that deserves commendation. There was some discussion as to whether or not we should have permanent force personnel on the continuing boards to administer this fund. We have here a regulation which prevents employees of the federal government from taking an active part in the work of administering the fund, and I believe that provision will get the support of the public generally. The citizens of the country other than members of the civil service will be in a position to administer it.

There is one minor point which escaped me at the time it went through the committee, and the minister might consider it at another time. I refer to the interest rate of two and one-half per cent which is mentioned in subsection 3 of section 3. There may have been an explanation for it in the committee at the time, but if so I have forgotten it. The fund, I submit, should earn the same rate of interest that the government generally pays for its money.

Beyond that, the members of our group are in hearty agreement with the general scope and provisions of the bill. It looks to me as though we shall be able to administer the $9 million odd left from the canteen fund operations to the benefit of the veterans and their families as a whole.

Mr. CHURCH: I am glad that the soldiers of all parties who sat on the committee have presented us with such a commendable bill. I happened to be on a similar committee that was set up after the last war and I moved a resolution at that time that the fund should be administered according to soldier population, so far as the soldiers were concerned, in the various provinces equitably. Looking back, I am sorry that the act that was then passed did not afford the public protection that is written into this bill, namely, public control over the whole fund. I think there was some criticism of the manner in which the fund was provincially administered, particularly in one or two areas in Saskatchewan. I am pleased to note that the auditor general has control of the fund by audit, but I should like to see one of the clauses, that relating to education of veterans' children, made a little less stringent, because many of these veterans' children work very hard in the summer to earn their fees. In the last few days we have seen in the newspapers pictures of some of them engaged in different forms of rather hard work.

On the whole, I wish to congratulate the committee and the house on the good work that has been done in connection with this bill. I think we ought to extend the principle and have similar cooperation in other directions. It would enhance the reputation of parliament before the people of the country as far as the conduct of the country's business is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: Do I gather from what has been said that hon. members are agreeable to all the clauses?

Mr. TUCKER: With the exception of section 9. It is desired to ensure that the dependents of deceased veterans shall have the same rights as if the veterans were alive. It is therefore intended that a motion be made that subsection 1 of section 9 be amended by inserting the words "or former dependents" after the word "children' in line 21 on page 5 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall sections 1 to 8 carry?

Mr HARKNESS: There is one question I wish to ask with reference to section 3. Does this list of amounts credited to the fund include all the amounts which the committee considered should be included? I ask that because, going over it, I could not remember whether all the various funds which we thought should be credited to the account had been included in this list. As far as subsection 3 of section 3 is concerned, the amount for kitchen by-products is only for kitchen by-products which were secured overseas, and the amount for kitchen by-products in this country apparently is not there. I may be incorrect in that regard, but that is according to my recollection. Could the minister say whether everything we thought should be included has been included in the list?

Mr. MUTCH: Perhaps I might be allowed to say a word. In the final report of the committee there was not included a recommendation with respect to kitchen by-products in Canada. After a discussion we had with the associate deputy minister, and the explanation that was made, the matter was not pressed. We did press for the inclusion of the whole of the sum overseas which had been designated with the regimental names, and for which claims had been entered at the time payment was made. I can say to the hon. member that the bill introduced today, with the exception of the amendment that was made a few moments ago, is in point of fact exactly the same bill that the committee finally recommended. The by-products from the camps in Canada are not included in the bill, for reasons given in the committee.

Mr. HERRIDGE: I think the committee which dealt with this question has done an excellent job. I have read the minutes and followed the proceedings of the committee, and I think they approached the question in a very fair and practical manner. I support the commendatory remarks made by hon. members who have spoken previously. Two features of the bill appeal to me particularly. One is the provision for a decentralized administration; the provincial committees and subcommittees will be close to the problem, and needs. I think that will make for successful administration of this act and of the fund. I am pleased also to see some provision for the education of veterans' children. In British Columbia for a good many years we have had an act which provides grants for the assistance of veterans' children, and it has done a great deal of good in these cases. I am particularly delighted with the provision of the bill.

Sections 1 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

Section 9 as amended agreed to.

Sections 10 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PENSION OR SUPERANNUATION BENEFITS TO SENIOR APPOINTEES SERVING OUTSIDE CANADA

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a measure to provide pensions or other superannuation benefits for senior appointees of the Department of External Affairs serving outside Canada and the wives, widows and dependents thereof.

Mr. GRAYDON: Would the Secretary of State for External Affairs mind giving us some explanation as to the purposes and objects of the proposed measure?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I would not like to precipitate a debate at this stage, I think it would be more practical to have the debate upon the bill, when hon. members will have it in their possession and can see just what we propose to do. The purpose of the legislation is to deal with the position of a small number of persons who have been brought in from outside the public service to head missions abroad. Our public service has developed so rapidly that it has not been possible to provide as heads of missions everywhere persons who were in the service and who were entitled to the benefits of the Superannuation Act. A few such persons have been appointed under conditions similar to those which prevail in the selection and appointment of judges, and the purpose of this bill is to provide pensions which in a general way would be somewhat similar to

those provided under the Judges Act but which would be contributory whilst the pensions under the Judges Act are non-contributory.

There are two or three other provisions in the bill to take care of the continuation of the pension rights of those from other branches of the civil service who are made heads of missions in foreign countries. The bill will deal with a small number of cases, of which I can give the details when we deal with the bill, to show how each section will apply to them. If it suited the convenience of hon. members to allow the resolution to pass, the bill could be distributed at once and would be brought on for discussion as soon as it can be reached. A full discussion may be held on the second reading, when the terms of the legislation would be before hon. members.

Mr. G. RUSSELL BOUCHER (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, from the explanation given by the minister I understand the main purport of the bill is to provide superannuation for those of our senior servants in the Department of External Affairs, principally diplomats—

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Exclusively diplomats, serving outside Canada.

Mr. BOUCHER: —who have been appointed from private life, not having served previously in the public service. I take it that where such appointments are made from the civil service itself an individual appointed to a diplomatic post would have served a number of years in some department of government, during which he would have contributed to the superannuation fund, and that he would be permitted to continue that contribution and eventually to receive superannuation. On the other hand as I see it this bill is being introduced to bring under the superannuation act persons who have not formerly been employed in the government service, so that they will get superannuation benefits similar to those received by people who have won distinction and promotion through many years of public service.

Take the case of a man who assumes a high post in the diplomatic service, at the request of the government. I would say he would be required to have a vast experience in the type of work he is undertaking, and to be in close touch with and sympathy for government policy. When such a person is appointed from outside the service I do not see why his compensation while in the service should not be sufficient to compensate him for leaving his position in industry or whatever it may be and accepting such an appointment at the request of the government, instead of putting him in the station of those who, by actual contribution, have earned their right to superannuation. Such an individual would be put in a better position than a man who has been in the service, by virtue of the fact that he has not contributed to the superannuation fund, and also by virtue of the fact that he may be in the diplomatic service for only a short time. During his service he may have little opportunity to contribute to the superannuation fund; yet after his service he will be permitted to retire with superannuation benefits for himself, his wife and his family. That may be merited in many cases, but I think it would be a very bad example for this parliament to establish, for many reasons. In the first place a man who has qualified himself in his own business for such an appointment should be a man of substantial means, and as such would be in a preferred position as compared to those who have spent long, faithful years in the public service. Again, while today we in Canada are very much in favour of superannuation and retirement allowances, we must realize that as yet comparatively few of our people have the opportunity to obtain superannuation, even on the basis of contributions made by themselves. One of the greatest inducements our civil servants have is the security they establish when they are permitted to pay into a superannuation fund, to which a contribution is made by the government. To let a new class come in who hold senior positions, positions which carry with them great dignity, honour and respect, and which require the exercise of a real national spirit, is in my opinion not a proper development of the principle of superannuation. To my mind this type of servant, while their numbers may not be great, cannot be looked upon as urgently requiring superannuation. With the social reform legislation now envisaged, and the need for social improvements among the needy, I do not believe we should place on a pedestal perhaps higher than ever before those to whom this measure refers.

My understanding is that if a person in this group accepts a diplomatic or ambassadorial post abroad he is provided with a substantial salary together with a living allowance and the other emoluments which go with a post of the kind. If he is not, then he should be. There is no reason why we should be niggardly in the compensation we give those who undertake positions carrying with them high responsibilities and requiring special qualifications. It is an entirely different approach, however, if we say to men of that type: "If you take this job with its meagre pay—" and we may

call it miserable, or insufficient, or any other term which would seem appropriate—"we are going to give you permanent security by way of superannuation for yourself and your dependents for all time." I do not believe that is a proper procedure. The people of Canada are not looking to parliament to create special privileges for a limited number of individuals.

I have the highest respect for those who accept diplomatic posts to serve their country abroad, and I recognize the fact that they must have the highest qualifications. But I do not believe we should give them lifetime security in this fashion, rather than by adequate compensation while they serve. I can easily envisage an appointment to a high office in the diplomatic corps—a political appointment, if you like—involving a prominent and a capable man. After serving only a short time he could retire from that service, reassume his previous vocation and perhaps earn an added income because of the experience he had gained, the contacts he had made, and the business relationships he had established while in the diplomatic service. Yet this man, upon returning to his earlier vocation, would have security thrust upon him through the beneficence of the government of Canada, rather than through the position of merit he may have earned while in the diplomatic service.

A condition of this kind is not fair to those who serve in the Department of External Affairs and other branches of the government service and who in those years have acquired wide experience and knowledge, but who for many years have been paying for their own superannuation. Placed alongside these civil servants would be this new group of those from outside the service who on retirement would be entitled to superannuation benefits, for themselves and their dependents for the rest of their days. There may be individual cases which merit support, but in my view those cases should be compensated by way of salary while in the service rather than by superannuation as a means of security for the rest of their lives and those of their dependents. While a few cases should receive treatment of this kind, I believe that in adopting this principle we would be setting a bad example, and in the eyes of the rest of the service would be establishing a preferred class who would be given special treatment.

I do not believe the people of Canada want their members of parliament to set up special legislation establishing superannuation for a limited few when there are so many more who need extra help to a much greater degree.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on the resolution before the house. Hon. members of this group do not intend to enter the debate on the resolution stage, chiefly because of the insufficiency of the information set out in the resolution. In view of the fact however that certain statements have been made by hon. members on both sides of the house, I should like to indicate our desire to reserve our opinion until we see the actual details of the bill.

We agree there are cases in which special consideration should be given. In the main however I believe we must follow the point made by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Boucher) with respect to the superannuation plan among civil servants. We should have regard also to the extent to which we in parliament are prepared to go in respect of superannuation benefits and old age pensions for Canadians generally.

With regard to the insufficiency of information in the resolution, I respectfully suggest to the government that this is a practice which ought not to be continued. Beauchesne's Rules and Forms states definitely that care should be taken in the drafting of resolutions preceding money bills to cover all the points. Only a few days ago the committee of the whole got into quite a dilemma because of a resolution drafted along lines similar to this one. The government in drafting resolutions should take care to give more details, and particularly to fix in the resolution the maximum amount of money to be spent under the bill based on the resolution.

Having said this much may I add that we reserve the expression of our opinions until the bill is before us.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. St. Laurent thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 412, to provide superannuation benefits for senior appointees of the Department of External Affairs serving outside Canada.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING VETERANS' PREFERENCE, INCREASED SALARIES FOR COMMISSIONERS, ETC.

Hon. COLIN GIBSON (Secretary of State) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a bill to amend the Civil Service Act to provide, inter alia a

statutory basis within the act for veterans' preference in appointments to the civil service; to provide for payment of increased salaries to the chairman and members of the civil service commission; payment of annual increases in rates of compensation to temporary employees; and for the establishment of certain temporary positions, appointments thereto, and remuneration thereof.

Mr. BROOKS: Does the minister intend to give an explanation on the resolution stage?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Like my colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent), I do not wish to institute a debate at this stage if it can be avoided, and if the discussion can more conveniently take place on second reading. The main purposes of the bill are to provide veterans' preference for veterans of the second world war and to carry it through into the Civil Service Act, to make provision for the remuneration of temporary employees and also for the remuneration of members of the civil service commission. There are other minor amendments to the act, but those are the three chief features of the bill that is to be introduced.

Mr. RENE HAMEL (St. Maurice-Lafleche) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, before this resolution is concurred in, I should like to say a few words. I do not intend to discuss it at great length, but I believe it expedient to make a few remarks in regard to the civil service. The object of this resolution is to increase the salaries of the chairman and of the members of the civil service commission. I believe that the whole problem may be gone into at this time.

In the first place, I wish to point out the status of French Canadians in the civil service. I shall then show the consequences, try to place responsibilities for such a situation, and finally propose certain reforms. In regard to the civil service, the situation must be envisaged on the basis of population. The 1941 census, volume IV, page 334, places the population as follows: total population 11,506,655; population of French origin, 3,483,038; population of English origin, 2,968,402; population of Irish origin, 1,267,702; population of Scottish origin, 1,403,974. Two facts are apparent from those figures: first, that the French-speaking population constitutes the largest ethnical and homogeneous group in the country; second, French-speaking citizens represent over 30 per cent of the total population of Canada. With those figures in mind, let us see what is the proportion of French-speaking persons in the civil service. Two sources of information are available for this purpose. The report of the Montreal chamber of commerce which was submitted, I believe, to the Gordon commission and to the members of the cabinet, and a statement of the so-called "committee of five" which appeared, last week, in the *Journal*.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but during the debate on this resolution he must confine himself to the general principles of the resolution now before the house. The hon. member is now bringing up a case which deals with a certain racial group. He will undoubtedly have the opportunity to discuss special cases when the bill is before the house or the committee; he may then base his arguments on certain clauses. I do not think he should bring up special cases at present; he should confine himself to the general principles of the resolution. It is my duty to call the attention of the hon. member to this fact. If I were to allow him to continue, I would be forced to allow the same privilege to any other member who would like to discuss special cases pertaining to the civil service commission. I therefore suggest that the hon. member should confine his remarks to the general principles of the bill.

Mr. HAMEL: Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to abide scrupulously by the rules of the house. The object of the resolution is to increase the salaries of the members of the civil service commission. I wish to prove, Mr. Speaker, that the civil service commission has been a total failure since its inception. Now, how can I prove my point without quoting figures. However, if Your Honour, refuses to allow me to proceed, I shall have to submit to your ruling inasmuch as your authority must be respected.

Mr. SPEAKER: The resolution before the house does not allow the hon. member to discuss whether or not it is advisable to have a civil service commission. The resolution reads as follows:

That it is expedient to present a bill to amend the Civil Service Act to provide, *inter alia*, a statutory basis within the act for veterans' preference in appointments to the civil service; to provide for payment of increased salaries to the chairman and members of the civil service commission; payment of annual increases in rates of compensation to temporary employees; and for the establishment of certain temporary positions, appointments thereto, and remuneration thereof.

Specific needs of the commission are therefore dealt with. It has often been repeated that when a resolution is brought before the house, hon. members can only speak of the general principles on which it is based. However, I wish to draw the hon. mem-

bers attention to the fact that he will have the opportunity of making representations when the bill is brought before the house, as the minister stated a moment ago. I would therefore ask the hon. member to limit himself to the general principles contained in the resolution. If he wants to deal with specific cases, he should wait until the bill has been referred to the committee of the whole.

Mr. HAMEL: Mr. Speaker, my only intention is to deal with the principle of the resolution. I am opposed to increasing the salary of members of the civil service commission and, as I must base my judgment on facts, I may say that it has been derelict in its duties, and I shall prove it. I do not want to be disagreeable and I would gladly await another occasion; however Your Honour knows very well that in these dying days of the session, when we are sitting eight hours every day and expecting to sit ten and even twelve hours daily, I can hardly take the risk of the matter coming up while I am away. But, my main reason for continuing my remarks is that I believe them to be in order. If I am ruled out of order, I shall evidently be relieved of all responsibility in the matter.

I want to show, Mr. Speaker, that the civil service commission has failed, because it has not been able to give the Canadian population representation in the civil service—which at the present time constitutes a fourth power —based on that fundamental democratic and British principle of representation according to population, and has violated since its inception another great principle on which our charter is based: no taxation without representation.

Now, since Your Honour prefers it that way, I shall keep my statistics and give them later. However, I will mention a few figures. There are, at present, 112,658 employees in the civil service. According to a statement published in the *Journal,* only ten per cent of that number is made up of French Canadians. That is to say, French Canadians should hold 22,000 more positions than they do at present. What does it represent in actual dollars? It means that between 35 and 40 million dollars, which should be paid French Canadians every year, go elsewhere. The situation is particularly noteworthy in the higher grades. I am asking hon. members to my right, my compatriots and all other representatives in this house what they would say if at a certain time French-speaking members were excluded from the cabinet? If it is considered that it is fair that French-speaking citizens be represented in the cabinet, if it is fitting that French-speaking citizens be represented in this house on the basis of population, that French-speaking citizens be represented in the judiciary according to population—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I am very sorry, but I cannot allow the hon. member to continue his speech which is completely out of order.

May I remind him once more that he will be given an opportunity for making certain representations when the bill comes before the house. But his remarks are absolutely irrelevant to the resolution now before us.

(Text):

Mr. A. J. BROOKS (Royal): Mr. Speaker, this resolution is to provide, among other things, a statutory basis within the Civil Service Act for veterans' preference in appointments to the civil service. We all realize that one of the most important benefits that can be granted to a returned soldier is a preference in appointment to the civil service. I think all returned soldier bodies have recognized that since the last war, and the returned soldier has become very jealous of this preference.

I want to ask the minister a question with reference to the recommendation that was made by the veterans affairs committee last year and which will be found in No. 51 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence. It reads:

> That the present civil service preference for disabled veterans who served overseas be extended to cover all employment, both temporary and permanent, by the House of Commons and by dominion government agencies, inclusive of crown companies.

We have discussed in this house on many occasions the question whether the veterans' civil service preference should be extended to crown companies. I think that the returned soldiers today feel that these crown companies are the thin end of the wedge which is getting rid of the returned soldier preference, and considerable bitterness and resentment is felt by returned soldiers on this account. There may be some justification for setting up these crown companies. I am sure there is in some cases; in others we feel that possibly there is not, but whether there is justification for them or not, these crown companies employ civil servants and it is felt by the returned men that these civil servants should be recruited from the ranks of the returned men as far as possible. Yesterday when the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) was speaking on the Canadian Commercial Corporation it was brought out that this particular crown company employed 184 men, of whom only 56 were veterans. It would seem to me that if

the veterans' preference was applied to crown companies we would have a much larger percentage than that.

There is another point I wanted to mention. I understand that quite a number of civil servants enlisted during the war without the consent of their departments.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): That is being covered by this act. The same provisions are being extended to them that were extended to those who resigned from their departments during the first world war.

Mr. BROOKS: Up to the present time I know that these men have not been reinstated in the civil service with the seniority to which they felt they were entitled. I am pleased indeed to hear from the minister that that situation is being corrected. I shall say nothing further about it at the moment.

The third matter on which I wish to speak is the merchant marine. As the minister will remember, it has been discussed in the house before. Speaking in the house yesterday on another bill I said that the merchant marine is generally considered by the people of Canada, as it was considered by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in his speech the other day, as being on the same footing with the army, the navy and the air force. Here, then, it seems to me is an opportunity for the minister to do justice to these men of the merchant marine by giving them a preference in civil service appointments. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) yesterday was very much grieved, according to his statement, that nothing had been done for these men. The circumstances had been unfortunate. I feel that it was the intention of the veterans affairs committee to see that these men received their due. Unfortunately we thought that a bill would be brought in by the transport department, which is looking after this matter, but nothing practical was done. I suggest to the Secretary of State that this bill be amended to do justice to that extent at least to the men of the merchant marine.

Another matter I would bring to the minister's attention concerns returned soldiers who have written an examination for appointment as postmaster or some other civil service position and who, after the examination has been held and the successful candidate named, have been informed that the position was being opened up again, for different excuses. One that I would refer to particularly is the excuse that another examination was being held because all the returned men were not back home. This excuse does not seem altogether right to me. The case I have in mind has to do with the appointment of a postmaster in Milltown in my own province. The examination was advertised and a good number of returned men applied and took the examination. One of their number was successful, and understood that he was to get the appointment, but apparently that was not satisfactory to certain powers that be in the constituency. Apparently he was of the wrong political stripe, if I may put it that way, and a demand was made for another examination. The excuse which was offered, and I contend it was an excuse, was that all the returned men were not back home. I would ask the minister if it has been the general practice of the department to wait until all the returned men were home before these vacancies were filled, and if second examinations are held, after a candidate has passed successfully the first examination, on the ground that all the returned men were not back home. In this particular case the examination was held on December 3, 1946, and it seems to me that by that time there would be at least sufficient returned men back home to fill a position of this kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If I may interrupt my hon. friend, we endeavoured as best we could to meet that situation which my hon. friend very properly brings up. I arranged to visit the troops in Holland and we went through all the divisions and other corps organizations with two representatives of the civil service commission, who held examinations in the field, so that those who were there would not feel that they were being ignored in civil service appointments by the examinations being held before they got back home.

Mr. BROOKS: I am not criticizing the Department of Veterans Affairs. I am satisfied that they did what they could and what they felt was necessary. What I do criticize is the fact that after these examinations are held—and in this particular examination there were ten returned men who applied—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I just called the hon. member for St. Maurice-Lafleche (Mr. Hamel) to order because he was discussing an individual case. I would ask the hon. member to discuss only the general principle of the resolution. He will have an opportunity at some other stage of the proceedings to discuss individual cases.

Mr. BROOKS: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. In this particular case I was asking if it were the general principle to act the same way in

other cases. It was the general principle on which I wished to get information. I knew of this particular case and I have not the least doubt that there are a great many more. If there are, I feel that it is an unjust way in which to treat these men. There is nothing further that I wish to bring to the minister's attention; I hope he will be able to answer what I have said.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to read the portions of the resolution which are pertinent to the remarks I wish to make. First, it says:

That it is expedient to present a bill to amend the Civil Service Act to provide, inter alia, a statutory basis within the act for veterans' preference in appointments to the civil service.

What the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks) has said I am in agreement with and will not repeat. However, there is one matter that I wish to bring to the attention of the minister. If the veterans' preference has been generally applied as the government indicates, then I point out that very few veterans serving in the civil service who were entitled to the preference have been made permanent.

The other day I had occasion to ask the following question:

How many veterans of the first great war entitled to veterans' preference and who entered the government service on or after the 19th July, 1927, are recognized as being permanent and subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

The answer that I received I have summarized, and it shows that of the total number of veterans who are in the civil service and who have been appointed within the last twenty years, only 5,577 are recognized as permanent and subject to the Civil Service Superannuation Act. The departments and the numbers are as follows: Department of Agriculture, 250; Public Archives, 1; Office of Auditor General, 8; Civil Service Commission staff, 5; Comptroller of Treasury, 33; Department of External Affairs, 8; Department of Finance, 1; Canadian Farm Loan Board, 7; Royal Canadian Mint, 6; Department of Fisheries, 44; Governor General's secretary, 3; Department of Insurance, 4; Department of Justice, 192; Department of Labour, 7; Unemployment Insurance Commission, 331; Department of Mines and Resources, 255; Department of National Defence, 92; National Film Board, 3; National Harbours Board, 4; Department of National Health and Welfare, 39; Department of National Revenue, 1,088; Post Office Department, 1,202; Department of Public Printing and Stationery, 62; Department of Public Works, 228; Department of Reconstruction and Supply, none; Air Transport Board, 1; National Research Council, 11; Department of the Secretary of State, 4; Department of Trade and Commerce, 154; Department of Transport, 524; Department of Veterans Affairs, 1,010; total, 5,577, which indicates that of the number of veterans who have joined the service since July of 1927 a very small proportion have been made permanent. Something should be done to end as far as possible the temporary classification which in certain cases lasts for many years, not because of inefficiency or neglect of duty on the part of the individual but apparently because of neglect on the part of officialdom somewhere. The difficulty, of course, is that when these veterans are denied permanence they are also in consequence denied superannuation. Finally when they are allowed to accept superannuation they have to pay back for the time in which they have been in the service. That has proved exceptionally costly and difficult.

I have before me one case, and it is representative of many, in which a temporary civil servant finally was allowed to come within the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act. For instance, the protective staff were denied that privilege for many years. Finally when they came under the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act they had to pay contributions for the years in which they were not within the provisions of this act, and also the interest thereon, which in many cases has become almost prohibitive. Let me give an example of the figures in that connection. One of these men was required to pay back—

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I must interrupt the hon. member. The matter dealing with the superannuation act has nothing whatever to do with the Civil Service Act.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is part of the picture.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I understand that another bill will be before the house dealing with the Civil Service Superannuation Act. The hon. member can discuss the matter then.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Since the matter dovetails in with the argument I am advancing I decided to deal with it now rather than have to bring it up again on the other bill. If the minister will permit me to complete it, I think he will understand the pertinence of it. The amount that this man was ordered to repay was $2,998.34. He continued to pay a

monthly amount for a period of five years and three months, during which time he paid $1,364.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. member of what I said to the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks). I would ask every hon. member to confine his remarks to the general principle of the resolution which is before the house, and not discuss individual cases. Moreover the remarks should be relevant to the resolution. I do not believe that the remarks of the hon. member are relevant.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly could not quarrel with that decision. What I am trying to show is that even if the veterans' preference is applied, these veterans today, by reason of the long delay in permitting them to qualify under the superannuation act, are placed in a difficult if not impossible position. However, sir, agreeing entirely with your ruling, as I do, and of course accepting it, I will simply point out that having paid that amount, the total credit allowed the veteran is only $400. I suggest therefore that when the bill based upon this resolution is introduced, something should also be done to provide for the removal of too great a load on veterans who, having the preference, will have been appointed to permanent positions in the civil service.

Yesterday I dealt at some length with the general question of the extent to which the veterans' preference had been applied, I pointed out then that even since the end of the war, on the first of May, 1945, 31,000 out of 75,000 appointments have not had the veterans' preference.

Mr. McILRAITH: I have not had an opportunity of seeing the return. Does that figure include females as well as males?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes. I pointed out frankly yesterday, and I repeat, that it does to the extent of 19,969. One of the objections I have received from veterans is that, out of work as they are, and able to do some of the work that today is being done by females recently appointed, they have strong reason to object to the fact that an opportunity is not given them to hold some of the positions that are vacant and are being filled by young women who are not veterans.

That these positions are not unimportant is borne out by this fact.

In appointments made by the civil service commission from May 9, 1945 to April 30, 1947 there were 66,078 with a salary under $2,000, there were 4,464 in the salary classification between $2,000 and $3,000, and there were 1,242 in which the salary paid was over $3,000. When it is understood, as this reply indicates, that 11,094 appointments were made of males to whom the veterans' preference did not apply, I suggest that the time is overdue when a bill based on this resolution should become the law of the country. Today it is the law under order in council, and now, if this bill passes, it will be the law of the country, and it should not be departed from to the extent we have seen in the last two years.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Were these appointments made in all departments of government, or in one particular department?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: All the departments are referred to in the return, but the return does not indicate which departments have been the offenders. The Postmaster General the other night absolved himself by his answer, so that it indicates that while in the Post Office Department there were a great many appointments—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member will admit, I think, that he is discussing the subject in too great detail. He should confine himself to the general principle set out in the resolution, which is:

> That it is expedient to present a bill to amend the Civil Service Act to provide, inter alia, a statutory basis within the act for veterans' preference in appointments to the civil service; to provide for payment of increased salaries to the chairman and members of the civil service commission; payment of annual increases in rates of compensation to temporary employees; and for the establishment of certain temporary positions, appointments thereto, and remuneration thereof.

I would ask him to discuss the general principle of the resolution. If he wishes to discuss the details of it and to ask questions, he should wait until the proper time comes.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I say, Mr. Speaker, that if there was any offence, I was the offender, because I asked the hon. gentleman a question which he was graciously trying to answer. I apologize for having transgressed the rules of the house.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The minister was most kind to make that explanation. I was trying to show how necessary it was that the principle of the resolution should be carried out and the extent to which the application of that principle is overdue so far as civil service appointments are concerned. The principle of this resolution has been the law under order in council up to the present time. This merely translates that principle into legislative form, if the bill based on the resolution is passed. My reason for giving these details is to point out that

in spite of the fact that there was an order in council providing for veterans' preference, it has not been properly lived up to. I hope that when the house passes a law to establish this principle, that law will be observed to a greater extent than the order in council which has been in effect and which was designed to put into practice the principle enunciated in the resolution.

Mr. G. RUSSELL BOUCHER (Carleton): I wish to keep strictly within the confines of the resolution, and I shall be brief. The resolution is divided into three or four parts, the first being to provide for the payment of increased salaries to the chairman and members of the civil service commission. I hope that, in effecting that, the government will go a little further and do some modernizing and revitalizing of the civil service commission generally. I believe the Gordon report tabled some time ago contained some constructive suggestions, though some of them would not in my opinion increase efficiency. I believe further that the government is very much behind in bringing the commission up to that point of efficiency which we have a right to expect today.

The resolution provides for the payment of an annual increase in rates of compensation to temporary employees. I should like to discuss that point for a few moments. I do not know whether the bill covers the point I am going to make, and in case it does not I would urge the government to put it into effect. During the past five or six years, owing to wartime regulations and controls, a great many employees were hired temporarily by the civil service commission to do a specific war job, without annual increases, superannuation benefits or permanent status. I am sure the people of Canada are very grateful to the men who did that work. Most of them were incapable of serving in the forces overseas; they could not qualify for such service, or they would not have been working here. They undertook employment with the government and gave diligent service, many of them working an hour extra every day and many extra days during the year. If they had been members of the permanent service in peace time they would have had leave of absence, annual holidays, sick leave benefits, superannuation benefits, and very likely permanent appointments.

I am sure every member of parliament is frequently consulted, as I am, by individuals who have given such service, many of whom have taken no sick leave at all during the past six or seven years, though some of their comrades did; few having taken their statutory holidays, as they normally would; a great many having worked extra hours every day, while seeing some of the senior men more fortunate in that they received war supplements. I have before me at the moment, for instance, the case of a friend of mine who was rejected several times when he applied for enlistment in the armed forces and who took a position in a government department, at a fair compensation. He has worked almost every hour of every day during the past six years. He took no sick leave. On June 28 of this year he was given notice that he could take his eighteen days' annual leave, after which his employment would be terminated. I believe these cases were dealt with by the civil service federation in a brief submitted to the government last April, and I do hope the Secretary of State has taken that brief under consideration and that some of the recommendations contained therein will be embodied in the act to be founded upon this resolution.

It seems to me that after people have served the government for five, six and even seven years it is not sufficient to tell them that after their eighteen days' statutory holidays, with no leave of absence and no more notice than that, their services are no longer required. I do believe they should have at least one month's separation pay, or in any case that much notice. I believe we should treat these people as they were treated after the first great war, by an order in council passed in 1918, and as I understand they are being treated by the British government; that is, that they should be given credit if they have not taken their sick leave, to the extent of fifteen days for every year they have been in the service, in addition to a separation allowance. In many cases these officials put in a great deal of overtime, with no extra compensation whatever.

During the war I believe the civil service worked overtime willingly, and the work of these men was satisfactory and efficient during that period of stress and strain. Some of the permanent employees who worked overtime received handsome war supplements while many of the others, much more in need of compensation, received no supplements at all and no compensation for the many hours of overtime they put in. Now that peace has come, a great many of these people who did their work well are being released from the government service. That is quite proper if they hold positions to be given to returned soldiers who have the preference and the permanent employees who are returning. It is probably quite reasonable to expect that many

of these people should be released from the service; I think perhaps that should be done on an even larger scale, but when temporary employees are released I believe they should be given compensation by way of some consideration for their extra work and overtime; and I do not think it is enough to say, "You are entitled to eighteen days' holidays this summer, so take that time and don't come back. We don't need you any more." I do not think that is treating the civil servant fairly. I certainly hope the minister has taken these points into consideration in preparing the bill that is to be brought in.

I do not want to delay the house longer at the resolution stage, because when the bill is brought in we may find these things provided for.

Mr. J. O. PROBE (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, I feel that we might have postponed the discussion which has taken place until we had the bill before us, but in view of the fact that a number of statements have been made I think perhaps a word is necessary at this time.

We are all primarily concerned about the efficiency of the civil service, and I think that should be the criterion by which whatever we do in regard to the first part of this measure should be examined. As far as the civil service preference for veterans goes, by their service to their country the veterans themselves have demonstrated that they have real ability. As to how this preference should be measured, recently I read something in regard to the system adopted by the British government for qualifying applicants for appointments and the way in which the civil service preference for veterans is measured there; and I should be glad if the minister could see fit to make some statement as to what the department has done with respect to studying closely the points basis in connection with the appointment of veterans to the civil service, instead of an absolute preference for those who have had overseas service. Undoubtedly modern techniques of personnel management make a very considerable use of such things as aptitude and mechanical tests of various kinds, depending upon the nature of the position for which candidates are being examined. I believe much of the abuse of the veterans' preference, which sometimes is definitely ignored because the head of a department wants a man of a certain type and will not take anyone else, could be avoided if we had some form of point rating based on a preference for overseas service, for service which resulted in a wound, and possibly for service during which the individual had no opportunity to get overseas for reasons over which he had no control. I should like the reaction of the minister to that suggestion, either now or during the debate on second reading of the bill, because I believe the British system has considerable merit.

In introducing the measure a few moments ago the minister made one statement which I heard with some gratification, though he did not enlarge upon it. He said those civil servants who had enlisted without the consent of the heads of their departments, or perhaps contrary to the wishes of their departments, were to be completely reinstated with respect to salary schedules, seniority and so on. I should like him to indicate, if he will, whether that applies to members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police as well as other members of the civil service. I presume, as he indicated, there will be something in the bill to cover that point.

Mr. F. D. SHAW (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to detain the house by making any observations on the resolution. Hon. members of this group feel that whatever contribution we may have to make or criticism we may desire to offer may be made when the bill is being considered. For that reason, and in the interests of making progress, we have deferred consideration of these matters until that time.

Mr. E. B. McKAY (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, I have only a brief word because I agree with the hon. member who has just spoken that the resolution need not be discussed, because an opportunity will be afforded on second reading. However before the bill is introduced I should like to say only a few words because I note that the measure is to provide veterans' preference in appointments to the civil service. This provision has been in effect for a considerable number of years. I feel however that the principle of preference should be extended to all veterans who were on active service, whether they served in Canada or overseas. Many Canadian veterans on active service never left the shores of this country, but it was through no fault of their own that they were unable to proceed overseas. Many of them made several applications to go overseas, but that privilege was denied them. I believe the preference should be based upon service to the country at home and abroad, and that the government should give consideration to giving preference, first, to overseas veterans, and secondly, to veterans who were on active service in Canada.

In my view those who served in isolated spots in Canada, either in the army or in the

air force, or those who served in territories contiguous to Canada, were just as necessary to the service of the country as were those who proceeded elsewhere.

I hope the minister will give consideration to this suggestion, and that some provision will be made in the bill for it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. HAMEL: On division.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Who said that?

Mr. HAMEL: I did.

Motion agreed to on division, and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Gibson (Hamilton West) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 413, to amend the Civil Service Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE

ADDITION OF PART DEALING WITH HABITUAL CRIMINALS—VARIOUS AMENDMENTS

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 364, to amend the criminal code.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have only one or two observations to make in connection with this bill, the principle of which is that amendments to the criminal code are necessary. As we shall have an opportunity of discussing the several sections as they arise, I shall not make reference to them at the present time.

May I reiterate what I have said on previous occasions, that as it is now constituted the criminal code is composed of many incongruous sections, and a very considerable portion of it is no longer applicable to present-day conditions. For that reason I suggest that in his position of Minister of Justice the minister could perform no more useful piece of work than at the earliest possible day to proceed with the recodification of the criminal code so as to bring it up to date, to remove many of the sections which are obsolete in effect, and also to amend the punishments, many of which have continued down to the present day from the year 1830, about which time cruel and unnatural punishments were done away with.

The recodification of our criminal code is long overdue. It was done last in 1892. Since that time psychological and penological advances have been made which in considerable measure necessitate an early alteration in the law with respect to insanity, and also with respect to the principles applicable to responsibility.

In connection with the question of responsibility, as hon. members know, anyone under the age of seven years is incapable of committing a crime, while in respect of those between the ages of seven and fourteen before an accused person can become liable the onus is placed upon the crown to establish knowledge as to the nature of the act. Two hundred years ago, when those principles were established, physical and mental age were believed to be synonymous. In recent years advances in psychology have shown that many persons of the physical age of more than fourteen years have the mental development of a child of seven years or less; yet they can be convicted of crime.

There is one other matter I would bring to the minister's attention. Having regard to the number of cases going to the courts of appeal on the question of the admissibility of statements and confessions, I am surprised that something has not been done to render uniform throughout the country the general principles applicable in this regard. We have only to point out two recent cases, namely the Dick case in Hamilton and the Sears case in Windsor, where persons had been convicted of murder, such convictions having been based upon statements the accused had made. On appeals those statements were held inadmissible for the reason that police officers failed to follow principles established in a multitude of cases with respect to the admissibility of statements. Many people place strong reliance upon the admissions of accused persons, but experience has shown that persons do confess even though they are entirely guiltless because under certain circumstances they have been taken into custody and have not realized the consequences.

In Saskatchewan some years ago a man was charged with the murder of a little girl. He confessed and went into complete details as to how he committed the crime, which had been preceded by criminal assault. He came up for preliminary hearing and his statement went in which revealed him as a person who had committed one of the most sordid crimes in the history of our province. He was brought to the place where the crime had been committed, which happened to be in the constituency of the hon. member for Humboldt, and he reconstructed the crime. After he had been in custody awaiting trial some one read of his

confession and could not understand why he had confessed to the murder when for two weeks before and two weeks after the date in question he had been two hundred miles away. This was brought to the attention of the attorney general of Saskatchewan and the accused man was released, even in the face of his confession. Later another man was arrested and confessed, but by reason of his suffering from insanity at the time of the commission of the offence he was sent to the North Battleford mental institution where he remained for some ten years. Some weeks ago he was found fit to stand trial but was found not guilty because during the interval the star witnesses for the crown had disappeared or were not available. That indicates the danger of confessions extracted from accused persons.

The minister may say that we have rules. True enough, general rules have been adduced from a variety of cases, but we have not the uniformity of rules that they have in the United Kingdom, where in 1912 Lord Alverstone and a committee of judges enunciated rules which must be followed by police officers all over the United Kingdom before proceeding to interrogate persons against whom there is a suspicion of guilt. Whether he can incorporate it in the criminal code or not, I think the minister would be making a splendid contribution to uniformity by having judges in various parts of the country join together and arrive at certain fundamental conclusions as to admissibility of statements so that there will be uniformity in practice.

You cannot maintain respect for the law when one court determines that a person shall die for murder and another court determines that because a person happens to appeal he is not guilty of the offence charged because wrongful evidence was admitted. I mentioned the case in Saskatchewan because it is an authenticated case which indicates that persons do confess under interrogation regardless of whether or not they are guilty. You may ask why that man confessed. The reason given was that he was in Portage la Prairie and thought it would be a way to get to Macoun, where he had lived, without having to pay any fare. He not only got back; he had to remain in gaol for a period of time, and but for gratuitous circumstances he would in the ordinary run of events have been executed for that murder.

My second suggestion is that uniformity should be established on another ground: when men are convicted of murder and their convictions are quashed on appeal, respect for the administration of justice is undermined. It is difficult for the average laymen to understand how such things can happen. The fact that death would have followed in the cases to which I have referred but for the court of appeal indicates the necessity of proper rules being established.

There is the other side of the question. Guilty men should not be permitted to escape because of mistakes made by police officers because of the fact that no police officer in this country, no matter how well versed he may be in criminal law, can state with certainty what the law is and what course he should follow before a statement which he secures will be admissible.

There is one other matter in connection with which I had hoped there would be an amendment to the criminal code. May I say that since becoming Minister of Justice the minister has been moving forward in making these amendments with commendable speed—one does not expect him to do everything within a few months of becoming the custodian of the king's conscience in our country. I had hoped that the minister would remove the sections dealing with the alternative penalty of imprisonment which today is levied on those convicted of minor offences and who, when they are unable to pay the money penalty, must go to gaol. It happens frequently that men come before the courts charged with petty offences such as being drunk and disorderly, and a fine of $5 or $10 is imposed with an alternative of 30 days in gaol.

Mr. LESAGE: It is always the same men who are accused of drunkenness.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not understand what my hon. friend means by that. It is a fact none the less that when a penalty by way of fine with the alternative of imprisonment is imposed for a petty offence or petty acts of mischief, the inability to pay should not be a passport to a penal institution. I have referred before to its having been abolished in the United Kingdom. There the right to imprison as an alternative rests with the magistrate, who imposes the alternative of imprisonment when and if he ascertains after examination that the man is in fact able to pay the monetary penalty.

It is true enough that today many magistrates extend the time contrary to the provisions, and they are sometimes criticized by provincial attorneys general for following that course. I suggest that the minister give consideration to removing those sections which provide for the alternative of gaol under the circumstances that I have mentioned. The stigma of gaol stays with a man throughout his life. No matter what he does he is always faced with that circumstance, that some place, somehow, he served time.

With regard to the sections in question I refrain from mentioning any of them until we get into committee, at which time I shall direct my attention to one particular section which I believe contains a principle that is dangerous in the extreme.

Mr. DAVID CROLL (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have just a few comments to make on this bill which I think the members will give a wide measure of support. I agree with the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) that an act such as the criminal code must inevitably get out of date as a result of judicial decisions, so that it is necessary from time to time to tighten it up.

I am not going to discuss the sections, but there is in the bill a new principle which comes as a rude awakening to the Canadian people because for the first time the bill recognizes that there is in Canada a definite criminal class. We have liked to think of ourselves in the past as a law-abiding people. We are, but for the first time we are admitting the truth, what is even better than that, we are facing up to the truth, and I wish to commend the minister for the remedial action he is taking.

For a variety of reasons, not least of which has been our antiquated penal system and our outmoded methods of prison therapy, there has grown up in Canada a class of habitual criminals. Members of the house have been calling attention to this for many, many years, and even in this parliament we have called attention to it from time to time. The Archambault report emphasized the inadequacy of our penitentiaries to prevent repeaters and insisted on proper classification and segregation of the prisoners. General Gibson has agreed with that report, and the minister is now taking some definite action. Although this amendment to the criminal code is only a small beginning, it does attack the problem in the weakest part of our penal system. Here we are screening out and detaining in separate custody those criminals whose criminal habits are so deeply ingrained that they are persistently leading a life of crime. The action that the minister is taking is a definite, progressive step. Now that we have both the Archambault report and the Gibson report as guides, we can clean house from top to bottom. The segregation of habitual criminals will make ever so much easier the task of regenerating the younger inmates of our prisons, many of whom, as the example of the Borstal system has shown, will respond to intelligent and patient handling.

The minister said, in speaking in the house, that in the main we were following the United Kingdom legislation on the same subject. I consider it well worth while to point out that there are some important differences in this bill from the British bill. In the United Kingdom the accused must be over thirty years of age. In the present bill the age is fixed at over eighteen years. In the United Kingdom the limit of preventive detention is from five to ten years. Here it is indefinite and it may very well be for one's natural life. In the United Kingdom it is necessary to obtain the consent of the director of public prosecutions. A similar office in this country would be the attorney general, but the bill does not provide for that. In one other important aspect this bill differs. In the United Kingdom, provision is made for counsel for anyone who is charged as an habitual criminal, counsel to be provided by the state at the request of the accused. No such provision is made in this bill.

I want to touch on another aspect that was touched on by the hon. member for Lake Centre and it is an important matter, the one dealing with voluntary statements. The spy trials, the Dick case in Hamilton and the Sears case in Windsor have pointed up the confused and highly unsatisfactory state of the law on this matter. Under the law as it at present exists there have been grave miscarriages of justice against the person on trial and sometimes in favour of the person on trial. Unless the confusion is cleared up, we may soon find that no statement made by an accused person or any person under arrest will ever be admitted as evidence at any subsequent trial. That may be very good. That perhaps puts the onus where it belongs, but I think it is time for the highest legal authority in the country to clarify that situation and for all purposes attempt to make the practice uniform.

There are other parts of this bill which appeal to me. One part of the bill recalls last year's Tobias case, where a Toronto storekeeper was shot to death in cold blood by five youths who escaped the death penalty because the jury decided that the young killers had not intended to cause his death. I think the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) discussed this case last year. This case and all the attendant publicity constituted a travesty of justice.

Mr. MacNICOL: It certainly was.

Mr. CROLL: I am glad to see that the present amendment will prevent it from happening again. From now on under this bill, to kill a man in such circumstances will be murder, and if this amendment comes too late to afford any satisfaction to the dead

man's family I hope it may be some consolation at least to them to know that his death was the cause of remedying a serious defect in our criminal law.

I wanted to say one word about what I thought was a distressing spectacle which occurred recently in the investigation of a young woman's death at Bracebridge. I think we can all regret the personal tragedy involved, but just as regrettable was the public exhibition which occurred. Somehow in our courts we seem to have borrowed a little from the United States. What does not appeal to me is the three-ring circus that seems to be an instrument of justice over there finding its way over here. I think any parent who read the newspaper accounts of bobby soxers thronging the courtroom must have been filled with disgust. I do not know what can be done to prevent this sort of side-show happening in the future. I should like some direction from the judicial authorities which bars children from court proceedings of this kind. I think they see enough of it in the movies. They should not be allowed to witness these tragedies which unfortunately occur all too often in real life.

I commend the minister for bringing in this bill at this time. I join with the hon. member for Lake Centre whole-heartedly in saying to the house that more progress has been made in the department in recent days, not only with respect to judicial matters, but also with respect to penitentiaries. We have a great deal of confidence that the minister will bring into effect many more of the recommendations of both the Archambault and the Gibson reports, so that we shall not find it necessary to use this new section dealing with habitual criminals.

Mr. F. E. JAENICKE (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, we need only to discuss the principle of the bill now before us, but I find that there are thirty-four principles involved. I may say that I more or less agree with all of them and commend the minister for bringing in the amendments to the criminal code.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker). I have always had great respect for his knowledge not only of criminal law, but of criminology in general which he has gained in his experience as a distinguished criminal lawyer in my province.

As I say, there are thirty-four principles involved in this bill, and we can discuss them in committee. I think they are all commendable and should be supported; but there is one principle contained in section 18 which is something revolutionary, I may say, in our criminal law, and has been revolutionary in any other country where it was first introduced. I agree that an habitual—I might call him an incurable criminal—should be put in a place of safety so that he will not be able to do any more damage. I would consider an incurable criminal on a par with a mentally incompetent person. Criminals who persist in committing crimes, in spite of their previous punishments, are, in my opinion, mentally defective as compared with ordinary law-abiding citizens who accept our moral code, which is reflected in our criminal law as reasonable and necessary. The difficulty is to establish who is an habitual or an incurable criminal. The royal commission presided over by Mr. Justice Archambault devotes a chapter to the subject. They recommended an amendment to the criminal laws which is now before the house.

The amendments proposed by the minister are substantially the same as those proposed by the Archambault commission. There are a few differences, which are only procedural, but I think there are two vital differences. The Archambault commission recommended that the trial of an habitual criminal should be by a judge alone, regardless of whether or not the criminal was convicted by a judge and jury. The bill before us proposes that the same court which tries the criminal for the criminal offence should also be the court to decide as to whether or not the convict or prisoner is an habitual criminal. I have not made up my mind as to whether or not the recommendation of the Archambault commission or the bill before us is the better method. I always favour the principle that a man, if he desires to be tried by a jury, should be tried by a jury. Offhand I would say that the amendment before us is better than the recommendation of the commission.

Then, the amendment provides that the facts to be produced at the trial of a person who is tried for being an habitual criminal are, first, of his criminal habits; second, of a criminal mode of life, and, third, that there must be three previous convictions under which he could have been sentenced to at least five years imprisonment. Perhaps the minister might take into consideration that a fourth fact might have to be established before the man could be convicted as an habitual criminal, namely, that there should be some facts on his mental attitude toward the accepted standards of morality. Perhaps the minister would consider some amendment to section 575B to that effect.

There is another important difference between the recommendations of the Archambault report and the bill before us. The bill

proposes that in order that a man may be tried as an habitual criminal there must be the consent of the attorney general of the provinces. I do not think I favour this particular section, because it tends to produce different practices in different provinces. In order that there may be uniform practice, I think the consent should be obtained from the commissioner of penitentiaries rather than from the attorney general of the province. After all, the commissioner of penitentiaries has the record of the particular prisoner. His consent should be obtained rather than that of the attorney general of the province, because it is my opinion that this will produce more uniformity of practice in this connection. The last subsection of section 18 states that the minister shall review the cases every three years. An amendment might be put in here stating that the minister ought to act upon the recommendation of the commissioner of penitentiaries.

As I mentioned in the opening sentences of my short remarks, the state of mind of an habitual criminal is somewhat equal to a defective mind, and I hope that the minister will soon see to it that one of the assistant commissioners to be appointed is an expert along that line, an alienist, as I mentioned yesterday. If that is done, then I think we might be more successful in working out the amendments now before the house and they will be of real benefit in connection with our whole criminal administration.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): There is one question I should like to place before the minister and the house, namely, the alarming increase in Canada in moral offences against children. I believe that that increase has taken place in all of the provinces; certainly it is so in my own province of British Columbia.

I have had different petitions requesting that some action be taken at this session to amend the criminal code to meet this situation. For example, one petition was signed by a large number of people from one of the junior high school parent-teacher associations, in the city of Vancouver, urging that the criminal code be so amended as to deal adequately with moral offences against children, regardless of which section of the criminal code these charges come under. I have had further representations from another parent-teacher association containing a resolution passed by the provincial convention of parent-teacher associations. At that convention there would be representatives of parent-teacher associations from all over the province, and this is the suggestion made by such provincial convention:

> Resolved (1) that representations be made to the federal government recommending that necessary legislation be enacted to provide for sentencing offenders against public morals where those offences are due to a psychopathic condition, to preventive treatment and detention in a separate institution provided for that purpose.
>
> (2) That representations be made to the government of the province of British Columbia recommending that all sex offenders (offenders against public morals) have medical and psychiatric examination before being sentenced in order to obtain, before disposition, an understanding of the personalities of the offenders.
>
> (3) That in view of the many protests concerning the number of light sentences imposed on moral degenerates, we make (a) representations to the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General that adequate psychiatric treatment be provided for such offenders and (b) to the Minister of Justice that adequate provision be made in the criminal code for retaining in custody these offenders until the treatment of the prisoner has proven sufficiently satisfactory that he may be safely returned to society.

Apparently under the present law many of the people committing criminal acts of this kind are sentenced, serve their time, are turned loose and commit the same crimes again. That happens time after time. Certainly something must be done to meet the situation. Just this week I received a Vancouver paper reporting an attack on two small girls. The father of one of the girls summed it up very well, I think, when he said:

> "I don't know. It's got me beaten," the eleven-year-old's father said this morning. "This sort of thing seems to be getting worse all the time and something has got to be done about it. But what I don't know."

I had hoped that there would be some amendment this year, but I can find nothing in the bill as presented to the house that meets the situation. There is some change in section 260 of the code, but that does not really meet the situation to which I have referred. I hope that when the minister speaks he will explain why it is that the government is not making a move at this time to cope with this very serious condition.

Mr. RODNEY ADAMSON (York West): I notice in this bill reference to motor car accidents, and penalties against drivers have been in many instances considerably increased. I have no objection to that at all if it will decrease the tragic number of highway accidents all across the country every year.

The question that I wish to raise at the moment is this. It has been found in the United Kingdom and in other countries that increasing the penalties for infractions of the various highway acts, and increasing the penal-

ties against operators of motor cars, did not in the main have the effect of decreasing accidents on the highway. The main purpose of this legislation is to prevent such accidents.

I see there is a clause in the bill increasing the penalties for stealing motor cars. That is an excellent and necessary step. For leaving the scene of an accident the penalty is also increased. It appears to me, however, having studied some of the insurance records, that a great percentage of the highway accidents are caused by a very small percentage of drivers. It has been said that eighty per cent of the accidents are caused by some ten per cent of the drivers.

I suggest that some consideration should be given to preventing the drivers from operating motor vehicles after the third or fourth accident. I realize that it would be difficult to enact such a provision in a statute or in the criminal code, but a recent accident caused the tragic death of someone very close to a member of this house. Before the trial took place, the driver of the car was operating again and was actually involved in another accident. The jury in both cases brought in a verdict of not guilty. The evidence adduced was that this driver had actually caused four accidents, two of which had been fatal; yet no penalty was imposed on that driver and the jury in both cases failed to register a conviction.

I feel that increasing the penalties for infringements of the law in connection with motor cars is necessary, but some further study should be given to the case of the driver who repeatedly has accidents. A man is not guilty unless he has been found guilty by his peers, but in the bill we have the repeating criminal clause, and we also have the other problem of the driver who has repeated accidents. It is one of the most serious situations we have to face on the highway today.

To increase the penalties is probably a good thing, but you run into this psychological fact, that a very stiff penalty may result in juries not wishing to convict because to do so would be to impose a heavy mandatory penalty on the driver. I know that is so in a number of cases where the attitude of the jury frequently is, "That is the sort of thing I might have done myself." I have had jurymen tell me their decision was based on that sort of reasoning. As I say, I do not know what could be added to the criminal code to overcome that kind of thing, but we have a small number of drivers who habitually cause accidents. Perhaps they are psychopathic cases, the same as the habitual criminal, but apparently there are some people who are incapable of driving a car without causing accidents. If some consideration could be given, after a driver has had three or four accidents, even though convictions may not have been registered, to preventing that man from continuing to drive I believe the accident rate would be greatly decreased.

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice): Before the motion is carried—

Mr. SPEAKER: If the minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

Mr. ILSLEY: —I should like to express my sense of indebtedness to the hon. members who have taken part in the debate for the suggestions they have offered and the interest they have shown in the improvement of the criminal law.

The bill before the house contains a fairly large number of important amendments proposed by the government, but a great many other suggestions have been made to the Department of Justice and, upon examination, have been rejected. I am not at all sure that if they had been brought before the house they would have been rejected by the membership of this house. Opinions would differ as to their efficacy, and as to the desirability of enacting them. In this field of legislation judgment plays a very large part. It is most difficult to know whether to embody certain suggestions in the form of amendments to the criminal code and propose them to the house; as I say, it is a matter of judgment as to whether or not they really would make an improvement in the code.

Some important matters have been mentioned in this debate. One is the question of whether imprisonment in default of payments of fines should be possible, where the person convicted is unable to pay a fine. As a matter of fact I had the officials of the Department of Justice prepare a series of amendments to the criminal code which would carry into effect roughly the provisions in that respect of the criminal justice administration act, 1914, of Great Britain; but I felt that we should not enact those provisions in this country until the whole criminal code is examined with a view to ascertaining whether changes should not be made in the penalty sections themselves. I listened to the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), and I gather that is what he suggests; that the penalty provisions of these sections themselves be changed. We have a great many sections where a fine is provided and imprisonment in default of payment of the fine. If we were to enact a provision that the person convicted

need not go to jail if he is unable to pay a fine I am afraid a great many persons would rapidly discover that they could commit certain offences with complete impunity. Therefore a provision of that kind, which roughly speaking is the provision of the British legislation, should not be enacted until we examine the sections themselves with a view to possibly revising the penalties. For instance, perhaps many of those sections should be changed in this way, that at the discretion of the court there be a fine or there be imprisonment. If that were the case the prospective offender could not say in advance for sure that he could commit the offence with impunity. I hope I have made that point clear to the house, and that is my reason for not proceeding with changes of that kind. I think the matter is well worthy of consideration, but only after thorough study is given the penalties imposed by the criminal code, which, I must say, are not altogether consistent.

Another important matter that has been mentioned is whether some attempt should not have been made to enact law relating to the admissibility of statements by an accused. I am willing to look into that matter, and I must confess that up to this moment I have not looked into it at all thoroughly. I have been going on the assumption that these situations arise from time to time where difficult points seem to come before the courts, that if just a little time is given they are settled by the courts of ultimate jurisdiction, by the final courts of appeal; and that when they are settled by the courts that is sufficient and better than for parliaments to attempt to cover by legislation matters which are extremely difficult. I must say I thought the law was fairly satisfactorily settled on the question of the admissibility of these confessions, but recently I am told there are differences between the courts. I would hope that by the process of judicial decision the points would be settled in such a way that legislation would not be necessary.

Then the hon. member for Lake Centre suggests that the whole criminal code should be revised, and perhaps that is true. As the years go on, I think a thorough-going recodification of the criminal law of Canada becomes more and more necessary. It is just a question of judgment, again, as to the time when that will be undertaken. It will be a colossal task when it is undertaken. If the commissioners who undertake that task spend as much time in considering the pros and cons of the desirability of making an amendment to each section as I have spent on these few sections, it will be a very long task indeed. It is so hard to say what penalties ought to be, and so hard to say what should be constituted as offences in the field of criminal law.

Then the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Jaenicke) made some suggestions about a certain section of the criminal code, as did the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll), and perhaps I can discuss those suggestions when we come to the consideration of that section.

The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) has brought forward the important question as to what should be done about sex offenders, and he has asked why the government has not introduced some amendments in the criminal code to deal with that situation. The reason is that we must get a little more information about what would be effective. I have undertaken to read some articles with respect to this matter, dealing with sex offenders, and one of the best articles is one entitled "Sexual Offenders." It is written by W. Norwood East, M.D., F.R.C.P., who was special consultant to the royal navy, and was formerly His Majesty's commissioner of prisons in England and Wales. It is to be found in the *Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases,* an educational journal on neuropsychiatry, in the issue of June, 1946. Appended to this issue is a bibliography of books and articles on the subject.

It is a field in which there is much disagreement. There are various schools of thought. The officials of my department, particularly General Gibson, have been pursuing this subject with the Department of National Health and Welfare in an effort to get from them some conclusions upon which people can now agree.

There are those who think psychiatry is not the whole answer. Psychiatrists, of course, may do much good. There are not many of them in Canada, and, indeed, not very many in the United States. We are beginning to bring them into the penitentiary system of the country to see what we can find out, and to learn what is practical.

If hon. members would read these articles and the articles to which reference is made they would see at once that there is no agreement as to just how far a country ought to go. It might be that we should construct certain institutions which would be more in the nature of hospitals than prisons, staff them with psychiatrists and then take the word of those psychiatrists as to when the offenders convicted of these offences should be released. Immediately that opens up a large question and provokes considerable opposition as to whether, in addition to taking steps with

respect to habitual offenders, we should also take offenders who are not necessarily habitual and place their liberty in the hands of psychiatrists.

In many instances they cannot be sure. Let me quote from one article by Doctor East, in which he quotes from another article as follows:

> The extremists who see in psychiatry the sole and ultimate solution of sex crimes claim that most if not all, of these offenders suffer from some individual mental disorder which should be treated by psychological individual methods. They want the psychiatrists to decide once and for all which individuals are treatable and determine how long their treatment should last. They want the doctors to decide definitely that they are cured or else pronounce them definitely incurable, as if it could be predicated that every sexual offender would fit into one of two cubby-holes for the rest of his life.

The writer of that article is skeptical as to whether that can be done with certainty. On the other hand, I believe considerable progress can be made, and we are trying to get as much information on the subject as we can. However we are not in a position to introduce an amendment to the criminal code prescribing preventive detention for sex offenders for indefinite periods, when we are not prepared to state for sure that we can say when they should be released again.

Mr. GREEN: Has consideration been given to increasing the penalties?

Mr. ILSLEY: I cannot say that consideration has been given to increasing the penalties. But I am under the impression that that is not the solution of the problem. I do not believe that that type of crime is committed by persons who are keeping in mind the penalty involved.

Mr. GREEN: But they would be out of circulation that much longer.

Mr. ILSLEY: It is true that they would be out of circulation that much longer. But, there again, whether the state would be justified in taking that action with regard to persons who are not habitual offenders I do not know. I think it is quite justified in taking action of that sort with regard to habitual offenders.

The hon. member for York West (Mr. Adamson) referred to an important subject, namely the question of driving motor cars by persons who are intoxicated. This is a matter of increasing importance. With the increasing amount of liquor being consumed in Canada, the increasing drink bill of the Canadian people, the increasing numbers of motor cars on the highways and the increasing number of accidents, parliament should take any steps it can which would be effective to prevent the causing of accidents or deaths on the highways.

Much thought has been given to the matter without, I must admit, very great results in the bill. The penalties for hit-and-run drivers have been increased. That is a peculiarly unpleasant sort of offence. We thought we would be justified in recommending an increase in the penalty. On the other hand, we did not think we would accomplish anything by increasing penalties for drunken driving. At the present time the penalties for drunken driving are seven days or thirty days, as the case may be. I, personally, do not think that raising it to fourteen days or sixty days would act as a deterrent.

There again I believe that many of those persons convicted of drunken driving dread the seven days or the thirty days in gaol just as much as they would the longer periods. If we make the detention longer magistrates and courts become increasingly reluctant to make convictions. In some cases they are reluctant now to convict. So we turned our attention from penalties to definitions, and considered how best we could define intoxication. The present definitions could possibly be made more satisfactory. The ordinary definition of intoxication in relation to drivers is that degree of intoxication or of being under the influence of liquor which renders the driving of a car dangerous to the public. This means that if the person were permitted to drive the car it would be a danger to the public.

That is accepted by most of the courts. Therefore there did not seem to be much to be gained by trying to extend that definition. It is almost impossible to say that a man is intoxicated if he has had a drink we will say, within one hour, two hours, three hours or four hours, because the variation is so great. It would be extremely severe to make it an offence to drive an automobile while under the influence of liquor. The courts have ruled that a person is under the influence of liquor after he has had a drink. The influence may be quite slight, and it hardly seems sufficient to make a criminal out of a man who has had a drink. So we abandoned that.

We gave consideration to the reversal of the onus in some cases. The best section that I could evolve, and which I want to put on record for the consideration of members, is this:

> Provided that whenever a motor vehicle is involved in an accident evidence that the person driving the said motor vehicle acted at or about the time of the accident in a manner indicating that he was under the influence of intoxicating liquor, shall be prima facie evidence that the said person was intoxicated.

I am not recommending it at this session, but if in the course of time it is found that we have to do something, from what consideration I have been able to give the matter this is the most practical amendment I can suggest if an amendment is to be made to stiffen the section. The proposed amendment has much to commend itself, but it also has much against it. I should like those who are interested in the subject to give it some consideration between this and the next session. I may say that we have had strong representations to the effect that we ought to go quite far in amending the section. I have not gone very far, as will be seen when the section is reached; what I have done is to try to offset the decision of the courts with regard to one particular phase of the matter which will be explained when the section is reached.

Mr. GREEN: Is that section 3?

Mr. ILSLEY: Section 10.

Mr. MacNICOL: Would the minister elaborate on the Bracebridge case, the particularly revolting case which was referred to by the hon. member for Spadina?

Mr. ILSLEY: I think the general rule is that an inquiry may be held in camera. It is the duty of the presiding officer—I think a coroner would have the same right, although I am not sure—whether a judge or other officer, to do what is right in that regard. I am not familiar with the case mentioned by the hon. member for Spadina, but I do know that judges often hear cases in camera if there is sufficient reason for doing so.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Imprisonment to be served consecutively.

Mr. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, if this is the best bill the government can bring down on this 104th day of the session regarding law reform, then we might just as well realize that there is no law reform proposed in the said bill. The bill is a disappointment to me. You cannot discuss the principle of the bill because there is a different principle in each clause. Each clause deals with a different subject matter. I am disappointed if this is the best law reform that Canada can get after being twenty-five years behind the times.

One section deals with accidents, but it offers no effective means of preventing accidents. The bill does not deal with some of the most important problems we have. We have had no opportunity of discussing the bill on second reading, and for that reason I do not think the minister will object if I make a few remarks in connection with the bill.

This bill is a disappointment to the chief constables' association, to the bar associations of the country, to the magistrates, to the judges and to the police officials who are enforcing the law. It would be better if the Attorney General of Canada would enforce his own statutes, and not leave their enforcement to the attorneys general of the provinces. As I see it, these amendments will not prevent any further accidents. You are going to have a lot of trouble. When you go over the bill you find that it absolutely forgets some of the main principles involved in law reform, or road accidents that cause death from the motor car, the abuse of which is one of Canada's greatest scandals.

We should have a complete revision of our criminal code every ten years, but I do not think there has been one since it was first passed. Is this the best law reform that the members of the two old parties and the other parties to my left can bring about? This bill of reform is not in accordance with the principles of real law reform which they have in England. There is nothing in this bill to prevent imprisonment for debt. Our gaols are filled with people, some of them soldiers, who cannot afford to pay their fines. Nothing is done about that in this bill. The summary offenders act was adopted in the mother country twenty-five years ago. Before the war, half of the prisons in England were closed as a result of time given to pay fines under the summary offenders act there.

Our newspapers are filled with details of accidents every day, but so far as these measures are concerned, we might as well meet in secret for all the public know of what is said here. It will be noticed that the bill contains some mention of the payment of fines, but that will have very little effect. The only thing to do is to adopt the same principles of law which have been in effect in England for twenty-five years. This minor change in the principle will not keep people out of gaol who have not the money with which to pay their fines. Some of our gaols are filled with these people, notwithstanding what has been said.

In these days the motor car is the cause of many deaths. Thousands of people are injured on our highways and the amendments proposed will have very little effect. I can find very little cure in these amendments for the problem of the hit-and-run driver, one of the most beastly types of murderer you can find. This is the man who runs away and leaves a child on the pavement. This is the

most cowardly form of murder. Women and children are left on our pavements, some of them killed. In the riding I represent and in the ridings of Danforth and Greenwood, including Danforth avenue, and in York East also, who have this great problem concerning deaths of the hit-and-run type. There have been a number of children killed by the hit-and-run type of driver on the streets of our cities. If we hope to get a lead from parliament we hope in vain.

In view of the decisions handed down by the court of appeal, the sections dealing with "voluntary statements to the police" should be clarified, but I can find very little in the bill touching on that important matter. The court of appeal has divided on that question and the judges and police have been asking for some clarification of those sections of the criminal code. We should know what the duties of the police are. At present they can hold without bail a man on a charge of which he is not guilty, and in some cases they have extended the law regarding vagrancy. We had, in my opinion, a miscarriage of justice in a city in central Ontario recently.

Where a female is on trial, women should have the right to compose half the jury. That is done in some states of the union, and women on the jury would be far more intelligent than some of the men we have. I am sorry that the minister did not include that in these amendments. I proposed it in a bill not very long ago.

There are minor changes proposed with regard to youthful offenders. Some do not have counsel. I think provision should be made for that, and that, before trial, the parents should be notified. Such an amendment is not to be found in the bill.

The chief constables' association have been making representations to parliament. They are the people who have to enforce the law. The enforcement of the criminal code is not done by the dominion at all but by the attorneys general of the provinces, who in turn leave it mostly to the municipalities, and there is a different enforcement in every province and no uniformity at all in the sentences handed out. Some people are given ten days for an offence for which another man gets thirty days or two years. Some of the savage fines imposed for infractions of the control regulations were ridiculous.

I should like to see some protection afforded to those who hire motor boats, rowboats, canoes and other craft, to ensure that their lives will not be endangered by such craft. Penalties should be provided by an amendment to the code for those who hire out these boats when they are not safe, or to make it reasonably certain that the applicant can swim or is safe to rent a craft to.

I would refer to section 15 of this bill which says:

> Paragraph (c) of section four hundred and forty-six of the said act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:
>
> (c) being armed with an offensive weapon or instrument or imitation thereof robs, or assaults with intent to rob, any person.

The words "or imitation thereof" have been added. That puts the person who carries a wooden gun and grabs a payroll out of a girl's hand but does not hurt her at all in the same class with reckless bandits going all over this country seizing payrolls, and bandits who mean murder and get away with it.

I shall not take time to discuss the bill clause by clause. On the 104th day of this session this bill is a disappointment to those who are looking for real law reform all over this country. The law courts are closed for the long vacation. Many lawyers, as well as judges and crown attorneys, are away on their holidays, and no opportunity is given to the chief constables' association of the dominion or the provinces to see what the amendments are. I object to the way we do our work. You ignore the chief constables' association, and the same with the bar association and the judges and magistrates who know the law. They have no opportunity of seeing the bill or of making suggestions to strengthen it. It passes this house and then goes over to the other part of this building to be passed there *seriatim* without much, if any, inquiry whatever. In future the bill should be introduced in the early days of the session and distributed thus.

We should have a legal committee. I have urged that earlier this session, and for twenty years. They have a legal committee in all the provinces. Ontario and Quebec were the first provinces to have one, and then it spread to the other provinces. It is a very good committee, which can sit down and consider the merits of a bill and its principle, hear deputations and see that the law is brought up to date so that we get some real law reform.

I am sorry to see that the recommendations of the women's organizations of our country such as the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire, the Council of Women and other organizations have not received consideration. They have been asking for measures to protect the wives and the families of our citizens, and some of them have made representations with respect to the non-payment of fines by a poor person.

I should like to see some clarification of the vagrancy clauses of the criminal code, so as to bring them up to date to meet changed conditions, but there is no clarification of them at all here.

With respect to section 18 dealing with habitual criminals, I am sorry that the law of England has not been copied *in toto*. Here you have to get the consent of the attorney general of the province; and it sometimes takes months to secure it, and you are kept running around in a circle by the circuitous methods of this section.

If there is any real law reform in this bill I cannot see it. I am dissatisfied with the bill. I am not criticizing the present minister at all, because he cannot be expected to cure the troubles of twenty-five years in less than twenty-five months. He has been in office for only a short time. But there should be a drastic revision of the code, and I would suggest that Mr. Justice Keiller Mackay be appointed to a committee of three or four or five judges to revise and consolidate our whole criminal law, so that a bill could be presented to the house next session. The code has been unrevised with very few exceptions since it was started in 1905 or 1906. It is true that statutory amendments are made from session to session, but so far as making real changes in response to representations by public bodies for real modern law reform after two wars, or with respect to the jury system of the country is concerned, that is another matter. The jury system should be protected and strengthened, and further amendments should be made to protect that system, which has not been satisfactory in all respects for the liberty of the subject.

Then with respect to appointments to the judiciary, I am not here to criticize the judiciary. I do not wish or intend to do so, but some of them have had no training and no practice at the criminal bar in the sections of the code which they are trying to enforce, with the result that in some cases there may be or may not be a miscarriage of justice.

It takes two people on a highway to make an accident. One driver may be eighty per cent responsible for the accident and the other twenty per cent. I do not see why the owner of the car who is eighty per cent responsible for the accident should not be prevented from driving a car for two years, with a penalty as well, which was the law of New York and which I included in the bill that I proposed.

I hope I can get some support from the estimable young lady who is a member of the House of Commons for the policy which I propose in allowing women to sit on grand juries. If the hon. member for Qu'Appelle is competent to become a member of the high court of parliament she ought to be able to sit on a jury. I think she would be a far better juror than some members of juries whom I have known.

Mr. KNOWLES: We should have a lot more like her in the house.

Mr. CHURCH: I do not know about that. She might make an excellent judge. My colleague the hon. member for Davenport used to be a learned justice of the peace. Judge Cohen of Toronto was a good justice of the peace who became a magistrate. As a matter of fact he was one of the best magistrates we ever had in Toronto, and I have the authority of the late Colonel Dennison for that. He gave most excellent and efficient service at no cost to the city. He was a most patriotic, reasonable and painstaking man. I have heard some of the lawyers say that he was the best magistrate they ever appeared before. My good friend, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Boucher), when a fine law student, learned a lot from Judge Cohen. I understand that at one time he went to get a search warrant, and Judge Cohen called his attention to the code and told him he was not entitled to a search warrant; that if he issued one to him he would be personally liable. That just goes to show that it is not necessary to be a lawyer to make a good magistrate. You, Mr. Chairman, are an able lawyer; you have had vast experience. Some of the best magistrates we have had in our province have had no legal training at all. I hope that during the recess of parliament the minister will be able to study the situation sufficiently so that he will be able to give us a better bill next session, one that will commend itself to the wisdom and the judgment of the country along the lines I have suggested.

I believe this is not the kind of law reform which we should have. I believe that we should have a consolidation of the code every ten years, and a judicial committee at once to consolidate it, along the lines I have suggested.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3—Causing a disturbance.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: This new section constitutes a departure from every principle of criminal law in so far as causing a disturbance is concerned. As a matter of fact, over all the years, under British common law and in Canada, under common law and then under the code, never before has it been

an offence to create a disturbance in any place other than in a public place. I submit that this section is not very well drafted. It provides for the definition of a dwelling house by reference to section 335 of the criminal code, which is in part VII, which states in the headnote:

Offences against rights of property and rights arising out of contracts, and offences connected with trade.

Actually what is taking place is that a section is being used as a definition section that is in another part of the code altogether, although that part is in no way applicable to the part in which section 222 is to be found. The new section reads:

Any one who causes a disturbance in any place other than a dwelling-house as defined in paragraph (g) of section three hundred and thirty-five, by screaming, shouting, swearing or singing or by being drunk or by impeding or incommoding other persons shall be guilty of an offence...

If a person happens to be on his own land and screams and if anybody happens to hear it who is not located on a public highway or in any other public place, this section makes it an offence.

Mr. KNOWLES: Can he scream in the House of Commons?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: As a matter of fact this section could apply to the House of Commons. If a member of the House of Commons becomes noisy and disturbs the sensibilities of other hon. members—and on occasion all of us do that—he would be guilty of an offence under this section. That shows the danger of drafting a section designed to prevent one wrong and thereby substituting an offence in a different situation which was never contemplated by the amendment. My hon. friend has pointed this out. There can be no question whatever that any hon. member who today does anything that disturbs any other hon. member could be brought before a court of this country and charged under this section.

I shall tell the committee the reason for the section. Some eighteen or nineteen years ago one Benson was charged with disorderly conduct in a public place, to wit, a restaurant. He was found not guilty because a restaurant is not a public place. Public places are places where all of us as citizens have an inherent right to enter. In order to make a person liable for creating a disturbance in places like that, the law officers of the crown have so constructed this section that incongruous results will follow therefrom. The more I look at the section, the more impossible it becomes. On consideration, I can understand why it is that in the United Kingdom, with their centuries of experience, have been very careful to maintain that no disturbance can be created in other than a public place. I suggest to the minister that if this amendment is passed in its present form, no matter whether a person is noisy in his own place or in some other place—

Mr. FRASER: At a ball game.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes, at a ball game; that is how it is drafted here—an offence is committed. It was never intended that an offence should be created under those circumstances. I should like to hear the minister discuss this important matter. It is not a simple amendment as is indicated by the explanation. "Public place" is removed. The doing of these things in a public place has always been the essence of the offence. I think it is a case of indifferent draftsmanship designed to get around one difficulty and, having got around that difficulty, created another more serious than that it was intended to cure.

Mr. GRAYDON: Out of the frying pan into the fire.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes. That is possibly the best description of it. I know something of the situation as it is today under that section, "public place" being defined as it is in the Benson case. But I would point out that at some time a situation will arise and a charge laid under this section which will render this house subject to considerable ridicule. I would suggest to the minister that the matter be re-submitted to the law officers, so that we do not under this section create a new type of offence, because certainly we are not intending to create these anomalous conditions by this section. When, however, the matter comes up for interpretation before the courts in the future, our ideas and intentions will not be taken into consideration. The words themselves will determine what we intended to convey in drafting this new section.

Mr. MICHAUD: I should like to add a word to what the hon. member has said. I, too, find it difficult to determine what the purpose is in amending the law in this way. I am under the impression that these vagrancy clauses are severe enough. I happen to have had a little experience under section 238 in little country places where I come from. We have had a great many such cases. Many trivial cases have come before the courts under section 238, a great many cases that are much too trivial to come before the courts. I have always found section 238 (f) as it stands broad enough to include anything of a criminal nature which may constitute a nuisance. I do

not think the offence should be broadened unless there are very good reasons therefor. I would urge the minister to give us the reason for which the amendment is sought. Is it urgent? Is it considered advisable to have this enlargement at the present time?

Mr. ILSLEY: I think the draftsmanship of the section is all right. I am not impressed with the observations of the hon. member for Lake Centre on that score. The question is whether the content is defensible or not. The reason for the section is the unsatisfactory state of the existing law. The wording of the present section requires a change mainly on account of the interpretation given to the words "public place".

In Rex v. Benson, 50 Canadian Criminal Cases, page 426, to which my hon. friend referred, restaurants, railway stations, public libraries and shops were declared not to be public places.

In Rex v. Carney, 12 Canadian Criminal Cases, page 349, licensed saloons and billiard halls were considered public places.

In *ex parte* Ashley, 8 Canadian Criminal Cases, page 325, a theatre was considered to be a public place.

There is therefore considerable confusion as to what is or is not a public place, and it was considered that it would be an offence for any person to make a disturbance in any place except a dwelling house. Causing a disturbance has been defined as raising a clamour or commotion, or quarreling or fighting, and applies to the comfort and convenience of the inhabitants and not necessarily to a breach of the peace. This was decided in Rex v. Martin, 12 Ontario Reports, page 800.

This offence is being moved from the vagrancy section, 238, to the nuisance sections, because it would appear to be at present wrongly placed. A person who engages in a fight on the street, or who obstructs traffic, is not necessarily a loose, idle, disorderly person or vagrant. In Rex v. Law, 42 Canadian Criminal Cases, MacDonald, P.M., dismissed such a case and said that it shocked his sense of justice to hold that a respectable citizen should be dubbed a vagrant simply because he blocked the sidewalk through causing a disturbance. He said he felt it could not have been the intention of the parliament of Canada to brand a man as a vagrant unless there was something else to show that he was a loose, idle or disorderly person.

Therefore the reason underlying the amendment was that causing a disturbance is not a badge of vagrancy. It is a nuisance, and the offence should be moved out of the vagrancy section into the nuisance sections. It was thought that when it was placed in the nuisance sections something should be done to define with more consistency the place within which a disturbance created by persons would be a nuisance.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Could you not define "public place" as including a place where the public have or have not an inherent right to enter? I think that would cover it. I would point out once more to the minister that to create a disturbance, as he has indicated, has been defined as raising a clamour or a commotion, and I again point out the incongruity of the fact that, as it is at present worded, it would apply to the raising of a clamour in this house or in any other public place. I know the reason for the amendment. My hon. friend mentioned Rex v. Benson, 50 Canadian Criminal Cases. I happened to be counsel for the appellant in that case, where it was decided that a restaurant was not a public place and I realize that, since that case was decided, wrongs have been committed which have gone unpunished. For that reason there must be some change in the law.

I think it is a good move to transfer this offence from section 238 and put it under the head of nuisance, because in the past any person who was noisy and was convicted under section 238 was forever thereafter designated as a vagrant.

Mr. ILSLEY: I will see what can be done in the way of drafting between now and eight o'clock.

Mr. ADAMSON: I certainly think the words "or singing" should be taken out. Every time there is a division in this house we might be charged under that.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, but it does not cause a disturbance.

Mr. ADAMSON: It says "swearing or singing".

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, but in addition to that it must cause a disturbance, and what my hon. friend mentions in illustration does not cause a disturbance within the meaning of the act.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the intention of the committee to proceed with the consideration of this bill after private bills?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at seven o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

OTTAWA ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY

The house in committee on Bill No. 241, respecting the Ottawa Electric Railway Company—Mr. Benidickson—Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—Company empowered to subdivide shares.

Mr. REID: Are we to have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. BENIDICKSON: This is a routine amendment of a private bill which was introduced in the senate, considered by a committee there and passed, came to this house for first reading and then was sent to the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines, which reported it without amendment. This private company is quite old, and the main amendment it is seeking is in section 1, under which it simply proposes to multiply the number of shares as now authorized by four. On another occasion the house imposed upon the company the restriction that its shares should not be issued at less than $100 each. In the proposed amendment effect is given to that restriction, in that the shares when split four for one are not to be issued at less than $25 a share.

The principal object of the amendment is that there may be a wider distribution of the shares of this company. The present capitalization, based upon a figure of $100 per share, is a stock issue of only 40,000 shares, of which some 35,197 have been issued. It is hoped that the new shares, priced at a lower figure, will be purchased by employees of the company, who have already shown some interest in that possibility.

Mr. CHURCH: It is just a change in the financial set-up of the company?

Mr. BENIDICKSON: Just a change in the capitalization; I assure the hon. member for Broadview that is all. It is hoped that when the individual shares can be purchased for a lesser amount more employees of the company will participate in the ownership of the company itself.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

FEDERATION INSURANCE COMPANY

The house in committee on Bill No. 266, to incorporate Federation Insurance Company of Canada—Mr. Cote (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)—Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

On section 8—Power to acquire rights, etc. of a certain insurance company.

Mr. JAENICKE: This company is to take over the assets and business of a French company, and it is the understanding that only the Canadian business of this French company is to be taken over. That being so, I believe section 8 should read accordingly. I therefore move that section 8 of Bill No. 266 be amended by inserting the words "within Canada" after the word "property" and after the word "liabilities" in line 35.

Mr. RINFRET: That is exactly the amendment I was going to propose.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What is the effect of the amendment?

Mr. JAENICKE: The section will then read:

> The company may acquire by agreement to insure or otherwise the whole or any part of the rights and property within Canada, and may assume the obligations and liabilities within Canada of "La Foncière, Compagnie d'Assurances Mobilieres et Immobilieres à primes fixes,"—

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 9 and 10 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 366, to incorporate Progressive Insurance Company of Canada—Mr. Rinfret.

Bill No. 378, to incorporate the Limitholders' Mutual Insurance Company—Mr. Lesage.

COMMONWEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre) moved the second reading of Bill No. 294, to incorporate Commonwealth Insurance Company.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

EILEEN MAUDE GARDNER RICHARDS

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre) moved the second reading of Bill No. 273, for the relief of Eileen Maude Gardner Richards.

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I understand there are forty or fifty divorce bills on the order paper for tonight. We know in recent years of the controversy and difference of opinion in the house in regard to this procedure. However, sir, until the house wishes to alter its own rules with reference thereto, it would be, I believe, in the process of expedition of the business of parliament if we could have these bills disposed of. I know there is opposition to them, and I am not at all objecting to that opposition; not in the slightest. But in my own humble way I commend to the house the necessity for getting these bills advanced one stage and off the order paper.

Mr. GRAYDON: How any girl ever refused you, after an appeal like that, I do not know.

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I had wished to draw to your attention something which I believed would be preliminary to any observations which might be made by other hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: Since the hon. member is the sponsor of the bill, it is his privilege to speak first.

Mr. MAYBANK: It was not exactly as mover of the motion that I desired to address the house. Rather it had been my intention to let the bill stand. However I did not hear Your Honour clearly when my name was used in the motion. There has been some confusion as to which should come first.

I had not intended to move the bill tonight, at all, but I do not know whether I am now in a position to withdraw it from the house. I have no desire to make an issue of it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Go ahead.

Mr. MAYBANK: If, on the other hand, it is agreed that the bills should be presented tonight, I shall make a short statement with respect to them. I believe the house knows well my attitude with reference to these private divorce bills. For two or three years I have been introducing them, but definitely I am not in favour of the practice. I realize that, since I do not favour it, I could refrain from moving them. I do that, however, because I am chairman of the miscellaneous bills committee. It is not a rule of the house, nor indeed until a few years ago was it the practice, for the chairman of the miscellaneous bills committee to do as I have been doing for the last two or three years. I understand, however, that in the other place that has been the practice for many years.

An hon. MEMBER: What has that to do with this?

Mr. MAYBANK: It has considerable to do with these divorce bills. As I say, I have followed that practice for the last three years, and I am willing to continue to do so, solely because it appears to be the desire of the house that divorce bills should be dealt with in this way.

I cannot express too strongly my opposition to this business of granting private divorces. This year a great many cases have passed in front of my eyes which I think would have been handled differently in the courts. I say that with all respect to the committee of the other house which is doing this business of hearing divorce cases. I think hon. gentlemen over there who are giving their time and attention to these cases are to be commended for the assiduity with which they prosecute the duties that have been put upon them; nevertheless I cannot help thinking a large number of these cases would be handled differently in a court of law.

As an illustration, this year a husband was the applicant in one case, while the wife was the applicant in another case based upon a set of circumstances that she alleged. Unquestionably in a court of law there would have been an examination into both petitions at the same time and the whole domestic trouble between the parties would have been dealt with then. However, under the procedure which we have in the House of Commons and in the other chamber the committee can deal only with the bill before us. The result was that one bill was passed and there was no occasion to pass the other, but we were in danger of being in the position of offering a bill to this house for acceptance in connection with which all the facts had not come out. Indeed, that was admitted. Our procedure makes that sort of thing possible.

I believe the best rule that this house could adopt for the future would be to declare that we will not pass private divorce bills. There might be a chance of some other satisfactory procedure being worked out if that were done.

Mr. REID: I doubt it.

Mr. MAYBANK: At any rate things could not be more unsatisfactory than they are. We

are in the position apparently of the house not being willing to pass a general divorce law for the province of Quebec. That is the nub of the difficulty. What do we do then? We do not pass a general divorce law for Quebec, but we pass two or three hundred divorce laws for Quebec. There is no use in the people of Quebec saying that they do not have divorce in Quebec; they do. The only thing is that they get it in pieces; I mean little bits of legislation.

It seems to me that if a person wants to live in a place where there is no general law covering divorce that person should accept the place which he or she has chosen as his or her domicile. If Mrs. Richard Roe lives in Brazil and there is no general divorce law there, she would not run to the parliament of Brazil if she had a husband who was a philanderer and say, "I have a philandering husband; I want to start over again, perhaps with a new husband, and I wish you would give me relief." The parliament of Brazil would not do that. But this parliament will do that for people who live in Quebec. The parliament of Canada would not do that for a woman who came from Manitoba, Ontario, British Columbia or one of the other common law provinces. They would say to that woman, "You have a general law there that can handle this situation; we will not pass it." I am quite confident that if any of these bills were from one of the common law provinces we would not consider them because there is a general law for the common law provinces.

In effect, every one of these bills says that there is a philandering husband or a philandering wife, and the husband or the wife asks for relief, as the case may be. Year after year hours of senators and of members of the House of Commons, not to mention the possibility of the Chairman getting writer's cramp by having to sign his name to every section, are taken up with these bills. We cannot give adequate consideration to these matters. Even though we could give adequate consideration, I submit that this is a practice from which we ought to get away.

I have every respect for the fine people of Quebec. If they do not want a common divorce law, then they had better see to it that some other system is adopted. It is no use for hon. members from Quebec to say that they have no divorce law in the province of Quebec because they have a divorce law there. The only difference is that they get it in this sort of undercover way, and in using that word I am referring to the law, not to the acts that lead up to these bills. The law is pretty much under cover. As everybody knows, the criminal code forbids the publication of these senate cases. That is a bad thing in itself. One of the worst things you can have in connection with the administration of law is to have it administered in camera.

One of the cases we had before us was actually defended on the ground that there was connivance by the husband with respect to the adultery of his wife. It came out down in the basement over there from the evidence of one of these investigators that the husband who engaged him said, "Follow my wife and get the evidence; if you cannot get evidence, make evidence. Then come and tell your story but, of course, don't let on that you and I framed this proposition against her." This scoundrel actually went on to follow out the instructions the husband had given.

If that sort of thing occurred in a court the attorney general would take some action against that blackguard. But this man came before the parliamentary committee and told a story of that kind. No check-up could be made. When a divorce is granted, it is immediate; there is no waiting period in which to check up whether there has been perjury. There is no opportunity of checking a great many other things, whether there has been collusion and so on. The divorce is absolute the moment His Excellency gives royal assent to the bill. It is well known to me that there are numerous people just waiting for that word of His Excellency to get their licences to remarry. If any of these divorces are obtained improperly before these houses of parliament there is no possibility of correction open to anyone.

It seems to me that, despite the long history of the granting of divorces in this fashion, we ought to get away from it in another session of parliament.

With respect to the bills which are this evening before this chamber and with respect to the few more that are yet to come and go to the miscellaneous private bills committee, there is a peculiar set of circumstances that we have to take into consideration. I think I have made it abundantly clear that I am opposed to this procedure; yet I have to admit that on a vote on this question tonight I would have to vote that these bills should pass, just as I have sponsored them as a matter of duty as chairman. Of course the reason, if there were no other, that I would advocate their passing at the present time is that great numbers of people have been led to believe that they can get these divorces through these houses of parliament in this way, and it would be visiting upon them a severe punishment if we were to throw out these bills. Take any one of these bills and you can figure it out that, on the average, the applicant has not very much left out of a thousand dollars.

There is a large amount of money invested in all these divorce bills, and summarily to turn down these applicants after they have all presented their cases to the Senate would seem to me to be harsh. There would be no opportunity for redress for the many innocent people who have spent their money in moving thus far in the direction of obtaining a divorce, and I would regret greatly to see that happen to this large number of people.

But I think we ought to let future applicants know that this business has come to an end; that, so far as this manner of getting divorces is concerned, the honeymoon is over, to use an expression that is fairly common nowadays to indicate that a great change in conditions has occurred, a phrase that the Minister of Reconstruction used effectively once or twice in dealing with matters which came under his jurisdiction. It may not, of course, be appropriate to talk about a honeymoon in connection with this sort of thing; but the honeymoon is over, that is clear, and we should let the public of one province, because only one province is involved, know that this method of obtaining a divorce cannot be followed any longer.

I submit that the rule of the house should be changed which permits this kind of private bill to come in. One simple change would be that, instead of private bills of this sort coming in with a payment of whatever fee there is, the fee should hereafter be $25,000 or $50,000, or any other ridiculous sum of money to make it clear that they are not to come here at all. If they happen to pay nothing to the House of Commons but $200 to the Senate we could easily say that it will be $50,000, $60,000, $70,000, $80,000 or $90,000 for each petition. I have no friends who could get a divorce if they had to pay $90,000. I do not want a divorce, and if I did I could not get it at such a price. That is only one way to amend the rule.

We could amend the rule to say that whenever an application for divorce came in it had to come in within the first thirteen minutes of parliament meeting, or something like that, or we could simply pass a resolution that in the opinion of this house it is not desirable to continue the practice of granting divorces in this way.

Some of my friends from Quebec have said to me, "It is an odd thing, but down our way a great many people are asking how it comes about that you are always introducing these divorce bills. You have a sort of reputation down there for being strongly in favour of divorce, and more of it, and easier divorce. We try to tell them that that is not quite right but still the idea persists." I hope that after tonight every person will understand that I am engaged in this practice because up to now it had been the desire of the House of Commons—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Because it is a public duty.

Mr. MAYBANK: Yes, I have taken it in that way, that it is a public duty, and I hope that hereafter no person will think I am in favour of this method of granting divorces. I do not wish it to be understood that I am against divorce. On the contrary, I am in favour of divorce. I think there are marital difficulties which arise for which there is no other suitable solution than divorce. So far as I am concerned I would liberalize divorce. Divorce solely on the ground of adultery or some sexual perversion is demanding too much. It would be better if we went more, probably not wholly, in the direction of the English practice and liberalized our divorce laws. But my whole point is that, whatever the law is, it should be a general law administered by the courts, and not a specific law for every outraged spouse who wants to come around.

Mr. EUGENE MARQUIS (Kamouraska): I wish to take exception to some of the statements made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Maybank) on the ground, first, that I am not in favour of divorce; second, that the amount of money involved is not so important that we should do away with principles far greater than divorce bills, and, third, that our divorce law is voted by a large majority of members from the other provinces which give laws to the province of Quebec. That is abnormal and should be abolished. I agree with the hon. member on that point. I will go farther and say I think divorce should be abolished in the whole dominion. Every minister of the church, every priest has preached that divorce is a very bad thing; that it is a calamity, and that it should disappear. For half a century divorce has brought bad results in countries like the United States, Canada and Great Britain, and everybody agrees that it would be better to have no divorce, but nobody can say that we should abolish divorce. So, if we have to face the situation we have only to abolish the law by which divorces are granted and in that way we shall have peace.

(Translation):

As I glanced through the order paper this afternoon, I was pained to see the long list of divorce bills it contained. I counted 123 such bills which we are asked to pass tonight.

Economic problems of great import, particularly in this period of reconstruction, are discussed daily in this house. But let us not stop to consider only economic values, which are worth much less than moral and spiritual values. Therefore, I do not think I am exceeding my rights as a member of this house in emphasizing, for a few moments, the importance of spiritual values and marriage according to Christian precepts, and the abomination of divorce in a country such as ours.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that any country which accepts divorce is headed for decadence and ruin. I am not setting myself up as an authority. One need only read the great London and New York dailies, or some Canadian newspaper to realize that decadence threatens and disorders are rife in countries where divorces are mounting up. Statesmen gather around tables to pave the way for a just and lasting peace. They would establish a doctrine of love in the world and kill all germs of dissension. Unfortunately, they forget to protect the root of love in the home itself.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARQUIS: Mr. Speaker, statesmen should in the first place direct their efforts and turn their minds to the upholding of this principle, in order to stabilize the home, to strengthen the family and to foster in our country as in other nations the establishment of a christian society, resting on solid ground and assured of future peace.

When France reached the highest pinnacle of intellectual and spiritual fame, when she filled the pages of her history with glorious conquests did France then draw her strength from divorce? No. When France suffered reverses, the sacred bonds of married love had been broken, the home had been overthrown and disorder had been gnawing at the heart and soul of the nation.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARQUIS: Great Britain, which had always been a model of discipline, has also allowed divorce to become rampant. What happens today? Ministers of the gospel hold meetings to devise means of uprooting this poisonous plant which is threatening the Christian way of life in that country.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying anything new—but truths take on a stronger meaning in their application—when I say that divorce is doing an injustice not only to husbands and wives but to children as well. Recently I noticed in a newspaper the picture of a child, her mother and her grandmother. The court had decided that the child should be given out for adoption because her parents had been divorced; the mother remarried and the father was found unfit to look after the child who was only two years old. The picture showed the grandmother looking sadly at her daughter and her granddaughter, both unfortunate victims of this social evil.

Mr. Speaker, recently I read in a Montreal newspaper, *Le Devoir,* an article which dealt with statistics published by the Toronto *Star,* and I would like to quote a brief excerpt therefrom:

> Recently, the Toronto *Star* made a parallel between the United States and Canada from the point of view of divorce.
>
> In 1946, there were 2,300,000 weddings in the United States, which represents an increase of 680,000. On the other hand, divorces numbered 620,000, an increase of 118,000, or four divorces for every ten weddings.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): It is unbelievable.

Mr. MARQUIS:

> A comparative census shows that in 1932, there were four divorces for every 25 weddings.
>
> In Canada, states the Toronto *Star,* there were about four divorces for every 250 weddings in 1932, as against four divorces for every 85 weddings in 1945.

An hon. MEMBER: A tremendous average.

Mr. MARQUIS:

> Of course, the divorce to wedding ratio is not as alarming as in the United States, but divorces were five times as numerous in 1945 than in 1932 and the statistics for 1946 will show a further increase. In other words, the progression takes place at a faster rate here than among our neighbours.
>
> What is the explanation of this tendency in both countries? The gradual forsaking of sound principles . . . is no doubt responsible to a large extent. The war has also been an important factor. Hasty marriages, long separations and war-provoked circumstances have largely contributed to the increase in the divorce rate. The example given by Hollywood, both in real life and the films has been an influence. But, above all, divorce provokes more divorces. The more common it becomes, the less reprehensible it appears and the more frequent it is. What will this lead us to?

Mr. Speaker, one principle should never be forgotten: that marriage is the very foundation of human preservation and that it is a divine institution. I feel it my duty to state in this house that human laws can never supersede the dictates of God, nor abolish the hard-and-fast rules, nor modify them one whit.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MARQUIS: What was good long ago for the ancestors of those who advocate divorce, which allowed them to people the earth with sturdy and righteous men, should be equally good for those of their descendants who, at the present time, can no longer differentiate

between licence and freedom, disorder and order, caprice and sound morals, immorality and morality. Let us not delude ourselves; we are facing quite a serious problem, and if we do not consider important matters on their merit and from their true angles, we shall grope in the dark on a course leading us to error. Marriage is assimilated to concubinage and people are told that if they have mistakenly contracted marriage it is up to the man or woman who has made that mistake, to make a fresh start. However those who after a first marriage, found that they had made a mistake, have married a second time. Seeing that they had made a second mistake, they married a third time, and then found out that they had been just as much mistaken the last time as the first. Moreover, we are asked to cover up that shame with our ridiculous legislation. How stupid! Divorce is condemned by all church authorities, Protestant or Catholic. Protestant denominations have repeatedly done so. I feel that in a country like ours divorce should be prohibited, for the sound reason that marriage is not a whim and does not exist for the mere satisfaction of husband and wife. Marriage is a divine institution whose purpose is the procreation of the generation which will come after us, which will develop this country and ultimately ensure the continuity of our traditions and our national heritage.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARQUIS: Mr. Speaker, I admit that my hon. friends have every right to hold different views, but there is quite a difference between an opinion and a principle, and as far as I am concerned, I consider that in such matters we should be governed by the principles proceeding from a divine source, which is the same for all religions which glorify God and for all countries where faith exists. The principle which we must uphold is the protection of marriage and the elimination of divorce. Besides, did not the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Maybank) admit it a few moments ago, when he said, there was no sense in this, that this legislation should be changed.

The province of Quebec has its own law as regards marriage. Section 185 of the civil code, which governs property and civil rights in our province, reads as follows:

185. Marriage is dissolved only through the natural death of the husband or wife; as long as they are both living, it is indissoluble.

In our province, the law says that marriage is indissoluble and that no legislation can annul it. Because, as Catholics and Christians, the husband and wife must live in conformity with the principles which have been the basis of their education, which must govern their lives and lead them toward the great beyond. It is not through a bill of the Canadian parliament that their status can be established from the standpoint of religion or family because this divorce law prevents their being arraigned for bigamy, and precludes any criminal proceedings.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that divorce legislation should be abolished in this country. The hon. members of the Senate are tired of hearing divorce cases. Many hon. members of this house, especially those from the province of Quebec, object to the passing of divorce bills. Catholics and even some hon. members of other denominations or from other provinces, whom I wish to congratulate, voted last year against some divorce bills. I respectfully submit that we should do away with divorce and leave each province free to settle marriage matters.

Finally, we have, at the present time, in the province of Quebec, a statute relating to marriage. Now, what is the effect of these divorce bills? The Quebec civil code is eluded. Indirect methods are countenanced of doing things which cannot be done directly. These acts are passed in the Canadian parliament and enforced in the province of Quebec, in spite of the opposition of its representatives. The time has come for these matters to be considered most seriously, for they constitute a vital problem for the country. Once for all, let us rid this house and parliament of the divorce problem.

Mr. Speaker, I wished to quote statistics. Unfortunately, the time allotted to me will not permit it. However, I want to refer to what the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Arsenault) stated a few months ago, in connection with divorces in Canada:

In 1901 there were only 661 divorces in Canada, for a population of 5,300,000; in 1911, 1,530 actions were taken and in 1921, the number had climbed to 7,410. Between 1911 and 1921, a period similar to the present one, inasmuch as it was marked by an armed conflict, the troublous times resulted in a five-fold increase in the number of divorces, which climbed from 1,500 to 7,401. In 1941, divorces numbered 14,032 in our country compared to 7,441 in 1931. This is an increase of practically 100 per cent. On the strength of these figures, unless we endeavour to curb this tendency, if the five-fold increase in the number of divorces holds for the period 1941 to 1951 as for that of 1911 to 1921, 70,000 homes will have been broken in Canada in the ten years previous to 1951.

(Text):

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hour reserved for private bills having expired, the house will now revert to its business prior to six o'clock.

CRIMINAL CODE

ADDITION OF PART DEALING WITH HABITUAL CRIMINALS—VARIOUS AMENDMENTS

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. 364, to amend the criminal code—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock it was considering section 3 of the bill.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is the minister in a position now to answer the question regarding this section, as to whether or not an amendment should be made to make this section applicable to an offence being committed in a place to which the public has or is permitted to have access, whether by licence or otherwise?

Mr. ILSLEY: The motion I propose is that section 3 be amended by striking out the words "any place other than a dwelling-house as defined in paragraph (g) of section three hundred and thirty-five" in lines 24, 25 and 26 on page 1, and substituting the following:

in or near any street, road or highway, or in any restaurant, railway station, public library, tavern, billiard hall, theatre, shop or other place to which the members of the public are admitted whether as a matter of right or otherwise . . .

Do hon. gentlemen think that is too broad, or what? Perhaps we could let this section stand while I have the amendment copied for the benefit of my hon. friend.

Section stands.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

On section 6—Culpable homicide murder in certain cases.

Mr. REID: Has the minister given any consideration, or will he give consideration, to the number of indecent assaults occurring in the various provinces? The suggestion is made that a crime of this kind is committed by a person who is mentally ill, and it is complained that when these men are sent to penitentiaries or reformatories the practices still continue in spite of the surveillance to which they are subject. My request to the minister is that the entire situation be reviewed with a view to segregating these offenders instead of having them mix with other prisoners.

Mr. ILSLEY: The matter to which the hon. gentleman has referred is being studied at the present time. I have taken note of the articles in the press, the resolutions that have been passed on this subject, and the scientific arguments that have been advanced. We are in communication with the Department of National Health and Welfare on the matter, and I can promise the hon. gentleman that the matter will continue to receive most careful and intensive consideration.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Section agreed to.

Sections 7 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

On section 10—Proviso.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I quite realize the circumstances under which this amendment is being introduced, but I question whether it is not going too far in placing the onus upon the accused. The principle of common law is, of course, that the onus must always rest upon the crown. The amendment reads as follows:

. . . any person who while intoxicated or under the influence of any narcotic occupies the seat ordinarily occupied by a person driving a motor vehicle shall be deemed to have the care and control of the said motor vehicle unless the said person establishes that he did not enter or mount the said vehicle for the purpose of setting it in motion.

I can appreciate the reason for the amendment, because certain judges have held that a person sitting behind the wheel of a car that is not in motion is not driving that car, nor has he any control over it. I rise only for the purpose of pointing out that in accepting this departure from the major principle of criminal law, namely that the onus rests upon the crown, I hope the minister does not take it as a precedent to remove that safeguard, which is of the essence of British criminal law, as far as other sections are concerned.

Mr. ILSLEY: When I have more time I want to give the house the long list of sections in the criminal code where the onus is shifted in circumstances something like these, and to point out that if this were not the case, law enforcement would be impossible. I realize the validity of the underlying general principle, and that it should not be interfered with except in the case of necessity, and, generally speaking, where the means of proof are peculiarly with the defendant.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: In the knowledge of the defendant.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes; that is the general principle. Perhaps it does not apply in every case; but in this instance, as I think the hon. member appreciates, no injustice can be done.

Mr. MILLER: Does the minister not think perhaps this amendment will encourage a drunken driver to keep on driving in an endeavour to get home? It seems to me that if a man is driving a car and realizes that he is drunk the proper thing for him to do is to pull over to the side of the road and sleep it off instead of trying to get home. It seems

to me that, under this amendment, once a man has started to drive while in that condition, he is guilty of this offence, and, knowing that, he will try to carry on until he gets home, whereas what he should do when he finds he cannot handle the car is to get to the side of the road and sleep it off.

Mr. ILSLEY: The hon. gentleman is taking the case of an intelligent man who finds himself getting a little too drunk to drive. All he has to do is to pull over to the side of the road and get out of the driver's seat.

Mr. GRAYDON: How intelligent is he when he is too drunk to drive?

Mr. ILSLEY: If he is intelligent enough to realize it, he is pretty intelligent.

Mr. FRASER: I wonder why the minister does not include the driver of a motor boat in this section. I say that because at many summer resorts people get into motor boats and ride around in circles near people in canoes, and cause a great deal of trouble. There should be a stiff penalty for anything of that kind.

Mr. ILSLEY: I believe the suggestion of the hon. gentleman is worth looking into. I have had no representations about drunken drivers of motor boats; I did not know there were any.

Mr. FRASER: That has happened at many places throughout the country, and I do not think there is any law to protect those in other boats. If these drunken drivers get into the ship channel then the Minister of Transport has a law for them, but if they get into the bay or out of the channel there is nothing to protect other people.

Mr. LESAGE: Suppose this motor boat driver realizes he is drunk; what should he do? He cannot park on the side of the road. Should he jump in the lake?

Mr. CHURCH: Notwithstanding the heavy loss of life, we have yet to provide a section dealing adequately with this offence. As the chief analyst for the Ontario government has said, eighty per cent of the accidents on our highways are caused by people who are not fit to drive their cars because of the intoxicants they have taken. It is all very well to talk about those who are in charge of a car. Some people sleep in their cars. Recently in my own city they have moved all the cars off the downtown streets and put them on the waterfront. Others sleep in trailers, which they are trying to move now to make room for the sick children's hospital. This section has not been strengthened at all. The proposed amendment will cause far more confusion than there has been under the existing law. The appalling fatal accidents and injuries from highway motor traffic are mounting steadily night and day. Every highway in Canada is coloured red with the slaughter. The loss in men, women and children, as well as the economic loss, is deplorable.

Several months ago, when I proposed an amendment somewhat similar to this one the minister showed a great deal of sympathy. Many of these accidents are caused by failure to exercise care and judgment on the part of those who drive these deadly, menacing machines. Nothing has contributed so much as the motor car to the education and enjoyment of the public. But, like every other great invention, and as in connection with medicine, science, physics and chemistry, use is one thing and abuse is another. Because of the abuse of the motor car in Canada today, we read in our newspapers every day about these casualties. On Dominion day, Tuesday of this week, there were seventy-five casualties, some of which were from drowning, but the great majority from the use of motor cars.

I hope that something may be done under this provision to remove this public scandal. Every highway is coloured red with slaughter, and nothing has been done, so far as I can see in this section, to cure the disease. The total list of those killed and injured on the highways of England, the United States and Canada during the six years of the war was almost equal to the number of casualties of those killed and injured in the war.

I have referred to this matter on many occasions, and I shall not occupy more of the time of the committee this evening. I do not say anything by way of criticism of the minister or of his deputy, because the minister has indeed a most able deputy at the present time, a man who has the advantage of having come from Toronto. The deputy minister of justice, Mr. Varcoe, K.C., C.M.G., was educated at Harbord collegiate, which has produced some great men, including Sir Edward Beatty, Beverley Baxter, Garfield Weston and others.

I call to the minister's attention the recommendations of chief justices, judges and magistrates and the law courts, the bar association, the chief constables' association and others for the cure of this disease. I doubt very much that the changing of a few words here and there will obtain the object the minister has in mind, because anyone can say now, "I did not intend to drive the car, no matter where I was sitting", and he will get the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. McMASTER: I should like the minister to tell us in what way he thinks he is strengthening the section, or in what way it is better than the original one. It states:

(4) Everyone who, while intoxicated or under the influence of any narcotic, drives any motor vehicle or automobile, or has the care or control of a motor vehicle or automobile, whether it is in motion or not, shall be guilty of an offence.

Surely that section is as clear as it can be. If the accused person has the care or control he is guilty, whether it is in motion or not. I know a court has decided that if it was not in motion and the man was drunk there was nothing to show that he had it under his control.

Mr. ILSLEY: Right.

Mr. McMASTER: But I cannot see how we have made it any stronger by this amendment. The way it is now, the only difference it makes is that the onus is thrown upon a man, and it must have been on him before.

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. McMASTER: He was guilty if he was sitting in the car.

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. McMASTER: In the amendment the only difference is that he can get up and say that he did not enter the vehicle to set it in motion. He may have had it in motion, and may have stopped a moment. He may have been under the influence, but if he says he did not mount it for the purpose of starting it he is free. It should be stronger than that, if we are ever to get a court to make a conviction.

Mr. ILSLEY: The only way to make it stronger is to leave out the concluding words, "unless the said person establishes that he did not enter or mount the said vehicle for the purpose of setting it in motion." If we leave off those words we expose a person who accidentally, in a drunken stupor, gets into a car to go to sleep, or something of that kind. He is left open to a conviction. That person never did have the control of the car, and he should be given an opportunity of showing that he did not enter the car or get on the motorcycle, if a motorcycle is involved, for the purpose of setting it in motion, and that he was not in the car for that purpose at all. That should be a defence to such a person.

But if those words are left off everyone would be subject to conviction.

Mr. McMASTER: Those words were not in the old act. If he was in it, whether it was in motion or not, he was supposed to be guilty of the offence.

[Mr. Church.]

Mr. ILSLEY: No, with deference, I think the hon. member is wrong. Before this amendment, if his state of intoxication were sufficiently advanced the courts in many of the provinces held he did not have control of the motor vehicle. It is no longer open to an accused person to defend himself on those grounds. The early words in this proviso take that defence away from him. But they leave a defence to a person who, having got into the car for the purpose of setting it in motion, goes to sleep.

Mr. McMASTER: It takes away a defence that was not very strong and gives him a defence that is strong.

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. MILLER: I return to the point I tried to make a moment ago. It seems to me that a man who is drunk and stops his car on the side of the road for the same purpose, namely to sleep it off, should be in just as strong a position as the drunken man who got into the car, not intending to start off with it. The other man got into the car with the intention of driving it. He does drive it for a distance and finds he is incapable of doing so. Therefore he wisely drives off to the side of the road. I say he should be protected just as much as the drunken man who gets in but does not start the car at all.

Mr. ILSLEY: The hon. member's argument leads to this conclusion, that we should not change the section at all. Perhaps we should not. But certainly we have been severely criticized by the courts for not changing it. There is a recent judgment of a judge in the supreme court of New Brunswick which is most caustic in its reference to the lawmakers. The reason is obvious.

If persons accused of driving a car while intoxicated can go into a court and say, "I was too drunk to be guilty," it shocks the public; indeed it shocks us all, I believe.

Mr. MILLER: I hold no brief for the drunken driver; I hate him. I do not like defending them, either in court or in parliament. But I believe that if we are giving a break to the man who gets in and does not start the car, the man who uses his head and, when he finds he is drunk, is wise enough to stop, should be protected possibly more than the other chap.

Mr. HACKETT: I am going to suggest that the words which have been used to indicate that the man entered the automobile be changed. It does not seem to me that it makes much difference what his purpose was on entering the automobile, so long as he

was in it without the intention of setting it in motion. The words now are:

Provided that any person who while intoxicated or under the influence of any narcotic occupies the seat ordinarily occupied by a person driving a motor vehicle shall be deemed to have the care or control of the said motor vehicle unless the said person establishes that he did not enter or mount the said vehicle.

If the words "enter or mount" were changed to the words, "unless he establish that he was not in the said vehicle" he would then be in the position in which I think the minister wants him to be. It would enable a person to show that, having entered an automobile with the intention of setting it in motion, he had not done so, or, having done so, had ceased to keep it in motion. I would think that change would enable the person to set up a defence which might exculpate him in circumstances where he would necessarily be condemned if he had entered the car with the intention of setting it in motion, whether he did or not.

Mr. ILSLEY: It may logically be so, but would it not really mean that the section would become unenforceable. An accused person could step up and swear, "It is true I was in the car; it is true I was behind the wheel; it is true I was driving the car, or I entered it with the intention of driving it, but there came a time when I did not intend to drive it any more. I was drunk behind the wheel of the car; I had been driving it, but I stopped driving it and I did not intend to start the car again." I do not think he should get off under those circumstances.

Mr. HACKETT: Nor do I. If he said that he would be guilty.

Mr. ILSLEY: Not under the amendment suggested by the hon. gentleman. His suggestion is that the section be amended so that it will read, "unless the said person establishes that he is not in the said vehicle for the purpose of setting it in motion." That would enable him to say, "True, I got in for that purpose and I drove it; I was drunk at the time and drunk before I got in, but there came a time when I decided not to drive it any more. I am testifying to that; nobody can deny that was my state of mind and, therefore, I am not guilty." That man ought to be held to be guilty.

Mr. HACKETT: I am not going to carry the argument much farther, but I do not think my suggestion lends itself to that interpretation. If a man were driving a car I do not think it would be open to him to say that it was not his intention to do so. What I am endeavouring to do is to protect the person who, having entered a car with the intention of driving it, was not driving it, in that it was still at the moment of the collision or whatever happened.

Mr. ILSLEY: Is the hon. gentleman suggesting that he never drove it, that he entered the car and did not drive it at any time?

Mr. HACKETT: He may have driven it, but he had ceased to drive it. As I interpret this amendment, it merely means that the man having entered the vehicle for the purpose of setting it in motion, a situation is created from which he cannot escape. My suggestion is that, having entered it with the intention of setting it in motion, if he ceases to keep it in motion, then he may escape.

Mr. ILSLEY: I think that is a bit fine spun to incorporate into legislation. If a man is drunk and gets in a car, while he is behind the wheel of that car I think he comes within the spirit of the original section which was that he should be convicted if he had the care and control of the car while intoxicated. It should not be open to him to say, "I was too drunk to be said to have the car under my control even though I was sitting behind the wheel." It should not be open to him to be able to say that.

Mr. HACKETT: My suggestion was not that he be able to avail himself of the suggestion set forth by the minister.

Mr. MILLER: Is there any other section in the criminal code under which a man may be convicted of an offence when, under the statute, he is guilty only of the intention to commit an offence? That is what this amendment does. If a man gets in a car and intends to drive it and does not drive it, under this amendment he is guilty of an offence although he is guilty actually of only the intention to commit an offence.

Mr. ILSLEY: He is not to be convicted of intent only; he is being convicted of intent plus the act. The act is taking custody of a car, being in the car, having the car under his care and control while he is drunk, plus the intent of setting the car in motion after he got into it.

Mr. CHURCH: The explanatory note to this section states that the amendment is made following recent court decisions to the effect that a driver may be too drunk to have the care or control of a motor vehicle. There is a great need for a drastic revision of this particular section which is amending subsection 4 of section 285, as enacted by section

6 of chapter 11 of the statutes of 1930. Professor Jocelyn Rodgers, medico-legal expert of Ontario and of the attorney general's department, a gentleman who has been giving evidence all over the province in connection with this section, says it is not the drunken driver who is the greatest menace—he is, as a rule, quite harmless—it is the man who drives in a state of slight conviviality with enough alcohol to give him a little exhilarated feeling and inspires him to take a chance at a time when that amount of alcohol will slow down the action of his brain and nerve cells so that when a crisis arises he cannot act quickly.

The railroads have a rule, known as rule G, which forbids any employee to touch alcoholic beverages while on duty. That rule states that a man driving a railroad engine should have no alcohol in his system. The same provision should certainly apply to the driver of a motor car, which is a more dangerous instrument of destruction. In some cases this has been provided by amendments to the law with regard to vendors.

I should like to quote from a letter which I received from the Reverend John Coburn, who has been writing to the government for many years in connection with this matter. In this letter he referred to the evidence which had been given by Professor Jocelyn Rodgers, to which I referred a moment ago. A decision was given by a police magistrate in Mimico and also by two or three other judges, which is referred to in the explanatory note to this section. This gentleman, the Reverend John Coburn of Toronto, goes on to say, in his letter to the minister and to members of the house, as follows:

> I think you will recognize that the police officers are up against an immense task. Magistrates and judges often seem to think that unless a man is drunk he has not committed a violation of the law. This is entirely erroneous. Some states in the union have passed a law making a blood test compulsory. According to Doctor Rodger's estimate, liquor is killing 5 people and injuring 84 every week on the highways of Ontario alone.

I believe he gave that evidence recently. I am very doubtful if this law goes far enough. The public want some better law provisions.

Mr McMASTER: The minister is dealing with the case of a person occupying a certain seat in a motor vehicle. All the accused has to do is to establish that he did not enter the seat for the purpose of setting the vehicle in motion. He might have been sober when he entered the seat, and his excuse might be that someone gave him a little liquor and that it went to his head. I suggest that he should establish, not that he did not "enter or mount the said vehicle" but that he did not "occupy the seat." You are referring previously to his occupying the seat. Why go back to the time he entered it, which may have been an hour before?

Mr. ILSLEY: You would never convict. They would say that they changed their minds about driving the car any longer.

Mr. McMASTER: They must get behind the wheel.

Mr. ILSLEY: If he is behind the wheel and is drunk the car is under his control.

Mr. McMASTER: I suggest that the intention is to make the law stronger. Then why not use the appropriate words?

Mr. CROLL: I rather agree with the hon. member. The man not only must have the car under his care and control, but must actually be occupying the seat if he is behind the wheel. Those three things are necessary. It must be part and parcel of the offence.

Mr. FAIR: It seems strange that you should have one set of government officials selling liquor to a man and another set of government officials convicting him because he is drunk. Why not fix up the sales of liquor rather than arrest and convict and fine a man or hang him if he injures or kills anybody after drinking?

Mr. MILLER: In Manitoba they have watered the liquor down to about fifty per cent.

Mr. MANROSS: What clause protects us from the backseat driver?

Section agreed to.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Chairman, an amendment was moved to clause 3, and the hon. member for Lake Centre wished to see a copy of the amendment.

On section 3—Causing a disturbance.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I think the amendment suggested by the minister covers the point that I raised this afternoon. It provides that you only commit the offence of creating a disturbance, in other words a clamour, if you are at or near any street, road or highway, or in any restaurant, railway station, public library, tavern, billiard hall, theatre, shop or other place to which members of the public are admitted whether as a matter of right or otherwise. I think that brings it strictly within the rule in the Benson case, and it does do one thing: it protects members

of parliament from now on from being liable for any offence under the section as originally drawn.

Mr. McMASTER: This bill is to protect the public, and it does seem a little easier to get the minister to lighten the burden on the public than to make it stronger. You cannot possibly cover every place by specifying them all. I can think of a noise being made in an automobile. I do not see why a man should make a big noise in his own house. This government will keep a good man out of his own house and will not let a bad man be turned out of somebody else's house.

Mr. HARTT: Why not read the clause first and speak afterwards?

Mr. McMASTER: I still think the amendment weakens the clause. A man should not be allowed to create a disturbance in his own house. In Toronto if you telephone the police and say that there is an awful noise next door, unless you can prove that there is somebody almost being murdered the police will say, "That is going on in his own house". The public have a right to be protected against a disturbance.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 11 and 12 agreed to.

On section 13—"Dwelling-house".

Mr. FRASER: Will this clause not have to be changed?

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I wish to make a suggestion in regard to section 13. I do not know whether the draftsman in drafting this section had before him a case that took place in Saskatchewan in reference to having liquor in a dwelling-house. There the definition was very much the same as here, and it was held that a room in a hotel did not constitute a dwelling-house. I would suggest that the amendment does not exactly cover what the minister had in mind. What harm would there be in adding, in order to ensure certainty, words somewhat to this effect: "without restricting the generality of the foregoing shall be deemed to include a room or rooms in a hotel or house." Once you define it as it now is, I am little afraid that some judge might hold that it does not cover what the minister has in mind, namely, hotel rooms. I make that suggestion because I know of a case under the liquor act—I sent out for it but did not get the right volume—in which the person was charged with having liquor in a hotel room. The question of the definition of "dwelling-house" came up, and the appellant won his appeal because the definition of "dwelling-house" was not sufficiently explicit.

Mr. ILSLEY: It certainly was intended to cover a hotel room which was occupied as a permanent or temporary residence. I was a little concerned about getting too far away from what I assumed was the common law. This is a change of definition of part VII of the criminal code. That is the part that deals with offences against rights of property and rights arising out of contracts and offences connected with trade. This has the effect of making theft in a hotel bedroom a much more serious offence than it has been heretofore, because if we have properly drafted the section it will hereafter be the same as theft in a dwelling-house. That is, the offence carries twice the punishment or something like that. I do not think there would be any objection to making it explicit if it is necessary. I doubt whether it is necessary. It has been drafted at the request of one of the provinces where there is considerable trouble with this kind of theft.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Was it drafted in that form by the province which submitted it?

Mr. ILSLEY: I cannot say exactly. They did not refer explicitly to hotel bedrooms; they used general language. The deputy thinks it is just as it came to us.

Section agreed to.

Sections 14 and 15 agreed to.

On section 16—Tampering and interfering with fire extinguishers or equipment.

Mr. FRASER: This section reads:

> Everyone is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment, or to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or to both such imprisonment and fine, who wilfully damages or interferes with any fire protection or fire safety equipment or device so as to render it inoperative or ineffective.

There should be a period after the word "device", because if a person interferes with any fire equipment he certainly ought to get the full penalty. There should be no half-way measure.

Mr. ILSLEY: If they knock some enamel off or something like that?

Mr. FRASER: They would not do that wilfully.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, they would.

Mr. FRASER: The section says "wilfully damages or interferes".

Mr. ILSLEY: Suppose they did some damage to it mischievously but so as not to affect the working of it at all?

Mr. FRASER: If they do it mischievously it is not wilful.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. FRASER: In a case like that, no. There should be the full penalty on this, because I know one case where a person did not interfere with the apparatus so that it would not work; but he disconnected the end of the hose so that when the fire hose was pulled out the other end was not connected; it took four or five minutes to connect it, and a lot of damage was done in the meantime. This person would not be guilty under this section, because the apparatus was still operative although they disconnected it. There should be a period after the word "device".

Mr. LESAGE: There is something in what has been said. If the offence is small justice will be satisfied with a small fine.

Mr. HARTT: I respectfully submit to the hon. gentleman who proposes that the sentence should stop at the word "device" and leave out the words "inoperative or ineffective", that it would mean the person who caused the mischief had not caused any damage; because, unless the instrument is made inoperative or unless the act complained of interferes with the working of the apparatus, no person can be held responsible and liable for something that he has not damaged.

Mr. FRASER: He has damaged it.

Mr. HARTT: If a man just touches a machine and a malevolent complainant wishes to take him before the courts and says that this man has tampered with a fire apparatus the judge has no alternative and no discretion but must condemn him to one year's imprisonment or a fine of $500.

Mr. LESAGE: No; that is the maximum.

Mr. HARTT: I am not bargaining with the committee. What I say is that the judge has no option if it is proved that the mischievous person has committed an offence. If he has not made the machine inoperative; if the machine is still working he has caused no damage and has not interfered with the working of the fire apparatus. I submit that the only time a person can be held liable for an offence is when the offence is committed. As a matter of fact, when no injury is caused no offence is committed.

Mr. FRASER: The hon. gentleman has tried to put up a case, but I still say that a fire apparatus, no matter where it is, is sacred.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. FRASER: It really is. It is protection of life and should not be touched.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the section carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. FRASER: The minister has not given his decision.

Mr. ILSLEY: I would be a little worried about taking these words out, on the ground that we ought to be careful when we create a crime that we are dealing with something that should be made a crime. "Wilful" means "intentional"; that is all. Technically, wilfully interfering with fire protection or fire safety equipment or devices would include the moving of some apparatus, and might technically come within the wording of the section even though the person did not intend to render it inoperative or ineffective. In other words, if these words come out it would include slight damage which did not render the apparatus inoperative or ineffective, and it might mean just moving it around or something of that kind.

Mr FRASER: There is some fire apparatus that you can put out of operation by just moving it around.

Mr. HARTT: Then it is inoperative.

Mr. FRASER: All right; I should like to see these words taken out.

Mr. ILSLEY: Some fire marshals' association suggested this wording. I do not like to create crimes unless the act is in its nature criminal. Before we pass this section, I wish to say to the committee a word about the explanatory note opposite the preceding section. I have been informed that the explanatory note is incorrect. The note says that the court of appeal of Ontario quashed a conviction on certain grounds. The conviction was not quashed on the grounds set out in the explanatory note. That is immaterial from the point of view of the section. In my judgment the amendment is still a meritorious one. I have been informed, one might say officially, that that explanatory note is incorrect; that the grounds set out were not the grounds on which the conviction was quashed. I do not believe that written reasons were given.

Mr. CHURCH: With reference to section 16, the amendment is not necessary for this reason. The criminal code provides for the

wilful destruction of certain classes of public and private property. That is provided for already. From the records I have of our own city and others, as well as schools—and it applies in other places as well—except on Hallowe'en there has been very little tampering with the safety devices set out in the explanatory note to this section. The note says:

> Its purpose is to make it an offence for anyone to tamper or interfere with fire extinguishers or equipment in or on any premises which would render it inoperable in the event of a fire.

That is the proposal now put into section 16. I suggest that far more damage has been done, as any school board can tell you, certainly in our large cities, damage amounting to anywhere from $15,000 to $20,000, I am told, by children throwing stones at hydro electric lights and globes. It runs into a large sum of money. The same complaint comes from other cities. I have seen reports in one paper about the destruction here in Ottawa, to a lesser degree. I think for more damage is caused in that way, but school boards and community clubs are checking on it.

As regards fire calls, I think the fine of $500 is too much. For the most part it will be found that juveniles are at fault, especially on October 31, Hallowe'en, and offences of this sort also follow every war. There is always wilful destruction of public property. The Addington administration faced the same problem as far back as 1801. I would ask the minister whether he has had any recommendation from the fire chiefs in this regard.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. CHURCH: Nevertheless I think the penalty is severe, a year and $500. Surely the police can stop this without such a penalty. Damage has been done also to some public buildings. I know that, from the insurance rates having been marked up, because of fire protection not being ample. There has been damage to some of the public departments, to schools and public institutions by reason of such interference with fire equipment or fire boxes. A few minutes' delay in getting to a fire might result in a heavier loss. I know this is a serious matter, but I think the penalty is too great because most or some of the offenders are juveniles.

I suggest that there should be some other remedy with regard to wilful destruction of globes, and interference with direct currents and primary and secondary lines of electricity, and fire and police electric boxes on highways. Often lights go out on street cars and in subways because someone interferes with a pole or globe or with conditions around plants, or right of way, or on overhead and all that kind of thing. The minister says he has had recommendations from the fire chiefs association?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. CHURCH: Many of them?

Mr. ILSLEY: Several.

Mr. CHURCH: I still think the penalty is too severe, and it is dangerous to imprison for this in the case of juveniles who cannot shell out.

Mr. BROOKS: It occurred to me that if, as suggested by the hon. member for Peterborough West, a period is put after "device", it means that a mischievous boy ringing in a false fire alarm would be subject to a $500 fine or imprisonment.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BROOKS: Would that not be a severe penalty?

Mr. TOWNLEY-SMITH: Would this allow anyone to fool around with fire equipment, take it away and bring it back, as long as it was not damaged or rendered inoperative or ineffective?

Mr. ILSLEY: If he has it at home it is inoperative and ineffective.

Mr. TOWNLEY-SMITH: It seems to me that a parallel case would be to allow a man to use a rifle to shoot at somebody else and it would be all right as long as the bullet did not hit him.

Section agreed to.

On section 17—Section repealed.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is the reason for the repeal of subsection 7 of section 554?

Mr. ILSLEY: It has been redundant since 1941. It is a little complicated.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is it only a case of redundancy?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 18—"judge" defined.

Mr. JAENICKE: This is the important section of the amendments before us. As I understand it, if a person is convicted of an indictable offence and has been indicted three times previously of an offence for which he was liable to imprisonment for over five years,

he can be tried by the same court as an habitual criminal, and apparently the only evidence necessary to find him such, either by judge or by judge and jury, is that, since attaining the age of eighteen, he has at least three times previously been convicted of the crime charged in the indictment, and for which he was liable to five years' imprisonment.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is not quite right.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There is the question of leading a criminal life.

Mr. JAENICKE: That all has to be proved, and then the court, according to section 575B, if it is of the opinion that, by reason of his criminal habits and mode of life, it is expedient for the protection of the public, may pass a further indeterminate sentence. Suppose he is tried by a judge and jury. He will be tried by the same court, judge and jury, for being an habitual criminal, and all the jury has to determine is whether he has been three times convicted. The question of his mode of life and criminal habits is for the judge to decide, according to my interpretation of this section.

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. JAENICKE: I may be wrong, but that is my interpretation of it. I would suggest to the minister that something else be included in line 30 after "mode of life", or in line 29 after "criminal habits". Would his attitude toward accepted standards of morality be taken into consideration? I should like the minister to consider that point.

Mr. CROLL: Perhaps the minister can answer a number of questions at the same time. Might I direct his attention to subsection 2 on page 7:

> In any indictment under this section it shall be sufficient, after charging the crime, to state that the offender is a habitual criminal.

As I think the minister knows, if perchance the man is tried before a jury and he does not see fit to give evidence, it is the custom for the jury to take the indictment with them into the jury room, and on reading the indictment they see immediately that he is an habitual criminal. I submit that we are prejudicing the case of the man who is being tried, and I do not think it is the minister's desire to do that. You are giving information that would not ordinarily be obtained. That is my reading of the section. I do not know what others make of it, but in that way he may be three times the loser, much too quickly under that method of procedure.

Mr. HEON: It would be equivalent to reading the criminal record of the accused before he was found guilty.

[Mr. Jaenicke.]

Mr. CROLL: I am suggesting that the man does not enter the box and there is no way of the jury knowing. They would have nothing before them except the evidence. But it is mentioned in the indictment that he is a habitual criminal.

Mr. CROLL: That is my point.

Mr. JAENICKE: That is what I say; it would inform a jury that a man had a criminal record, before he was found guilty.

Mr. CROLL: Quite; that is my suggestion.

Mr. McMASTER: It has been suggested that the minister answer all the questions at once, and I should like to know if the records show that there ever was such a person, who has been convicted four times of indictable offences and punished with sentences of at least five years. If there are such people, how many are there?

Mr. ILSLEY: Let us take the questions one by one. In the first place, the hon. member for Kindersley asked a question. If the case is tried by a judge with a jury, before a man can be convicted of being a habitual criminal the jury must find not only that he has been convicted three times previously of offences for which he was liable to at least five years' imprisonment, but also that he is persistently leading a criminal life.

Mr. JAENICKE: With all due respect, I do not think the section says that.

Mr. CHURCH: The minister has been in charge of the department for only a short time, but I should think that already—

Mr. ILSLEY: I wish the hon. member for Kindersley would elaborate his point, because he has a different understanding of it.

Mr. JAENICKE: Section 575C says:

> A person shall not be found to be a habitual criminal unless the judge or jury as the case may be, finds on evidence . . .

There is only one condition there as to what they have to find.

Mr. ILSLEY: Read it.

Mr. JAENICKE:

> (a) that since attaining the age of eighteen years he has at least three times previously to the conviction of the crime charged in the indictment, been convicted of an indictable offence for which he was liable to at least five years' imprisonment, whether any such previous conviction was before or after the passing of this part and that he is leading persistently a criminal life . . .

Mr. ILSLEY: "And that he is leading persistently a criminal life."

Mr. JAENICKE: That is all they have to find.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is what I say, and that is plenty.

Mr. JAENICKE: I would suggest, as I did before, that there should be evidence of his mental attitude toward our accepted standards of morality.

Mr. ILSLEY: Too indefinite; too vague.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I want to refer to subsection 4 of section 575C. We are setting up machinery to punish—

Mr. ILSLEY: Would my hon. friend just defer his remarks for a moment, until I clean up these other questions?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I thought the minister was going to answer all the questions at once.

Mr. ILSLEY: Perhaps that is what I should do, but I will try to answer them as we go along. The hon. member for Spadina raised the point that this prejudices the fair trial of the accused, because the indictment will have on its face the charge that the offender is a habitual criminal in addition to the charge concerning the offence for which he is being tried. I was not aware of the practice to which the hon. gentleman refers; that is, of handing the jury the indictment. I should have thought the accused would be arraigned on the offence for which he was being tried and, after that matter was settled, without any knowledge on the part of the jury of the other charge, that then and only then would he be charged with the other charge, and it would be dealt with. This is the language used in the English statute. I will read it, so that there will be no doubt. This is the prevention of crime act, 1908, and section 10(3) is in these words:

In any indictment under this section it shall be sufficient, after charging the crime, to state that the offender is a habitual criminal.

(4) In the proceedings on the indictment the offender shall in the first instance be arraigned on so much only of the indictment as charges the crime, and if on arraignment he pleads guilty or is found guilty by the jury, the jury shall, unless he pleads guilty to being a habitual criminal, be charged to inquire whether he is a habitual criminal, and in that case it shall not be necessary to swear the jury again:

I think we have followed that language here.

Mr. CROLL: But I think the deputy minister will tell the minister that the procedure followed in this province is that the indictment must go with the jury into the jury room. That is the common practice, so that it becomes a serious matter. You might let the section stand to look it up and see what may be the answer.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: As a matter of fact, if the indictment were handed to the jury with the record of three convictions on it and the accused had not testified, the conviction would be quashed because evidence of bad character would have been before the jury, which would be fatal.

Mr. CROLL: But that is what this provides.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not say I disagree with my hon. friend, but I do not think any judge would allow an indictment to go to the jury upon which appeared the record of previous convictions.

Mr. LESAGE: No crown prosecutor would do it, anyway.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is only a matter of procedure in any event, and I submit that it would be a simple matter of directing the attention of the courts to the fact that such a course should not be followed; and it is not being ratified by the passing of this bill in its present form because it is only a matter of procedure. Today there are cases where the penalty is larger because of a previous conviction. In certain types of obtaining under false pretences the penalty provided is larger on a second offence. So this is what is done. That is inserted in the indictment and not read at the time of the arraignment of the prisoner. Then, when the jury retires, invariably the judge directs the attention of the crown prosecutor to the fact that the indictment contains the record of a previous conviction, and that portion of the indictment is deleted and the indictment, with only the charge in it, is handed to the jury.

Mr. ILSLEY: I am pleased to have that information. Another hon. member has brought to my attention the provisions of section 851 of our criminal code. It is a long section, but perhaps I had better read it, because it is a precedent for this type of section:

In any indictment for an indictable offence, committed after a previous conviction or convictions for any indictable offence or offences, or for any offence or offences, for which a greater punishment may be inflicted by reason of such previous conviction, it shall be sufficient, after charging the subsequent offence, to state that the offender was at a certain time and place, or at certain times and places, convicted of an indictable offence or offences, or of an offence or offences, as the case may be, and to state the substance and effect only, omitting the formal part of the indictment and conviction, or of the summary conviction, as the case may be, for the previous offence or offences, without otherwise describing the previous offence or offences.

So, as the hon. member for Lake Centre has pointed out, certain indictments contain reference to previous convictions, and apparently the courts find no difficulty in preventing that fact from prejudicing the fair trial of the accused.

Mr. McIVOR: I do not know a great deal about law, but I must confess that I am afraid of this amendment. It seems to indicate that, no matter what influence is brought to bear on a man's life, he is not capable of change. I should like to think that no one is so depraved that he cannot be changed for the better.

Mr. ILSLEY: What is contemplated under the section is that habitual offenders will be placed under preventive detention, on an indeterminate sentence, but that their conduct will be reviewed by the Minister of Justice. The minister must keep in touch with that man's conduct, and provision is made therefor in the section. He must review at least every three years and, as a matter of fact, a review will be made by the remissions branch more often than that. The sentence is not a life sentence, necessarily. It contemplates release, if a man reforms.

Mr. McIVOR: That is good.

Mr. CHURCH: I should have thought that, in respect of this innovation which the minister brings to the house for the first time, he might better have waited until he saw the results of his prison reform programme. I would point out to the committee that we have had a report with respect to prison reform before us for many years, but nothing was done about it until about two years ago when the minister took office. He has appointed an officer for this purpose.

Would it not be better, when adopting a new system of this kind, which may be upset by the courts later on, to wait until we see what the results will be of the proposals for prison reform? In the first place, the minister has appointed a chief inspector and deputy minister, and he has made a report. A bill was passed only a few days ago in this connection. We should wait to see the development of the penal institutions being conducted. After every great war, there has always been a wave of crime and of suggestions with respect to these institutions.

One of the cardinal principles of Magna Carta is that the people shall have a large share in the administration of criminal justice. Whether these institutions are rightly or wrongly managed, the fact is that they are managed by crown officers, and the public have no right to enter them. Boards of visitors consist of members of the House of Commons and of the Senate, and the heads of the provinces, lieutenant governors and others. But how many of them have made visits to those institutions in the last few years? I was told by one warden that he has not seen a single soul.

Yet we go to work and, in one sweep, we pass this new section. I say those who are habitual offenders are the victims of a vicious, half-baked system. We have never had a real system of prison reform in Canada; it is a relic of the middle ages. Many of the provincial, municipal and dominion institutions were started before confederation against all known laws of public hygiene. We should wait to see what the results of prison reform, so far on paper, will be. As I have said, "Abandon hope all ye who enter here" should be placed over the whole of them. I have seen some of those institutions. I am familiar with the one at Guelph, from criticism of Ontario's court of appeal. The city of Toronto has spent large sums of money to help this type of offender. In 1912 it spent a large sum of money in connection with the establishment of a farm for young men on Yonge Street, and in 1914, on one at Concord, in West York, three miles away, for women. Then, in this connection we must think of the Mercer reformatory for girls and women; which was established in 1866, a long time ago.

How can we expect anyone placed in institutions like those not to be a habitual offender. In our prison system in Canada we are twenty-five years behind the old country, so far as prison reform is concerned. We have never had any up-to-date, national Borstal system.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, we have in British Columbia.

Mr. CHURCH: To a large extent the officials are appointed, and it is proposed by the hon. member for Lake Centre to transfer them so that they will come under the civil service commission. These officials, wardens, guards and all of them, are crown officers. No one from the outside, not even a grand jury, goes in to see what is going on. Is there any wonder that there are habitual offenders? They are the victims of our vicious system. Our institutions have been condemned, and reference has been made to them by Chief Justice Robertson of the court of appeal of Ontario, and Chief Justice McRuer, of the high court of Ontario, trial division. Our institutions have been severely criticized by various judges

of the court of appeal and other courts and magistrates, that they have no place to send first offenders to. Ontario is adopting new places.

Attack has been made against the indeterminate type of sentence. The late Chief Justice R. M. Meredith, one of the ablest judges on the circuit for forty years, said that the indeterminate system had resulted to some extent in the development of perpetual offenders, and he gave as a dictum, he, questioned whether the indeterminate sentence was not ultra vires.

If you ask me, the bringing of the attorneys general of the provinces into it is just a roundabout way of killing it, because one attorney general will act one way, and another will act another way. The proposals in the various following sections and this dual roundabout way of it all will be condemned.

The system will fail because it is not founded on real prison reform. The explanatory note with respect to section 18 states that this part is new and makes provision for the preventive detention of habitual criminals. Is it any wonder we have them, with the way in which Canada has acted? Then the section goes on to refer to the proceedings on crime, and then there is inquiry as to whether the offender is an habitual criminal. Then we find that the provision is retroactive, and that a sentence may be commuted and turned into a habitual sentence, a contradiction of terms and sentences. Where are they to be housed? These institutions are overloaded now.

I doubt if this system has been very much of a success in the United States because the repeaters are there coming back. I read something in the press only yesterday with respect to the condition in the Mercer reformatory at Toronto, where eighty per cent are repeaters. From what I have seen of it and the pictures in the *Globe and Mail,* that institution is one of the worst factors in the prevention of real prison reform. I have not been in it; but, as head of a police system, I had some knowledge of it. It, too, has been condemned, and was to be sold and torn down, which it should have been long ago.

I am not criticizing the officials there or any other place; far from it. They are men and women who give their life to this work, and should be complimented upon so doing. But there are others who are not so efficient. Many have been appointed under the patronage system, and they must learn only by experience. Before their appointment, they have no experience at all, and with such a system of prison reform is it any wonder there are repeaters?

I should like to compliment the minister upon one thing, and that is that, since taking office, he has begun reform. No doubt it will take a long time to carry it out, but I should like to see some of it done at once and completed before he adopts this new system. After all is said and done, we must not forget the liberty of the subject. There is a great deal of talk about that. This provision is going pretty far, especially at a critical time like this. But if there is to be such a policy, do not hand it over to the attorneys general of the provinces so that they will do nothing about it. Make a success of reform first, before we adopt this.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There is only one section concerning which I should like some information. So far as part X (A) is concerned, which covers habitual criminals, I believe the minister has gone too fast in introducing this provision before bringing into effect a system of rehabilitation as recommended by the Archambault commission. I agree with the hon. member for Broadview that what we are doing here is bringing in punitive legislation against the habitual offender, without having given him an opportunity of rehabilitation after discharge from a penal institution. I am not going to deal once more with that subject because I have dealt with it on previous occasions, but I do feel that more attention should be given to rehabilitation by carrying out the recommendations to which I have already referred. The idea of establishing two penal institutions wherein young prisoners can be removed from association with old and experienced prisoners should first be tried out in order that new opportunities may be given to those who, having once served, are returned to their ordinary life. However, the government has taken the stand that this measure should be introduced now. I would point out that in Great Britain this type of legislation was not introduced until every means of reformation had been exhausted by means of the Borstal and other institutions to assist those who have been punished for crime following their discharge from the penal institution. The subsection to which I take objection is subsection 4, which reads:

> A person shall not be tried on a charge of being a habitual criminal unless
>
> (a) the attorney general of the province in which the accused is to be tried consents thereto.

If being an habitual criminal is to be the subject of punishment, why should there be a provision enabling the attorney general of one province to determine that proceedings shall be taken under this section and the

attorney general of another province to determine otherwise under like circumstances? Criminal law being what it is, it should be uniformly enforced in all parts of the dominion without regard to the wishes of individual attorneys general. In this section there is a marked departure from the uniformity which should be aimed at. This section means that for the first time in the history of our criminal law there will be a departure from uniformity of application in all parts of the dominion. The application of this section of the criminal law is to be left in the hands of the provincial attorneys general.

Hon. members will see what will happen. There may be an attorney general who is of my mind. If I were in the position of an attorney general I would be opposed to allowing proceedings to be taken against a man as a habitual criminal unless the opportunity had first been given for reformation. I would look at the matter from the point of view of one who had for years been somewhat concerned with defence rather than prosecution. On the other hand, there may be an attorney general who for years had been a crown prosecutor or crown attorney, and his attitude of mind would necessarily be different from mine. The result would be that a person convicted of three crimes in one province could commit a fourth crime, and because of the attitude of the attorney general in the province in which he had committed that crime he could be prosecuted as a habitual criminal, or not prosecuted.

I urge upon the minister that this introduces into our criminal law a lack of uniformity, in that the person in one province may be prosecuted as a habitual criminal, whereas if the same person committed a crime in another province he would not be subject to prosecution.

Mr. MacNAUGHT: What about *nolle prosequi?*

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The principle of *nolle prosequi* is that the attorney general of a province may determine that there is no evidence upon which a conviction can be registered, or he may conclude that a man has already been sufficiently punished for the offence committed. For instance, it arises quite frequently that a man is charged with three different thefts. He is sentenced on those thefts and, later on, a fourth theft arises. Instead of having that person again go through the mill of a trial the attorney general may direct the crown prosecutor or the crown attorney to return a *nolle prosequi.* Under those circumstances the prosecution would not be proceeded with. In that principle there is no lack of uniformity. That principle dates back to the time of habeas corpus when, for the first time, the crown vested in its servants the right to direct that in the interests of justice prosecution ought not to take place. But this is a departure which I view with considerable alarm. It places the human factor foremost in the determination of whether or not a person shall be proceeded against.

Mr. LESAGE: In certain provinces they will not prosecute in connection with slot machines.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That matter rests with the province because property and civil rights are involved. That point was raised in connection with confiscation, I believe in a case in Windsor, and it was argued that the property and civil rights of the province were being interfered with. For that reason, matters having to do with slot machines rest with the provincial attorney general.

Mr. LESAGE: What about bingo games?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My hon. friend may know something about bingo. That is not a case where the attorney general of the province would determine whether prosecution shall take place.

Mr. LESAGE: Oh, yes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: In one city in my province you may operate a bingo game while in another you may not. That is because of the different attitude adopted by the officers in charge of prosecution. There is not one law in one part of the province and another law in another part.

Mr. LESAGE: That is not what is happening here; the law will not be different.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am not advancing this argument in any contentious way.

Mr. LESAGE: I know that.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am trying to point out the situation which, I think, will arise. I tried to put myself in the position of the attorney general of Saskatchewan. As one who is used to defence, I naturally would object without opportunities for reformation to penalizing a person because he is a habitual criminal. On the other hand, my hon. friend the Postmaster General, who had a most distinguished career as a prosecutor, would, if he were in that position, naturally and instinctively and subconsciously look at the case from the point of view of the prosecutor.

Mr. LESAGE: He has changed a lot since.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I find him to be a most kindly man; but I am speaking of his psychological reactions, of emotions that affect us all. That is why I raise my objection against this section, because I believe it means the first departure from a uniform application of the criminal law everywhere in Canada.

Mr. ILSLEY: I shall not answer the first part of my hon. friend's remarks about there having been no opportunity for reformation, because I cannot accept responsibility on the part of previous governments of Canada for the fact that men commit crimes.

But we have a situation where some persons are apparently going to commit crimes every time they get out and have a chance. The first object of criminal law is the protection of society and this seems to be necessary for the protection of society. My hon. friend says that it will induce a lack of uniformity in the law; he referred to the law of England and undertook to show that the right of the attorney general to direct that no prosecutions take place is there and has been carried into the law of Canada and attorneys general have the right to call off prosecutions. The same principle was incorporated in the British legislation.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Why not say the Attorney General of Canada? In England they have only one attorney general and you can get uniformity.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is not our system in Canada. Nothing is more fundamental in our system than the administration of justice and the enforcement of law are the responsibility of the provinces, not of the Attorney General of Canada, but of the attorney general of each province. In England they have passed similar legislation providing that no charge of being an habitual criminal shall be inserted in an indictment without the consent of the director of public prosecutions. They put that in, because it is a serious thing to charge a person with being an habitual criminal, leading a persistently criminal life. They wanted to make it clear that he did not have to be charged with that in every instance, and so they said that the consent of the director of public prosecutions would be required. We are putting in the same provision here in Canada and substituting the only officials we can substitute under our constitution, and that is the attorney general of the province for the director of general prosecutions. That is not peculiar to this act at all. It is worth while to put on record some of the sections where the same principle applies. I will give the numbers of the sections first: Sections 205A, 592, 594, 596, 597, 598, 777 and 825. These relate to various offences with which persons cannot be charged without the leave of the attorney general of the province and, in some cases, the Attorney General of Canada where the matter has some peculiar connection with dominion jurisdiction. Section 205A deals with parading while nude, and so on, and the section concludes with these words:

No action or prosecution for a violation of this section shall be commenced without the leave of the attorney general for the province in which the offence is alleged to have been committed.

Section 592 relates to the offence of disclosing official secrets and provides that no person shall be prosecuted for that offence without the consent of the attorney general of the province or of the Attorney General of Canada. Section 593 makes necessary the leave of the Attorney General of Canada. Section 594 deals with explosive substances and there can be no prosecution without the consent of the attorney general. Section 596 deals with criminal breach of trust—no prosecution without the consent of the attorney general. Similarly for the other sections I have mentioned. So there is a class of offences where no proceedings can be taken without the consent of the attorney general. It is the attorney general who prefers the indictment through his officer, the crown prosecutor. This makes it clear that he is not obliged in every case to prefer this charge. I do not see how you could have it any other way.

Mr. JAENICKE: I wanted to support the hon. member for Lake Centre in his plea to the minister, but the minister has already given his answer. The idea struck me as he was speaking his last sentence, why not change subsection 4 (a) by saying that consent must be obtained either from the provincial attorney general or the Attorney General of Canada. The minister has just read a section where the consent was possible either of the attorney general of the province or the Attorney General of Canada.

Mr. ILSLEY: The Attorney General of Canada comes in where the matter is one in which the dominion has definite concern. Section 593, for example, provides:

No one holding any judicial office shall be prosecuted for the offence of judicial corruption, without the leave of the Attorney General of Canada.

It is the government of Canada that appoints the judges. That is tied up to the dominion. But the ordinary prosecution of criminals is a provincial matter, and I do not think it would be proper for the dominion government to endeavour to project itself

into that field by trying to say what charges should be laid by provincial attorneys general and what should not, because that is what it would amount to.

Mr. JAENICKE: I would suggest to the minister that the criminal code provides for a penitentiary system which is under the jurisdiction of the dominion and that the man who would be tried for being a habitual criminal will have spent at least one or two terms in the penitentiary. Therefore the federal department would be much better able to judge whether that man should be tried as a habitual criminal, because it would have the information from the superintendent of the penitentiary and the penitentiary officials as to just what sort of person the man was.

Mr. HARTT: I do not rise to discuss this clause in a spirit of criticism. It is perhaps due to some mechanism in me that I cannot conceive or understand how we can incarcerate anybody by anticipation. I know it is the principle of magna carta that no man shall be held in prison without having previously been judged by his peers. That is an established principle we were all brought up to respect and to follow. And if I were met with the answer that the man had been judged because he had committed three offences and that is why he should be incarcerated for an indefinite period—that is something I just cannot assimilate. It makes me think of the poem of Alexander Pope who said: "It is a question whether want of skill appears in writing or in judging ill." By what measure of psychological conception, by what interpretation of law, by what system of calculation can we arrive at the conclusion that, because a man has committed an offence three times, he is therefore a habitual criminal and whether, with the consent or without the consent of the attorney general, he can be put away, subject to revision which will always confirm the reports of the superintendent of the penitentiary? I am wondering whether we are not committing a crime against criminals.

I have seen hon. members sitting on this side of the fence; I have seen a man psychologically, perhaps by a perverted mentality, by a sadistic attitude who will say, "come on; let us put him away." Society admits that it can do nothing with its offenders; that it cannot reform them; that it cannot redeem them; that it has gone bankrupt in social conduct and that we want to put a man away because we anticipate he is going to commit a crime. You say to him, Well, this man has been condemned three times. This is an importation into Canada. I do not want any precedents cited from the state of Michigan which condemns a man probably to life for having committed three small crimes. I do not want to play with the gastric juices of any judge who some morning may have an attack of indigestion and say, "I am going to put away this fellow." The word "judge" does not scare me. Judges are not infallible. Even God Almighty does not want to destroy the sinner. All He wants is for him to redeem himself. Here we are smarter than God Almighty. We are going to do something that God would not do. I want to know by what standard of measurement, by what norm we come to the conclusion. I know that some psychologists, some psychoanalysts, some of those who probe the minds and souls of men have something to say about such treatment. Personally I think they know nothing at all about it, because if they were psychoanalyzed in turn it would be found that it was too soon to let them out and too late to let them in.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I do not understand by what principle this is being done. Is it because some men want to show their usefulness? Up to the seventeenth century there were 175 crimes punishable by death in England, which did not deter crime. It has been going on. I remember reading of a case where a man witnessed the hanging in Virginia of a man who had picked the pocket of somebody. While he was witnessing the hanging, he was picking the pocket of somebody else. Did that stop the habitual criminal?

I do not want to compare the legislators of this house to the dictators of Europe who, being personally corrupted and perverted, infused their attitude into the administration of their respective governments and put people in concentration camps under the pretext that it was protective custody.

Mr. MacNICOL: And gassed them.

Mr. HARTT: Gassed them and made soap out of them. It was a paying proposition. They were doing it for the good of society. I do not know of any law that is not introduced for the good of society. Canada has got along well for eighty years. We have a criminal code that is as rigid as can be. We have noted every crime that can be committed that is punishable on its own merits and by judging each incident. Why is it that we have to give this latitude of incarcerating men by anticipation. Who is to read their minds? Who is to take that responsibility? We are somewhat civilized. I said "somewhat".

Mr. MacNICOL: Oftentimes we are far from being civilized.

Mr. HARTT: I should like to agree with the hon. gentleman, but I must be very careful. The point that I am trying to make to the committee is, what caused the necessity?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. HARTT: Some hon. gentlemen are in a hurry and want this bill carried. I have no doubt they will carry it, but let it be on their conscience. They have to remember that they are the elected representatives of the people. It may inadvertently strike the son of any man who is here, and then they will say, how foolish the law must have been.

What I object to, Mr. Chairman, is the principle of the thing, to condemn a man for an offence he has not committed. It is not British; it is not Canadian. We have never heard of such things. Who is to review the case? With all due respect to the deputy minister of justice—he may be a man of great knowledge—he cannot review all cases. Some junior comes into the Department of Justice. Hon. members ought to see some opinions handed out in the name of justice. I do not think there is a court in Canada which would uphold them, but that would be the opinion and the man would remain incarcerated. We are consoled by the assurance of the Minister of Justice who, I know, is a fair man, an honest man, that the case will be reviewed every three years. What a splendid vacation, to put a man away on some subjective suspicion because he was condemned three times before. There are a lot of men who are not caught the third time and are still loose, and often these men are to go away for life. I ask the Minister of Justice to consider the matter. It is an Americanism we have imported. The state of Michigan has it. I think the state of New York has it; but it is a state law; it is not a federal law and does not apply to the whole of the United States. Here we are passing a law that is going into perpetuity, that because a man has committed a crime three times he *ipso facto* is condemned as a habitual criminal.

On this point I must agree with the hon. member for Lake Centre. We want to protect ourselves and excuse ourselves for our failure to reform these criminals. Whether it is psychological, or whatever it is, we have done nothing in Canada to reform the criminal.

Mr. MacNICOL: Not of any consequence.

Mr. HARTT: No, we have not done anything in Canada. For a prisoner to live in incarceration, society will consider that he has paid his penalty. In order to clear ourselves of that delicate consciousness of ours, we say we can do nothing, that the man is a habitual criminal. I hope that the Minister of Justice will reflect on the matter. I am not here to teach him. I know he is a good lawyer; I know he knows the social conditions under which we live. I know there are some inadvertent moments in the playing around with this problem of attorneys general. I agree again with the hon. member for Lake Centre. I have my suspicions, because I do not know who are the gods and who are the devils. I do not know who is to judge advantageously to himself and who may play politics with a law such as this. We have heard of the principle of *nolle prosequi*. An hon. member was asked about the case of *nolle prosequi*. That is a thing they play with. In criminal law constitutionally it has become general. That is the constitution of Canada. Of course the attorneys general always have the discretion. Then they have to resort to *nolle prosequi*, no proof to proceed further. Those who practise law know very well what it means. I appeal to the Minister of Justice and to hon. members to reconsider the idea of putting a man in a concentration camp and to justify our action to say, "Now, you are a bad little boy; we are going to call you a habitual criminal" I think we are committing a crime against the criminals.

Mr. ILSLEY: I just want to say that I believe the hon. member for Cartier is thinking too much about the criminal and too little about society for whose protection we have to pass these laws. I think that is the fallacy of his approach. The important thing, after all, is the protection of society, and I cannot work up very great feelings of righteous indignation in favour of the suggestion that we are unjust in this law to men who have been guilty of serious crimes three times, as shown by their convictions, and who have committed a fourth crime and have been found by judge and jury to be leading persistently criminal lives. That is what they are punished for and not for any crime they have not committed. They are not punished in anticipation, but for what they have done, and this is a form of punishment which is necessary for the protection of society.

Mr. JAENICKE: If a man is charged on three different counts and is found guilty on all three, that is only one conviction? It is the same crime.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, I think so.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My hon. friend has raised a point that is worth serious consideration, because the section reads:

A person shall not be found to be a habitual criminal unless the judge or jury as the case may be, finds on evidence,

(a) that since attaining the age of eighteen years he has at least three times previously to the conviction of the crime charged in the indictment, been convicted of an indictable offence for which he was liable to at least five years' imprisonment . . .

—and also that he is leading a persistently criminal life. The hon. member has raised a point that is particularly sound. If a person were charged with theft, obtaining under false pretences, and a third offence within the same indictment, all of which were subject to punishment of at least five years' imprisonment, and if he were found guilty of all three he might very well come within these provisions.

Mr. LESAGE: Or even three counts of breaking in at night would be sufficient.

Mr. ILSLEY: I take it to mean, different times.

Mr. JAENICKE: It does not say that.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, that is what it states. I certainly intended, and I think the intention of the law is, that if he is charged in one indictment with several crimes, the convictions on that indictment are deemed to be at one time.

Mr. LESAGE: They may not be.

Mr. HEON: Could it not be stated, three different indictments and three separate convictions?

Mr. LESAGE: I have seen it happen that there were ten counts of breaking in—

Mr. HEON: On one indictment.

Mr. LESAGE: Yes. He pleaded guilty on four and not guilty on six. He was found guilty, later, on three, so that there were two convictions at different times on the same indictment, and it is possible that there might be three convictions on the same indictment at different times.

Mr. HEON: That would make a good point for appeal.

Mr. ILSLEY: I certainly intended that the convictions on one indictment should be deemed to be the one conviction at that time, so that you could not say he was convicted at different times simply because different convictions took place as a result of one indictment. I should think, if there were any doubt about the matter, the attorney general would proceed accordingly.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Another case that might be imagined is this. Suppose a person has lived a decent life and suddenly he begins to commit crimes. He commits three different thefts in different parts of his province all within a matter of a few days, and he is charged in point A, in point B and in point C and is convicted in each. You have three convictions and the man is a habitual criminal, unless some change is made here.

Mr. ILSLEY: It must also be established that he is leading a persistently criminal life, and I should think that would be a case where he would not even be charged with it.

Mr. HEON: He would have to be found guilty of being a habitual criminal.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BENTLEY: Is it intended that the person charged with being an habitual criminal shall have served a sentence on each of three different occasions; that is to say, that he shall have served three sentences for three different crimes before this would apply?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BENTLEY: Could it not be worded in that way, then, so that he would not be serving two or three sentences concurrently, but three separate sentences one after another? That is what the minister is trying to get at.

Mr. HEON: It says "convicted".

Mr. ILSLEY: The important thing is that he be convicted at successive times. The essence of the section, is that there be conviction at this particular time of his life, and a conviction again at another time, and a third conviction at still another time, and that it be established also that he is leading a persistently criminal life. That is the intention, and that is the way in which it should be viewed by the attorneys general who administer it. I think the intention is clear enough.

Mr. BENTLEY: I believe that is what is meant, but legal opinion here seems to differ.

Mr. ILSLEY: I think it is clear.

Mr. JAENICKE: I suggest 575C (a), at the top of page 7, might be looked at. After the word "imprisonment" there might be added the words "and has served three separate terms of imprisonment for such offences."

Mr. ILSLEY: The trouble there is that the sentence might be suspended. He might have been released on suspended sentence the first time, but that should not prevent him from being regarded as having committed a crime. That was a conviction, and I think that should be counted.

Mr. TIMMINS: It seems to me that, since so much doubt has been cast upon this clause;

since we are dealing with the freedom of people, and so many proper and valid objections have been raised, this might very well be left over for one more year so that it might be given serious study. We cannot be trifling with a few words which we may insert and which may be interpreted quite differently from the way in which the minister interprets them here. I am just throwing out that suggestion.

Section agreed to.

Sections 19 to 23 inclusive agreed to.

On section 24—Appeal on ground involving question of law.

Mr. ILSLEY: There is to be a slight change here. The word "that", the first word on line 22, must be deleted. It is really a clerical error.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 25 and 26 agreed to.

On section 27—Fees.

Mr. LESAGE: I should like to draw attention to the fact that in connection with summonses taken out by officers of the mounted police it has been the practice of the mounted police to serve these summonses themselves, even at distances as great as twenty miles and at places where there are bailiffs who could perform the service. The result is that the defendant has to pay large costs. I have seen one case in which the costs amounted to $18 for the service of the summons, whereas if it had been sent to a bailiff the cost would have been only fifty cents, because he lived less than a mile from the person served.

Mr. HEON: C'est le même principe que dans un cas de procédure civile.

Mr. LESAGE: Yes. In our code of civil procedure in the province of Quebec we have a rule that the greatest amount which may be charged for the service of a summons or writ is the amount that may be charged by the bailiff living nearest the defendant. This provision in the code will create an injustice. It is not the same thing as the case of an arrest. As a matter of fact, in Quebec the department of the attorney general always used the services of bailiffs, and the officers of the provincial police or of the liquor commission do not serve these summonses. I think it is only fair that they should be served by bailiffs, and it would not require any change in the law; it would only require instructions to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. It is as simple as that, and it would correct an injustice which is contrary to the general practice in the province.

Mr. MILLER: Does not the criminal code say the summons has to be served by a constable?

Mr. LESAGE: No, it does not.

Mr. ILSLEY: I will give consideration to the hon. gentleman's suggestion. I was not aware of the practice he mentions, and I do not think it can be extensive.

Mr. LESAGE: It is extensive. As far as I know, it is done in every case in the province of Quebec, and I have had many complaints.

Mr. ILSLEY: I shall look into the matter and see whether my hon. friend's point can be met.

Mr. MILLER: In the schedule the witness fee is fixed at $3. That is too much, if I may say so. In the west you may bring six or eight or ten witnesses in a small case, even one heard by a justice. If that is done in trials of small importance the costs are made too great. People cannot afford them; they will go to gaol instead of paying a fine and costs. In many of these small trials they have more witnesses than the courtroom can hold.

Mr. BOUCHER: I think it is recognized that even these fees are subject to the discretion of the presiding judge or magistrate. One hon. member spoke of the excessive cost of having summonses served in certain districts. I believe the presiding magistrate or judge sees that these summonses are served in the most economical way possible, and police officers are not permitted to travel long distances and run up large costs. I know in my own experience the presiding magistrate or judge generally insists upon the most economical service being carried out, because if we run up heavy costs in court actions we shall do more harm than good. The minister might take that into consideration and see that the fees are only permissive, giving the magistrate or judge discretion in awarding them.

Mr. McMASTER: I would suggest that there be a basic rate for service by constables. It does seem unfair that because a man lives twenty miles from the county town it should cost him more to be served. The offence is no greater than in the case of a man living in town. I should think that, by averaging the amount so that everyone would pay the same for service, we would get a fair method.

Mr. MILLER: I should like to support that suggestion. In the west they have long

distances to travel. Sometimes a man must be brought from thirty or forty miles away, and even farther in my own district. The costs of serving witnesses, with mileage and so on, become so burdensome the people simply cannot pay them.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Mr. MILLER: Can we not get an answer?

Mr. ILSLEY: If there is anything wrong with this scale of fees we should not pass it. As I understand the objections that have been raised, they are, first, that the witness fee of $3 a day is too much, and, then, that the fees of the constables should be averaged in some way. Were there any other suggestions I did not hear? I believe those were the only two. At the moment I do not see how this averaging that has been suggested could be done. I believe this is the system followed everywhere.

Mr. BOUCHER: I believe the minister understands the situation which is encountered more particularly in the rural districts, where they have long distances to travel. In this city, for example, costs are much higher in the county police court than in the city police court. In the city court they can serve individuals charged with various offences within a very short time, and the costs are reasonable. But take the case of an individual who has committed an offence, who lives some distance from the city and who has to be served with a process. If a policeman is sent out thirty or forty miles to bring in a witness one will find that the same two men, charged with exactly the same offence, will pay entirely different penalties for their offences. I say a gross injustice is being done, and having that disparity does not work to the benefit of proper law administration. If the minister could equalize it by having a flat rate I believe there would be a better administration of justice, and in the end it would be much better than the scale basis. Presiding judges or magistrates may have some discretion, but they do not always use it. One can realize that particularly in connection with offences where fines are imposed; and where the fines are going to one department of government or another, the magistrate must consider seriously the costs of serving processes as well as the collection of fines from the culprits. The accused person is often handicapped thereby.

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not believe that I shall offer any amendment to this, because much consideration has been given to this matter of fees. I have been making some inquiries from one hon. member who has had considerable experience in at least one province in respect of witness fees, and he informs me that there is considerable difficulty in having witnesses attend, at all, because the fees have been so low.

Mr. LESAGE: They claim it is not sufficient.

Mr. ILSLEY: I suppose the witnesses are obliged to come.

Mr. LESAGE: But they complain about it.

Mr. BOUCHER: Anyone who has had any experience in the administration of justice can assure the minister that, no matter what fees were paid to witnesses, they would not want to come. I do not think any witness will come to court simply because the fee is raised.

Section agreed to.

Sections 28 to 31 inclusive agreed to.

On section 32—Reduction of imprisonment on part payment of sum adjudged to be paid.

Mr. TIMMINS: Is this not a vicious section, in that it seems to make the court a collection agency? A man receives a term of imprisonment for non-payment of a sum of money, and then he can pay part of it and, by so doing, receive a reduction in the number of days he must serve. Probably that is a benevolent thing to do, but it is hardly in accord with the manner in which we carry on British justice.

Mr. ILSLEY: This amendment was recommended by the commissioners on the uniformity of legislation, and it seems fair. On what ground does the hon. member object?

Mr. TIMMINS: In many cases matters are rushed to court because the damages are not taken care of. The result is that a conviction is registered and money is to be paid. This indicates that the force of law would be used to force a man to pay.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): This reduction of sentence when the accused has been convicted and is subject to fine and imprisonment applies only to the fine being paid to the crown. It does not apply to a remittance of money when a magistrate orders an accused person to make a remittance. An unjust situation arises when a man who has been convicted and is subject to fine or imprisonment does not happen to have enough money to pay all the fine. He has to go to gaol because he cannot pay the $100 he has been fined, when he has only $50 with which to wipe out half the term of imprisonment. I believe this provision is fair to the accused man.

Mr. ILSLEY: There is a clerical error in the first line of section 32 and I will ask my colleague to make the necessary amendment.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier) moved:

That the words "that the said act be amended" in the first line of section 32 be stricken out and the words "the said act is further amended" be substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 33 and 34 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES

PROVISION FOR ADDITION TO LIST OF REFORMATORY INSTITUTIONS

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 377 to amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act.

Mr. GREEN: Would the minister make a statement?

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Speaker, this bill was requested within the last two weeks by the government of Nova Scotia, and it is rendered necessary by reason of the fact that the Halifax industrial school will soon close down. In Nova Scotia Protestant boys are sent to the Halifax industrial school and Roman Catholic boys to the St. Patrick's home. A new school is being established called the Nova Scoita school for boys, and is to be added to the list of institutions mentioned in the Prisons and Reformatories Act. The act will provide that boys of either the Protestant or Roman Catholic faiths may be sent to the Nova Scotia school for boys. This bill was introduced because of a recent request by the attorney general of Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, read the third time and passed.

FOREST CONSERVATION

EASTERN SLOPE OF ROCKY MOUNTAINS—AGREEMENT WITH ALBERTA

The house resumed from Tuesday, July 1, consideration in committee of Bill No. 362, respecting the protection and conservation of the forests on the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains—Mr. Howe—Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. MacNICOL: Mr. Chairman, for perhaps half a dozen or more years I had the pleasure of travelling over the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains, and at that time I became greatly alarmed at the lack of protection against fire and other things which might destroy the forests. I am rising to support this bill strongly for the second time. I appreciate that the minister who is piloting this bill is doing so because the minister in charge of the department is away ill. I am not going to extend my remarks any longer than necessary because I am in favour of the bill.

There is a great need for what this bill sets out to accomplish. Anyone going through that area cannot help but be struck by the destruction that has occurred. I have a report here showing the results of ten years of administration, five years under the federal government and five years under the provincial government. In giving these figures, I do not intend for one moment to censure the provincial government, because their administration of the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains was during the depression years when, as everyone knows, revenues were at their lowest ebb. The government of Alberta could not have been expected to provide the same standards of protection that had been provided by the federal government. I have a letter from the department giving the fire losses on the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains at the headwaters of the Saskatchewan river for the years 1925 to 1936. During the period 1925 to 1930 inclusive, when the federal government was administering the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains, the total acreage of timber land destroyed was 58,530 acres, or an average of 11,756 acres a year. During the five years 1931 to 1936 inclusive, when the provincial government was in control—this was at the very depth of the depression when little money was available for these matters—the losses amounted to 235,155 acres, or an average of 47,031 acres a year. That is a terrific loss.

The department was not able to give me any figures following 1936; but if the same rate continued for the ten years since that time, on the basis of 47,031 acres destroyed each year it would mean that another 470,000 acres of timber land could have been destroyed. Whether or not that is the case does not matter for the purposes of my argument, because I want to support the programme the government is now putting forward to assist the Alberta government in preventing the destruction of forests on the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains.

If I had a complaint to make it would be that this bill should have been introduced

years ago. As the committee knows, I have advocated such a bill for quite a few years. I am not going to complain over that not having been done, because during that period every dollar was required to prosecute a victorious war. First, because of the depression and, second, because of the war these forests have been destroyed to an extent far beyond what they should have been.

Their importance is hardly estimable. I made a survey last fall in connection with the forests on the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains at the headwaters of the Platte river in the western states. I was informed that the forests on the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains at the headwaters of the Platte river—and this would apply also to the Missouri river—contained approximately one-eighth of the forest wealth of the basin of the Platte. I do not know whether that is the case in Canada, but I imagine it would be safe to say that the forest resources on the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains at the headwaters of the Saskatchewan river would be approximately one-eighth of the wealth and the water resources fifty per cent of the whole basin of the Saskatchewan, which is approximately 149,000 square miles.

The forest wealth on the eastern slope is far greater per square mile or per acre than it is in any other part of the watershed where there is so much in the way of scrub trees, jack pine and trees of little consequence whatever. On the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains there are many fine stands of timber. The importance of the eastern slope to that whole area lies in the fact that in the past it did retain for a long time into the spring and right into the summer vast sheets of ice and snow, and by the retention of that ice and snow the flow in the Saskatchewan river was more even. That, of course, goes without saying. But the reverse effect has followed from the destruction of the forests, and the figures show that the destruction has been great. The result has been that the flow of the Saskatchewan river, as was demonstrated clearly this spring, has been in greater volume than it should have been with the result that it runs off more rapidly and gives little return as it flows down to the sea. In other words, the more that the forests are destroyed by fire, the more rapid is the run-off of the water; and the more the forests are retained, the more permanent the water resources, which are almost priceless to the west, are retained for the benefit of the whole country. So I hope that this legislation will result in more retention of the water resources on the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

If I have any comment to make on the bill itself I would inquire, first, why the commission is to consist of two appointees of the federal government and one from the provincial government. The whole of this work is in Alberta; and, since Alberta is vitally interested, why should not two members of the commission be appointed from Alberta and only one from the federal government? Being on the job there all the time, Alberta might be expected to have a more intense interest in the maintenance of the forests than someone appointed from Ottawa. But I am not going to quarrel with that.

I would ask, further, if the measure is to be considered as a more or less permanent arrangement. I believe that the present limit is twenty-five years, and during the first five years this government is to contribute $6,300,000, plus one half of the cost of maintenance, which is estimated at about $250,000 a year. The federal government will contribute up to $200,000 for maintenance if that should be required, the provincial contribution to maintenance being $125,000 a year. I am not able to say whether that is enough or not. I would hope that the federal government will not stick at the cost of maintenance if it should cost more than $200,000 a year, because the water resources of the Saskatchewan river constitute the most priceless single resource in the west. If the water resources go, everything goes.

It is not mentioned in the bill, but I presume there will have to be some arrangement whereby the commission will consult with the P.F.R.A. The P.F.R.A. is a branch of the federal government and it is engaged just now, and I hope will be more so as the years go by, in the conservation of the water resources of the Saskatchewan river watershed. I should therefore think this commission ought to work in close harmony with the P.F.R.A. Under the bill the P.F.R.A. would have no authority, but I have no doubt that the commissioners from Alberta and the dominion government, knowing full well the importance of water conservation, would cooperate together.

The minister will, I hope, tell us something about the programme. Formerly there was some programme for the setting up of fire towers such as we have all through northern Ontario. There would also have to be reservoirs created, although the bill does not mention that, so that water will be available to put out fires either by hose or to be carried by fire truck to put out the fire. I presume that would be part of the capital investment.

I am glad to see that this government is to contribute $6,300,000 for the next five years.

I hope that when the five years expire another grant of equal amount will be made for the same purpose because of the vast importance of the preservation of the water resources on the east slope of the Rocky mountains which comes about through the maintenance of the forests. That makes it an investment that is good business. It is money well spent by this government.

I could say a lot more, but perhaps if I sit down the bill will get through more quickly, and I am anxious to see the bill get through. There may be a few amendments to propose; I do not know whether there are or not; but if the western members have amendments that will be helpful, I shall not oppose them. I am grateful to the government as a humble member and as a Canadian long interested in the preservation of the forests on the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains for what the government is doing by this bill. I am anxious to see it in operation.

My last word is this. While this bill pertains only to the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains, anyone who has travelled through British Columbia must have been horrified times without number as I have been, to contemplate the vast destruction of the forests in that province. One of the most pitiful spectacles one can see is those vast areas along the Fraser and Thompson rivers where formerly thousands and thousands of acres of fine timber grew but which section, through destruction of the forests by fire, is of no more value. So I hope that when the minister finds out, as he will, all the benefits that accrue from reforestation, the preservation of the forests, the conservation of water, the maintenance of the ice and snow which will be the result of reforestation and preservation of the forests, he will bring in another bill to assist British Columbia in the preservation of its forests from destruction by fire. This is almost too big a job for any single province. I look upon the preservation of the forests of the Rocky mountains on both the eastern slope and the main slope as national business. The headwaters of our great rivers are almost priceless and their maintenance is almost priceless. I strongly support this bill.

Mr. MacINNIS: I am not going to detain the committee very long. I just wish to do something similar to what was done by the hon. member for Davenport who has just taken his seat. I wish to approve the purposes for which this bill is brought before parliament. If there is anything in Canada more important than anything else it is the conservation of our forests. In these circumstances, I believe that the preservation of the forests and the water resources in this area is more than any one province can undertake by itself. I believe that the government has done the right thing by coming to an agreement with the province whereby the work is to be undertaken by both.

What the hon. member for Davenport said with regard to British Columbia and the destruction and devastation of the forests is true. As a matter of fact he did not put the case as strongly as it should be put. No one can travel by our railways from Alberta through British Columbia to the coast without being appalled at the terrible destruction of the finest forest stands in the world. The same is true in a great many cases right across this dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Forests are disappearing. With the disappearance of the forests will soon go the water resources if they are not conserved, and then will come the destruction of the soil through erosion of various kinds.

So far as this group is concerned, this bill will have our full support.

Mr. GREEN: Is there any set government policy with regard to giving assistance and protection against forest fires and in furthering conservation methods?

Mr. HOWE: The ownership of the forests carries with it the responsibility for their protection. That is the usual policy and has been over the years. When the dominion government owned the natural resources of the prairies it bore all the costs of protecting the forests and fighting forest fires. The reason for the government's intervention in this case is, as I said earlier in the debate, that the three provinces are dependent upon the protection of the forests on the east slope of the Rocky mountains. The purpose of the bill is not primarily to protect the forests, although by protecting the forests we achieve the real object of the bill, which is to protect the run-off in the headwaters of the Saskatchewan valley.

The hon. member for Davenport inquired why the commission had two members appointed by the federal government and one by the provinces. The reason is that the federal government in this case provides all the capital expenditure. The interests of the three provinces must be protected in the carrying out of the work. It is suggested that the capital expenditure in the amount of $6,300,000 be expended over six years. That is the fixed capital appropriated by this bill. It is provided that the maintenance expense is voted annually by parliament. If the maintenance expense is over $350,000, the province

of Alberta pays $125,000. If the maintenance expense is less, the province pays half the maintenance expense. If it is more than $250,000, the money can still be voted by parliament as required, but the provincial contribution is limited to $125,000.

No one can estimate the value of having the forests of the east slope amply protected. Without that, the run-off of the rivers is disturbed and the cost of regulating the flow of the rivers is greatly increased, if not made impossible. Therefore the commission will be made up of at least one forestry engineer of proven capacity to plan the programme of the development of the east slope, and he will be associated with at least one good businessman to see that the government's money is well spent and a representative of the province who, I am sure, will also be competent in the field in which he is appointed.

Mr. GREEN: Has there been any negotiating with any other province for a similar work?

Mr. HOWE: No other similar situation arises that I know of where the forests of one province protects the headwaters of the rivers of another province.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

On section 6—Purposes or objects of board.

Mr. MacNICOL: With reference to this section, will there be a regular sub-branch having to do with the destruction of insects and so forth in the forests in addition to the fire prevention branch?

Mr. HOWE: All the resources of the government will be available to the commission. At the moment there is a forest insect control board in operation. It happens to be in the Department of Reconstruction and Supply at the present time. It is doing splendid work in experimenting with pests to check insect devastation. The information of the board will be available to this commission. In fact the commission can, of course, call on all the resources of the federal government which may be required to enable it to carry out its work efficiently.

Section agreed to.

Sections 7 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

[Mr. Howe.]

NATIONAL PARKS

ADJUSTMENT OF BOUNDARIES, ADDITIONS, ETC.

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Acting Minister of Mines and Resources) moved the second reading of Bill No. 365, respecting certain national parks and to amend the National Parks Act.

Mr. GREEN: Will the minister explain the bill?

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Speaker, since this bill, if enacted, will divest the crown of areas of land in certain of the national parks, the title to which is at present in the crown, His Excellency the Governor General was informed in respect thereto and has given his consent to the consideration of the bill.

Briefly, the purpose of this bill is:

(1) To add to Fort Beausejour historic park two small parcels totalling a little more than four acres of historic ground.

(2) To withdraw from Riding Mountain national park a marginal 640 acres of land which is being exchanged with the owner of a similar area of land well inside the park which is of greater value for park purposes and which will be included in the park by this legislation.

(3) To add to Elk Island national park approximately twenty-four square miles of territory immediately south of the park which is required to protect the health and welfare of the buffalo herd.

(4) To withdraw from Prince Albert national park 373 square miles of territory which is not suitable for park purposes and which is needed for a dominion-provincial fur conservation scheme which will benefit the Indians, half-breeds and other residents leading the hunting life.

(5) To withdraw from Waterton lakes national park sixteen square miles of territory on the east end that is not suitable for national park development, but is actually required for grazing and timber by nearby settlers.

(6) To abolish Nemiskam park near Forcmost and Buffalo national park near Wainwright as these areas are no longer required for park purposes.

(7) To vest in the governor general in council the additional power to grant leases of lots in subdivisions for the purposes of residence during summer months only and to provide for extensions and changes in existing townsites and subdivisions.

(8) To authorize agreements with any province in which a national park is situated

extending to park residents social services which are supplied by that province to persons resident outside of the park.

The explanations given in the bill are, I believe, quite adequate. However, for the information of the committee, I should like to explain more fully some of the changes being made in regard to certain parks.

Hon. members will recall that at the 1941 session a bill was introduced to amend the boundaries of Prince Albert national park, and that bill was withdrawn because of the opposition raised at that time. The war was then in progress, and the matter was not of sufficient importance to engage too much of the time of the house.

Section 3 of the present bill now asks that the same areas be removed from the park and be declared to be no longer required for park purposes. I might say that this park was created in 1927 prior to the transfer of the resources and was originally known as the Sturgeon forest reserve. The area is 1,869 square miles. It is proposed to remove three areas containing approximately 376 square miles; the area remaining in the park being approximately 1,493 square miles.

Parcel No. 1 containing 340 square miles is located on the northeast side of the park and is unsuitable for park purposes. There are no lakes of outstanding value; the ground is very low and full of muskegs, and there is no fishing in any of the small lakes. Vertical aerial photographs of the area were taken in 1946, and later the area was cruised. The timber resources are very limited. The total amount of the merchantable coniferous saw timber is estimated at 1,577,500 feet board measure of white spruce located in six separate blocks, some of which are in insufficient quantities to make an economical operation feasible. The remainder of the area does not at present contain any timber of sawlog size, although there are small quantities of jack pine ties and poplar cordwood. Generally the area is unattractive. On the other hand, it surrounds the Montreal lake Indian reserve and is suitable for incorporation in the fur conservation programme that has been agreed upon between the dominion and the province for northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. MacNICOL: Did the minister say "surrounds"?

Mr. HOWE: Yes. That is my information.

Mr. MacNICOL: It does not surround it.

Mr. HOWE: My officers say it surrounds it. Perhaps the hon. member can look it over.

Mr. HACKETT: He is going to have it corrected.

Mr. HOWE: The provincial government has agreed that when the area is deleted from the park it will be included in the scheme which will permit the Indians to have equal trapping rights with the native population under the conditions of the agreement.

I should add that this reason for removing the parcel did not exist when the matter was before the house some years ago. I do not wish to take up time to discuss the joint fur conservation programme except to say that it is hoped it will be of great benefit to the trapping Indians in Saskatchewan. The inclusion of this parcel will facilitate the plans being made in that section of the country.

Parcel No. 2 comprises approximately ten square miles and is located on the southeast corner of the park. It is of no particular value to the park and is required as an addition to the adjacent Little Red River Indian reserve 106A. It is an area which juts out from the main block and adds unnecessarily to the length of the park boundary. When the land is reverted to the province it will then be transferred to the dominion to be added to the Indian reserve.

Parcel No. 3 contains approximately twenty-six square miles. It is located in the southwest corner of the park and is of no value for park purposes. On the other hand, it is suitable for agriculture. Like parcel No. 2, it lengthens the boundaries of the park and thereby increases the cost of administration. Apart from a certain portion of the park highway, approximately five miles, running through it and the telephone lines, there are no other park improvements situated in it.

In reference to the abolition of Buffalo park at Wainwright, as most members are aware the buffalo herd at this park was disposed of in the years 1939 and 1940. A number of the healthy animals were transferred to Elk island and the remainder slaughtered. At the present time there are approximately 1,200 animals in good condition at Elk island park. An arrangement has been made with the province to increase the area of this park by adding approximately 23·6 square miles from the Cooking lake reserve immediately adjacent; this is being transferred to the dominion and is being incorporated in the park by section 2, paragraph (c) of this bill. With the added area, which is very suitable for pasture, there will be sufficient land to maintain the present number of animals and to ensure for all time the preservation of this species.

Perhaps that gives a fair sample of the provisions of the bill, and we can take up the others, if hon. members are interested, as we reach the sections.

On motion of Mr. MacNicol the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, July 4, 1947

The house met at two o'clock.

PRIVILEGE

MR. TOWNLEY-SMITH—NEWSPAPER COMMENT RESPECTING WHEAT PRICE

Mr. F. W. TOWNLEY-SMITH (North Battleford): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. My attention has been called to an editorial appearing in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of June 26, which reads in part as follows:

Speaking on June 21 at Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan, Mr. F. W. Townley-Smith, C.C.F. member for North Battleford, criticized the United Kingdom-Canada wheat agreement at $1.55 and the guaranteed minimum price for all wheat of $1.35 per bushel. Mr. Townley-Smith was not opposed in principle but he argued that the price as fixed in the agreement and the five-year compulsory pool were too low.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would suggest that the hon. member quote only the relevant part, and then state his question of privilege.

Mr. MacINNIS: He did not get time to do it.

Mr. TOWNLEY-SMITH: I wish to state that I discussed the agreement but did not criticize it, and also that the last sentence, namely, that "Mr. Townley-Smith was not opposed in principle but he argued that the price as fixed in the agreement and the five-year compulsory pool were too low" is a misstatement because it is incomplete. What I really said was that if the prices of other things that farmers had to buy were to be allowed to skyrocket, then the price of wheat and wages should be allowed to go up with them. With this correction, the remainder of the *Fress Press* editorial is quite pointless.

Mr. KNOWLES: As usual.

MR. POULIOT—EDITORIAL IN MONTREAL "DAILY STAR"—UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JEAN FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege based upon the fundamental freedom of speech. As a member of parliament today I went before the human rights committee and drew the attention of hon. members to the following extract from an editorial published in the Montreal *Daily Star* of Wednesday, June 25. It states:

Were the characters involved in this episode other than they were, this debate would assume national importance.

The debate was about the united nations organization, and the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) and I expressed honest views in the debate. Here is the commentary of the Montreal *Daily Star*:

It would be rightly interpreted as a resurgence of old-style isolationism—the kind of doctrine which above all else brought on what Mr. Churchill has called "the unnecessary war." It will be so interpreted in Moscow and elsewhere; for the students of public opinion in those parts can hardly be expected to know very much about the irresponsibility of Mr. Church, Mr. Pouliot and their strange allies from Alberta.

This morning I went before the committee for protection of freedom of speech. Perhaps there was a little exaggeration in my calling the owner and chief editor of the Montreal *Daily Star* a bum, but there was much less exaggeration in my language than in their description of the hon. member for Broadview and myself as irresponsible.

My contention is this, that the human rights committee serves no more purpose than an umbrella made of only wire. Everything is gone out of it. I asked them for protection and I did not get it. I was referred to the house. I protest most strongly against the uselessness of that committee.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I have not seen the reference in the Montreal *Star* but I want to tell the hon. member for Temiscouata that I do not pay any attention to what that newspaper says. I found out years ago that there is no use trying to answer a newspaper; they always have the last word. As far as I am concerned I do not care what they say. My position can be explained in the house. I contend that there has been a flat failure of the UNO and I gave my reasons for it. This paper or its columnists never report what is said here in the house. President Roosevelt when attacked called some of them calumnyists.

PAUL TRIQUET, V.C.

WINNERS OF VICTORIA CROSS FROM CONSTITUENCY OF RIMOUSKI

Mr. GLEASON BELZILE (Rimouski): The *Evening Citizen* of July 3 states:

Canada's first French-speaking winner of the empire's most coveted award, the Victoria Cross,

Lt.-Col. Paul Triquet, of Cabano, Que., has retired from the Canadian army after twenty-one years' service.

We are all very proud of Colonel Triquet, but I should like to have it on the record that we are also very proud of two other Victoria Cross winners who came from the constituency of Rimouski. They were Captain Jean Brillant and Corporal Joseph Kaeble, who won the Victoria Cross in 1918 and 1917.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MORNING AND SATURDAY SITTINGS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Hon. members may have noticed that I have had placed on the *Votes and Proceedings* of yesterday the notice of a motion for the house to sit in the mornings next week at eleven o'clock from Wednesday until the end of the week and on Saturdays thereafter. If I can be given unanimous consent, I would move the motion this afternoon so that hon. members will know at once just what to expect. Otherwise I will leave the motion over and move it on Monday. May I ask the house if I have unanimous consent?

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I take it that the Prime Minister is obliged to get unanimous consent before he can move this motion today, and I take it that is his object in making the request he has made. Perhaps the house ought to be brought up to date in connection with the ramifications of the whole matter of shortening the time of the session. At the opening of the house yesterday we heard that there were to be some negotiations with respect to Saturday sittings, and I was wondering whether that had been decided upon. I ask that because it would have a direct bearing upon any move made with respect to morning sittings next week.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With regard to the previous discussions, there was an understanding that we would not meet tomorrow without considering the matter in advance to see if we could reach an agreement. There was no understanding with regard to future sittings. We have reached the point now where, in the light of the circumstances as we know them in connection with bringing the business of the house to a close, the government must itself take the initiative and responsibility. It is for that reason that I have had this motion inserted in *Votes and Proceedings* to cover the sittings of the house for the remainder of the session.

Hon. members perhaps may not realize that we have been sitting here since the month of January and we are now into July. Near the close of every session of parliament measures have to be taken to expedite the business. I would point out that not only is the convenience of hon. members of the house to be considered but, as they will have noticed, there is the position of members of the public service including the officials of this house. For six years past the civil servants at Ottawa have not had the opportunity of enjoying summer shorter hours. As long as this house continues to sit, members of the public service in Ottawa have to be on hand. They do not get a chance to enjoy the earlier hours of closing during the summer months they otherwise would have. I am sure hon. members will be prepared to consider that aspect. There are the employees in the printing bureau, those connected with *Hansard* and others whom I might name, on whom there is great pressure at this time. I submit that that is something of which account might well be taken, particularly by those who are interested in seeing that as much consideration as possible is shown in as many directions as possible.

So far as the business of the house is concerned, if I thought that there was the slightest reason why we should not expedite matters at this stage, I would be the first not to permit any attempt at hastening the conclusion of the session. However, we know that all important measures have been brought forward. I have asked time and again that if there was any particular measure that hon. members wished to have brought forward, or if there were any items of the estimates hon. members wished to have brought forward, the government would have them brought forward at once. I have had no further requests, and I think that with the items that there are on the order paper, if we have, as I hope we shall have, the cooperation of hon. members generally, we should be able to bring the proceedings of this house to a close next week, and that before the end of the week.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, this group has no objection to giving unanimous consent to having the motion put today in the terms in which it appears in *Votes and Proceedings,* but there are one or two questions I should like to ask. Is it the intention of the government to go through with the labour bill? If it is, I doubt very much if that bill can be got out of committee in time to go through the house. Is it the intention of the government to go through with the bill to amend the Dominion Elections Act which appears in *Votes and Proceedings?* I would like to know how much we are supposed to get through next week.

I would remind the house that if we sit from eleven o'clock to one, from two o'clock to six and from seven o'clock to eleven we shall be sitting two hours longer each day than we ever did before, at least in my time in the house. That puts a burden on the staff, the printing bureau and others. If the Prime Minister could give us some information on the matters I have raised, we shall have some idea of what we have to do before we leave here a week from tomorrow.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government naturally has been concerned with the matters my hon. friend has raised. So far as the Dominion Elections Act is concerned, as the hon. member has mentioned, a number of amendments have been proposed. I do not think, after this session, that there will be a general election before there is another session of the house. For that reason the government has thought it would be preferable that hon. members should have an opportunity of studying these proposed changes to the elections act between this session and the next. Therefore we will not proceed with this measure at this time.

With regard to the labour bill, there are a great many who feel that we ought to get that measure through at once, but there are a very large number who are of the view that perhaps it would be the part of wisdom, in the light of what we know has happened in connection with legislation in some other parts of the world, particularly legislation affecting industrial questions, that it would place hon. members in a better position to deal with that most important question, if we allowed this measure to stand over until another session. Hon. members would then have an opportunity of carefully studying the statements made to and the evidence which has been given before the committee.

Those are the two measures my hon. friend has mentioned. I cannot say offhand whether there will be any others which will not be proceeded with, but I do know the government will seek to accommodate hon. members of the house as long as we are not hindering in any way the essential business of the country.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the Prime Minister if his remarks about the elections act would apply also to the redistribution bill?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is important, I think, that the redistribution measure should be proceeded with at this session.

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): Mr. Speaker, I would not wish to say a word to impede greater progress in the house, but I am rather in a difficulty with regard to Wednesday next. Some of those associated with me have been endeavouring to arrange a public memorial service for the late Right Hon. Viscount Bennett, and overcoming a considerable number of difficulties we chose noon on Wednesday for that service at Chalmers church. My card has only just reached me, and it is possible that the Prime Minister's card has not yet reached him. But if he would give consideration to putting off the morning sittings from Wednesday to Thursday of next week it would be considered a very courteous thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, may I say that naturally I would be the first to wish that as many members of this House of Commons as possible would be present at the memorial service to the late Lord Bennett. I hope very much to be present myself. I did not know at the time this motion was drafted that there was to be a special service at twelve o'clock on Wednesday. I wonder if the house would agree to meeting on Wednesday at ten o'clock and adjourning at eleven-thirty? If that amendment were made to the motion, perhaps that would meet the situation.

Mr. STIRLING: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved:

That on Wednesday, July 9 instant, the house shall meet at 10 o'clock a.m., and on that day there shall be an additional intermission from 11.30 a.m. to 2 p.m.; that on and after Thursday, July 10 instant, until the end of the session the house shall meet at 11 o'clock in the morning of each sitting day, and that in addition to the intermission at 6 o'clock p.m. there shall also be an intermission every day from one to two o'clock p.m., and that on Saturday the 12th July instant, and every Saturday thereafter until the end of the session, the house shall meet at 11 o'clock a.m., and the order of business and procedure shall be the same as on Fridays.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Second report of the special committee on radio broadcasting.—Mr. Maybank.

JAPANESE PROPERTY IN CANADA

QUESTION AS TO APPOINTMENT OF INQUIRY COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Secretary of State. Has the government taken action on the recommendation in

the fourth report of the standing committee on public accounts that a commission be appointed to inquire into alleged loss of property by persons of the Japanese race, residents of Canada? If a commission has not been appointed will the minister say if it will be appointed, and when?

Hon. COLIN GIBSON (Secretary of State): Consideration is being given to that, and arrangements are being made to secure a commissioner. The announcement I hope will be made shortly of the appointment of a commissioner to carry out the inquiry.

BRITISH EMPIRE CONFERENCE

PRESS REPORT FROM AUSTRALIA—"STRATEGY FOR WINNING 1947 BATTLE FOR BRITAIN"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, I was handed just before coming into the house an Associated Press dispatch from Canberra, Australia, in which it is intimated that the suggestion has just been made in Australia's legislative body that all the British dominions should send their most senior representatives, preferably their prime ministers to a British empire conference for the purpose of "devising general strategy for winning the 1947 battle for Britain". I would ask the Prime Minister if Canada would be prepared to participate in such a conference and what his views are towards the suggestion.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to know what is meant by a conference in aid of winning the battle for Britain. I do not wish to commit myself to any view that there is a battle for Britain to be won at this stage. I believe that Britain is well able to look after her own troubles just now, without anticipating that there is going to be a battle that will require all the dominions to assist her. I would prefer to say nothing about the dispatch until I receive something official.

Mr. GRAYDON: I take it that it is the economic battle of Britain.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know what is meant.

HONG KONG

DEDICATION OF CEMETERY TO CANADIAN SOLDIERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. MATTHEWS (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, in view of a recent press announcement in reference to the dedicating of a cemetery on the outskirts of Hong Kong, where the remains of some three hundred Canadian victims of the Hong Kong tragedy are said to be buried, may I ask the Minister of National Defence whether the names of those soldiers are to be published, or are all available particulars to be forwarded to the next of kin?

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has said, the cemetery for Canadian soldiers who died at Hong Kong was consecrated and a memorial service was held for them on the first of July, Dominion day, of this year. My understanding is that the names of all those buried there have been or under existing arrangements will be communicated to the next of kin. If that has not been done, I will see that it is done.

AIR TRANSPORT

AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND SWEDEN

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the government of Canada and the government of Sweden have concluded an agreement for air services between the two countries. This agreement is similar in form to previous bilateral air transport agreements already concluded by Canada.

The agreement provides for an air line of each country to operate a return service originating in its own territory and terminating in or passing through the territory of the other country, and includes an exchange of third and fourth freedom traffic rights. The route to be operated by the designated air line of Sweden is from Stockholm via intermediate points to Montreal, and the route laid down for the designated air line of Canada is from Montreal via intermediate points to Stockholm. Since, however, Canada does not propose to operate an air service to Sweden in the near future, the agreement makes provision for subsequent review of the services to be performed by the air lines of the two countries at such time as Canada designates an air line to operate scheduled services between the two countries.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION

AMENDMENT OF ACT WITH RESPECT TO AGE OF RETIREMENT, ETC.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a bill to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act by provid-

ing a new and extended definition of civil servant and civil service; changing the age of retirement; amending the conditions upon which contributions may be made to the superannuation fund and benefits paid therefrom; and by a comprehensive addition to the act covering temporary employees in the service.

Mr. BOUCHER: Is the minister going to make an explanation at this stage?

Mr. ABBOTT: I will make an explanation when we are in committee.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

Mr. ABBOTT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to give a brief summary of the main provisions of the bill which this resolution precedes and of the reasons which have led us after careful consideration to recommend the changes which it proposes to make in the present law.

Several of the amendments contained in the bill are based on recommendations of the special parliamentary committee set up in the session of 1939, which were not acted upon in 1939 or subsequently when the act was again amended in 1944. Other changes are necessary to permit war service to count for superannuation in certain cases additional to those now covered. Other changes covering temporary employees, retirement age, entry into the service from pensionable employment, eligibility for superannuation of persons appointed for a fixed term, and the types of benefit available to such term appointees and to persons retiring voluntarily or for other reasons before the normal retiring age, have been found to be desirable to provide a superannuation plan suitable to meet the constantly growing variety and complexity of conditions in the public service of Canada.

In regard to the age of retirement, the house will recall that under the law as it now stands the age for voluntary retirement is sixty-five years and the age for compulsory retirement seventy, subject to extension by order in council for a further period of five years. The 1939 parliamentary committee had recommended that these ages be reduced to sixty and sixty-five years respectively, and the royal commission on administrative classifications in the public service recommended that the Superannuation Act should be so amended as to permit of superannuation in certain cases at the option of the government at age sixty for men and at age fifty-five for women. The superannuation committee of the civil service has also recommended earlier retirement ages than now prevail, feeling that general earlier retirement would make for greater efficiency in the public service "not only by separating those whose efficiency may have diminished but by accelerating the rate of promotions in the service which very frequently are much delayed in large portions of the civil service in existing circumstances."

The government has therefore decided to reduce the voluntary retirement age to sixty for both men and women, and the compulsory retirement age to sixty-five for both men and women, subject to extension year by year for a further period of five years by order in council on the recommendation of the head of the department and the treasury board for reasons of peculiar efficiency and fitness for the position. The bill is so drafted as to implement this decision but the new provisions will not require any contributor to be retired by reason of having attained the age of seventy years until at least two years after the coming into force of the legislation. Provision is also made that effective August 1, 1957, additional retirement benefits may not accrue after the age of sixty-five years. This provision will strengthen the effective application of the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five years. We believe that these changes, while perhaps increasing slightly the financial burden on the superannuation fund itself, will nevertheless make for increased economy in the public service because of greater efficiency and improved morale.

Perhaps of greater importance are the changes we are suggesting in order to increase mobility of personnel to and from the civil service. The present act, it will be recalled, empowers the governor in council to grant annuities only after a minimum of ten years' service and only if the contributor has reached retirement age, or is incapacitated, or is retired because of abolition of office or inefficiency. In every other case of a retirement, the only benefits provided by the act are either withdrawal of contributions without interest or a gratuity of one month's salary for each year of service. This involves a serious and almost prohibitive financial barrier in many cases to voluntary retirement and is a major contributing factor to rigidity in the public service. The plan was obviously developed primarily to meet the needs of permanent employees in a career service, and even in this field it is subject to serious difficulties—first, from the employee's point of view in subjecting him to too drastic a penalty in case he wishes to leave the service, and from the employer's point of view in making it difficult to get rid of unsuitable or incompetent employees, clogging the channels of promotion, and so on. For other than permanent employees, however, it is obviously most unsuitable.

As a consequence, special provision has had to be made in various acts of parliament for special superannuation benefits to members of boards and commissions in some cases, while in a good many other cases there exists the unfair and discriminatory situation of a lack of provision for retirement benefits of any kind whatsoever. There are also other cases where a sound personnel policy makes it desirable to appoint employees only for a fixed term. This is the situation, for instance, with substantial numbers of employees of the national research council and the defence research board. The need for some kind of retirement plan has led the governor in council in certain cases to authorize the establishment of separate pension plans. However, the development of a variety of pension plans, applicable to different groups and classes of employees in the public service, tends to constitute in the view of the government a constant source of dissatisfaction. If different pension plans are established for special groups in the public service, demands inevitably arise from interested parties for the most generous features of all plans. Consequently, our efforts in the bill before the house have been directed to making the Civil Service Superannuation Act suitable for application in a considerably wider variety of circumstances than at present and in general a sounder and more efficient instrument of employment policy.

The changes which are proposed to this end are somewhat complicated to summarize but their details will become clear as the individual clauses of the bill are examined. Broadly speaking, they involve elimination for most purposes of the ten-year rule, and provision for granting deferred or in some cases immediate annuities where at present only a return of contributions or a gratuity may be granted. As a result we are able to extend the act, under certain conditions, to term employees and to members of certain boards, commissions and corporations. A list of boards, commissions and corporations the members of which are included automatically in the eligible category is given in an appendix to the bill and power is given to the treasury board to add to this list and to designate as eligible, employees, either individually or as members of a class, who are appointed for a fixed term of years. Any civil servant who becomes a contributor under the act will henceforth be able to carry with him on separation from the civil service for any reason other than misconduct his accrued pension benefits in total, if he has completed twenty years' service, and on a reduced scale if he has not completed twenty years' service.

83166—324½

Under the present act, a civil servant who becomes a contributor and who retires, before he has served ten years, receives either a gratuity of one month's pay for each year of service or a withdrawal of contributions without interest. In future, a permanent civil servant with less than ten years' service who retires voluntarily before age sixty, and any member of a board, commission or corporation or other term appointee who becomes a contributor and retires on completion of a term of appointment, will be entitled, as an option to the benefits mentioned above, to an adjusted annuity, deferred to age sixty. This adjusted annuity is the amount of the ordinary superannuation annuity adjusted downward by one per cent for each year of service less than twenty. To illustrate: a contributor who resigns voluntarily at say age fifty-six after twelve years of service would have the right to an annuity beginning at age sixty equal to 92 per cent (100-(20-12)) of the normal superannuation annuity, while a member of a board who had completed at say age fifty-two a term of appointment of seven years would be entitled to an annuity starting at age sixty of 87 per cent of the normal superannuation benefits for such a term of service. On the other hand, if in either case the cause of retirement was incapacity or age, then the contributor would be entitled to an immediate annuity for the adjusted amount. Similarly, if in either case the termination of employment was due to death, the contributor's widow and his children would be entitled to the normal proportions of the adjusted annuity beginning immediately. If in the above cases the permanent civil servant or term appointee has more than ten years' service, the corresponding annuities to himself if the cause of retirement was age or incapacity or to his widow and his children in case of his death in the service would be payable on the basis of the full rate. In other cases the corresponding annuities would be payable on the reduced basis for service of less than twenty years. In the case of abolition of office the annuity for those having more than ten years' service will be payable immediately, but for those with less than ten years' service, it will be deferred to age sixty. In the case of retirement for inefficiency after ten years' service, the present provision for payment of an immediate annuity equal to 50 per cent of the full rate until age sixty-five and to 66⅔ of the full rate thereafter is dropped and instead there is provided what seems to me the far more satisfactory treatment of a deferred

annuity, payable at age sixty, and adjusted for the number of years of service as outlined above.

This very brief summary explains the principal new provisions relating to retirement or transfer from the service. The counterpart of these provisions is a section of the bill which is designed to encourage mobility into the service. It enables an employee who enters the civil service from an employment in which he was subject to a pension plan to count his period of employment in such "pensionable employment" as service for the purpose of the Superannuation Act, if his separation from such employment involves the loss of pension benefits under the said plan and if he elects to contribute twice the amount of the regular contributions with interest (in order to cover his own and the government's share). Such contributions in regard to past service so purchased are to be based on the contributor's salary immediately after his appointment to the service. Pensionable employment is defined as any employment designated by the treasury board as employment in respect of which there was an established superannuation or pension fund or plan.

This privilege has been extended to a limited extent in the past in the case of certain special groups such as provincial government employees transferred to the unemployment insurance commission or the Department of National Revenue. It is now proposed to give it the more general application outlined above, in order to facilitate the recruitment of persons who might make a valuable contribution to the public service but who are now debarred from entering it because of the heavy financial sacrifice they would have to make by giving up their pension rights in their present employment and their inability to secure immediate comparable protection in the service.

I come now to a series of amendments which extend the benefits at present enjoyed by war veterans.

Provision is being made to count the period of absence of a contributor who resigned to enlist or of an employee other than a contributor who resigned to enlist or was granted leave of absence to enlist, if he served on active service overseas—subject to payment of contributions on the basis of salary of the contributor or employee immediately prior to his enlistment. In the case of a contributor who resigned to enlist—that is, a permanent civil servant who resigned and got his contributions back—his service in the civil service may be counted on payment of his withdrawal allowance plus interest at 4 per cent from the date of payment to him to the date of his election to count such service.

This provision reopens the privilege of electing to count service in world war I to certain employees who were given the option of counting such service in 1940 pursuant to recommendations of the special parliamentary committee. A small number of eligible persons failed to take advantage of the opportunity at that time and they will be given another chance. In addition, employees who served in world war II will be given the opportunity to count their service in similar circumstances. The permanent civil servant, who was subject to retirement provisions at the time of his enlistment, may count his period of absence on active or full-time service with the forces during world war I or world war II without contribution, provided that in the case of world war I he was granted leave of absence. With these added provisions, all persons who were employed in the civil service immediately prior to enlistment may count their period of absence on war service, except those who were not contributors or resigned to enlist and did not serve overseas.

There is another new provision relating to war service. From time to time we have had representations that employees who served overseas and who have since entered the public service should be allowed to count war service although they were not employed in the public service prior to their enlistment. While these representations have been considered with a good deal of sympathy, it had to be recognized that to extend benefits to a comparatively small group of veterans through the superannuation account would hardly be fair to the great body of veterans entering other employment, to whom such benefits would not be available. As I mentioned earlier, we now propose to allow certain service in pensionable employment outside the civil service to count on payment of double contributions. While war service could not be categorized as this type of employment, we are nevertheless proposing that veterans who were not civil servants prior to enlistment be given a similar privilege. This, we believe, will meet the problem where the counting of such service is of some consequence in building up an adequate pension and is, at the same time, eminently fair to all veterans.

Another important provision of the bill is the continuance, on the basis established by order in council during the war, of contributions by temporary employees to the retirement fund. The problem of temporary employees

has received a great deal of careful consideration. At the moment the situation in regard to temporaries is abnormal and, although the matter is being dealt with as expeditiously as possible, it will be some time yet before the public service reaches a normal level in this respect. In the meantime, we consider it inadvisable to disturb the present plan which has worked very satisfactorily during the war and under which the employee contributes to the retirement fund and receives on retirement the amount of his contributions plus interest at four per cent.

There are a number of other amendments, including provision for a minimum return of contributions in all cases, the establishment of $15,000 as a maximum amount of salary countable for purposes of the act, and some minor changes required to give consonance to the act and to meet circumstances which have developed since the act was last amended in 1944.

In conclusion, I express the hope that the amendments I have outlined will commend themselves to the house. We believe that they are in accord with modern developments and progressive thinking in the field of personnel management and pension planning. We hope that some of the principles they now incorporate into our superannuation plan will be favoured by an increasing number of employers and that the Canadian worker will not be unduly restricted in his freedom of choice of employment by severe penalties involved in the loss of all accumulated pension benefits should he change his employment. We would like to see a more general acceptance of the principle that retirement provision is earned in respect of each period of employment.

I thought that on the resolution stage I would give this explanation of the general purposes of the bill, in the hope that the committee would allow the bill to be introduced and given first reading and be distributed to members so that they might study it over the week-end. Then, if it were the wish of the committee, we could have the main debate on the second reading.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Abbott thereupon moved for leave in introduce Bill No. 415, to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is the bill ready for distribution?

Mr. ABBOTT: The Clerk says it is ready.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

41. Departmental administration, $1,534,144.

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs): In introducing these estimates of the Department of External Affairs I do not think it is necessary to say much to the house about the international situation generally. I will, of course, where appropriate, attempt to answer any questions which may arise out of these estimates and which concern that situation, but I think the general picture is sufficiently clear to those who read to make any public explanatory comment almost superfluous.

Though we must admit that picture is not a cheerful one, I am sure we all feel that there is no reason to become panicky. On the other hand, of course, it would be folly to ignore the fact that there are difficulties ahead and that those difficulties might possibly develop into serious dangers. To assume a complacent attitude is certainly not warranted by the facts. Realism is the best foundation for national and international policies, and a realistic analysis of the situation at the present time cannot be said to give much cause for too great optimism.

What might, I think, become a serious danger to the peace of the world is its division, both politically and ideologically, into two great groupings. Somehow, methods which can make possible peaceful cooperation, political and economic, between those opposing groups, must be found. The sources of fear and suspicion between them must be removed. It must be the first objective of every country's foreign policy to avoid, or do what it can to heal, these tragic divisions. No government of men of good will can accept the irrevocability of any development of this kind. No government, least of all the Canadian government, can accept the view that there is any fundamental hostility or division between the common peoples of the several nations. Such hostility or division, however, in this age of mass propaganda, can easily be created by ruling groups whose authority rests on the power they exercise rather than on the freely expressed will of their peoples. If somehow we can break through the fog of ignorance and misrepresentation which seems to surround certain peoples, international affairs will be conducted in a much more sincere and amicable fashion. No fog of this kind obscures the vision or judgment of our own people, because our way of life and rule is democratic and

popular, not only in words but in reality. We are conscious of the will and aspirations of the people of our nation and we act accordingly.

Another source of our strength is the fundamental unity of our people, and of all parties in this house, on these matters of international consequence and on the principles of peaceful cooperation which must govern our relation with other states. These are times when one cannot help but feel that other principles—the creation of discontents and enmities, the emphasis on the influences which divide rather than on those which unite men—unfortunately prevail in some other quarters. It had been hoped, and indeed it is still hoped, at least as far as I am concerned, that the united nations can be the agency to counteract these dividing forces, that it can act as an organization of civilized states within which universal and friendly co-operation will become possible and should be realized. It is because it still thinks that this can be done that the Canadian government feels that the growth and strengthening of the united nations must be a real cornerstone of Canada's policy in foreign affairs. It would be folly to disparage the organization merely because it has not, in its short history, already accomplished all that we hoped for from it. The weaknesses which have been displayed make it all the more necessary that support for it be strong and steadfast with a view to removing those weaknesses At the same time we must not complacently allow any one state or group of states to use the united nations for their own selfish national or propagandist purposes. It must be a form for the expression of the collective will of all peoples and not a sounding board for false and misleading propaganda.

Within the united nations there is room, of course, for closer associations not inconsistent at all with the ideals of the world organization. One such association which day by day and every day proves its enduring value is our commonwealth of free British nations, which during the last few months has in recent developments again shown the genius of the British people for adaptability and political wisdom.

Within the united nations there is room also for the closest and most friendly cooperation between Canada and the United States. That cooperation has been strengthened during the year, and one reason for its strength is that it respects the sovereign independence of the parties to it. The United States, of course, is a great country; Canada is a much smaller one. But the relations between the two are based not only upon frienship but upon scrupulous respect for each other's rights. The intimacy and friendliness of this cooperation bears no threat to any other nation. We would hope that our collaboration, for instance in the north, could be extended to include other interested powers. On our part there is no reason why this should not be done. We seek the closest and friendliest contacts with all northern powers so that the development of that great area of the world may be for the welfare and progress of all peoples, and that it take place without the kindling of national envies or national fears. Also our association with other nations of the western hemisphere is growing in friendship and mutual value. The development of our diplomatic contacts in Latin America are one reflection of that growth.

I do not think it is necessary to make any more general observations. I think all hon. members will agree when I say that the foundation of our international policy must be hostility toward none, and peace and friendship with all. That, of course, is not a foreign policy in itself; but it is a statement of the principles upon which foreign policy must be based in order that peace may be maintained.

It certainly is no exaggeration to say that should there ever be another war, what we have experienced in the past in the application of human ingenuity for purposes of destruction will be merely child's play to what this unhappy planet would be subjected to in the future.

As to the activities of the department during the calendar year 1946, they were in broad outline stated in the report of the department for that year which I tabled some time ago. two matters of major concern in the department during the past six months have been, precisely, the united nations and the European peace settlement. I mention the two subjects together purposely, because it has become increasingly clear that the future of the world organization upon which we embarked when the Prime Minister signed the charter of the united nations at San Francisco two years ago will succeed only if political and economic reconstruction of the world is achieved sufficiently speedily and according to some coherent pattern.

We have therefore directed our attention closely to the European peace settlement. The government has recently secured from parliament approval of the treaties prepared with four of the satellite states, and in due course Canadian ratification of these treaties will

be deposited. We know however that acts of ratification on this occasion, while ending a state of war, will not of themselves establish real peace, the real conditions for which depend, first of all, upon a reasonable settlement with Germany and then upon the implementation of a great programme of reconstruction.

In the light of the general frustration which has fallen upon the process of peace-making with Germany and Austria, our own efforts to take a reasonable part in that settlement may not seem to be of particular worldwide significance. There is no escaping the fact, however, that if we are to contribute, to the measure of our ability, to that settlement, we must deal with the problem of securing adequate means for the expression of our views. In this connection, as hon. members know from previous discussions on the subject, we have sought to take a practical line which would not interfere in any way with the initiative of the great powers in the settlement of Europe but which would, however, permit us to play an active and constructive role. We have formulated and prepared our views in this connection and we have also made constructive suggestions in regard to the settlement itself.

The conference of foreign ministers which met this spring in Moscow did not get very much farther than to consider in what ways they could define with unmistakable precision the major issues upon which compromise will have to be reached before it will be possible to proceed with the settlement. In some cases the area of disagreement is small, even though the issues appear to be stubborn and unyielding. It is clear, however, that a new effort at compromise will have to be made before further progress can be achieved. That effort is now being undertaken by the Austrian treaty commission to find a solution to the major outstanding problem in regard to the settlement with Austria. Certain questions with regard to Germany were also referred by the foreign ministers to their deputies, but we have not heard that any real progress has been made, since the foreign ministers themselves adjourned their meeting. Hon. members know that they are expected to meet again in New York, and that the further session is to take place in November. We are still hopeful that the work of peace-making will go forward in the near future, and we shall be ready to contribute to the full measure of our ability in that process.

In the meantime, we are doing all we can to support the expanding activities of the united nations. I should like to call the attention of hon. members particularly to the special session of the general assembly which met for three weeks during May to discuss the question of Palestine. This was an occasion of great importance. For the first time in history a great modern state, confronted with a difficult international problem, has turned voluntarily to an assembly representative of the nations of the world and asked for guidance and assistance toward settlement. It seems to me that we shall have achieved a very great measure of success in our efforts to establish a world organization if, within two years, we have created a body which can be looked upon as capable of dealing in a practical manner with a problem of that kind.

The future of the united nations depends, I am convinced, upon its ability to contribute to the solution of questions of this nature on a realistic basis and in a practical manner, rather than perhaps upon progress being made in respect of some of the other activities of its committees in formulating theories of world government. The Canadian delegation to the special session took, as we know, an active and constructive role. The Canadian delegate was chairman of the main committee of the assembly in which the greater part of the actual work was done.

I do not wish to offend his modesty, because he is sitting before me at the present time, but I do not think that in the opinion of the world there has been a man who has handled himself better in these international meetings than did the head of our Canadian delegation at Lake Success in May last.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I rejoice in saying that that is the opinion of the world at large, and not merely the opinion of his admiring fellow citizens in Canada. We have also accepted membership in the special committee which was established to report on the Palestine problem, and the Canadian member of that committee, Mr. Justice Rand, is in Palestine with the committee at the present time. I think that is striking testimony of our willingness to do everything that is within the power of Canada and the Canadian people to contribute to the reestablishment of world peace. That was a serious problem, one that was not ours but one to which we have made an important contribution, whatever the results achieved in the end may be.

We have also participated in the regular activities of the united nations. We have sent delegations to sessions of the economic and social council and other commissions of that body on which we were represented. We have attempted to relate the work of the

united nations to the life of our own country. In the report to parliament on the united nations we have endeavoured to set forth, not only for hon. members but for the citizens of this country generally, the major issues which are now before the united nations. I am sure that hon. members have felt that the department did a pretty creditable job in connection with the report it published on the second part of the general assembly of the united nations. I feel free to say that because all I had to do with it was a little editing while it was being prepared. All the material was supplied to me by the hard-working officials of the department.

As members of the external affairs committee and the special joint committee on human rights and fundamental freedoms know, we have attempted in the discussion of subjects such as refugees and human rights to relate our activities in the united nations to our own interests in immigration and proposals for a draft bill, if it be necessary, on human rights in our own country. I have no hesitation in saying that the time and effort which we have expended in participation in the united nations has been justified by what has been accomplished up to the present time. We have reason to still continue to do our best to strengthen the united nations and to make it capable of performing the lofty purposes for which the charter was signed.

I shall be glad when dealing with the various items to supply such further information as to the new missions we have had to open, staff, the incorporation into the department of the Canadian information service, appointments, other international conferences we have attended, and generally the things for which we expended last year the money which was voted by parliament and for which we are asking parliament this year to vote the supply we are now considering.

Mr. REID: I wonder if the minister would answer a question with reference to the statement made in connection with offshore fisheries, a matter I brought up last year. The minister said earlier in the year that he intended to bring down a resolution in regard to Canada's attitude towards these fisheries. Will he make a statement now in the light of the fact that that resolution has not been brought down?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The hon. member is quite right. It was stated in the house that it was the intention of the government to introduce a resolution to assert a policy that would in fact be in accord with that announced by the President of the United States, and drafts of resolutions were prepared to make sure that there would be a uniform policy for the western hemisphere. The terms of the resolution were discussed with our United States friends. So far it has not appeared that we had reached the point where we were both agreed as to the best form of language to be used, and for that reason it was felt that it might be preferable to wait until there had been complete agreement on the exact language before bringing the resolution before the house. I should like to give hon. members the assurance that as far as the government is concerned the general policy is in accord with that which was expressed by the President of the United States.

Mr. HAZEN: Will an act be passed by the congress of the United States, or is the proclamation which the President made sufficient? Are we to pass legislation here before legislation is passed by congress?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Those are precisely matters which are now under discussion. The two governments are in accord as to the aims to be achieved, but there has not yet been full agreement as to what is the best way of laying the foundation for an effort to get international agreement to the implementation of proper conservation methods for offshore fisheries.

Mr. HAZEN: Has there been correspondence with any of the other commonwealths, or have they been consulted about this principle? I do not say that is necessary, but I was wondering if that had taken place in the interests of conservation.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The answer would depend upon the meaning one gives to the word "consultation." These are matters which are brought to the knowledge of the others, and the observations which any may have to make are welcomed and considered. The objective we are pursuing is to try to get a policy which will ultimately become world wide, and which can be implemented to the benefit of the whole of humanity.

Mr. J. M. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few observations on what the minister has said and perhaps range a little farther afield. I should like to reassure the committee at the outset that I have no intention of making a long speech. I think I can settle for ten minutes, or fifteen minutes at the outside.

I think we should be grateful to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent) for having given us this statement. In my short experience, and it

is short, this is the first time that I have heard such a statement when passing these accounts.

I think it would be hard to disagree with a single word which the minister has said. For myself I do not see how any person who would not echo what he said about the desirability of working for the success of the united nations, however disappointing that may be at times, could retain his sanity. Otherwise it seems to me that the world would have lost all meaning.

I echo strongly what he said about the difference between those countries where freedom is practised and those where it is not. I find myself asking from time to time: How is it that people behave in the way that our friends on the other side of Europe behave? I have been able to answer it to myself only by saying that they are prisoners of the situation which they have set up, that they are no longer free to behave except in the way they do behave. I suppose their power depends upon creating those feelings which they have created, and that they have reached a situation where they are terrified of uncreating it for fear that the source of their power may slip and they themselves fall.

Having expressed, and expressed most sincerely, my thanks to the minister I now want to make some comments which perhaps are not ones of eulogy. I still feel that the members of parliament are left in the position of receiving a report after things have been done. I want to say very quickly, and I said it in this house the other day, that I think I have common sense enough to know that the government cannot come into this house and discuss in advance with parliament everything they are going to do. I do not mean that at all. What I mean can best be described by referring to what goes on in England. I suppose we can in some ways regard them as a model because they have been dealing in foreign affairs, they have had such experience; and of course foreign affairs is one thing when you are a small island off the coast of Europe and it is another thing when you are three thousand miles away, although that distance is becoming vastly less than we used to think it was. Nevertheless, we must admit that in England they have had this experience and no doubt it has given them a technique which we can hardly expect to attain overnight.

I looked up today to see just what had happened and I noticed that in February last there was a debate in connection with supply for foreign affairs. That was opened by the foreign secretary who spoke at length. There was a subsequent debate in May and a further debate in June. The foreign secretary did not open the debates in those cases, but he spoke in both debates. What struck me was that in those debates every opportunity was given parliament to make a contribution. *Mutatis mutandis,* what had been done there enabled parliament to do what parliament did yesterday afternoon when we were considering amendments to the criminal code. There was a discussion across the gangway by hon. members on both sides who had experience in these matters, and the result was a meeting of minds.

I am not suggesting that that can be done exactly in connection with foreign affairs, but I am suggesting that if it were possible to have from time to time reports such as we have had today, with perhaps a little addition—I shall refer to that in a moment—then two things might happen. First, this house would be better informed and, second, the people of Canada would be better informed and I think that is important.

I should like to say a word further on another point. I notice in particular how Bevin in his speech last February closely related economic things to political and diplomatic things. If I heard him accurately, the minister made no specific reference to what I suppose is the most important thing affecting our welfare, the meeting at Geneva. I fully realize that that primarily concerns other departments; nevertheless I take it that it does concern also the Department of External Affairs to a considerable extent. I suggest that whatever the department be, the people of Canada and of parliament have been too long in ignorance. That is a most unsatisfactory position as regards that all-important matter. I suppose it is no exaggeration to say that our economic welfare —I do not want to say it will stand or fall—may be vitally affected by the success or failure of those proceedings. Subject to being corrected, I have been able to gain no knowledge of where we stand. As far as I know there has been no opportunity for anyone in this house to express his opinion on the general policy that we should follow. We know nothing of the instructions that have been given—and when I say instructions, again let me say that I am not seeking to get the fullest information, which can only be within the knowledge of the government itself; but I am suggesting that there could have been

and should have been opportunities for this house to express itself on that all-important question.

Therefore while thanking the minister gratefully for what he has done and for this review, I feel that it is lacking in two respects: first of all in specific reference to these things which are so vital and secondly I feel that it should have been made earlier. It is earlier than last year or the year before, and we have time enough now without immediate pressure to discuss these things, but I suggest that a good deal still remains to be desired. Meanwhile of course decisions are made and have to be made, and as I said at the outset, we are in danger of becoming more and more a rubber stamp—I should not say becoming more and more but continuing to be a rubber stamp, which almost inevitably parliament had become during the war.

I should like to read a small extract from Mr. Bevin's speech in February last to show what I mean by saying that he had diplomatic and economic things in his mind. He said this towards the end of his speech:

> The present situation is very difficult. We want houses, and, in order to keep themselves warm, some countries are burning timber which we need for the houses. They cannot let us have the timber unless we can let them have coal. Therefore, we get a bottleneck both ways. They want goods, but there is a terrible vacuum in the world. I am constantly being pressed, first by one side and then by another, to try to help them to get supplies for which they are willing to pay.

I said a moment ago that I thought the practice which has been followed leaves gaps in our knowledge, and what is even worse in my opinion is that it leaves gaps which give rise to misunderstandings. The Secretary of State for External Affairs this afternoon spoke very warmly and to my mind very wisely in what he said not only about UNO but about other groupings in the world; he spoke about the commonwealth and what it had done, and he spoke about unity in this country. Of course compared with some countries we in Canada are united. Nevertheless I cannot feel that we have the unity in this country which I believe we could have if we had been able—and when I say "we" I am not speaking of any political party—if we had been able to talk more frankly and openly to each other about our difficulties.

Frankly I do not think we are a united country. I think there are great gaps, and the great problem in this country is that we should try to be frank about it and try to overcome them. They did not always exist. For a long time in the early history of confederation both old parties, and I take them as symptomatic of the political life of the country, were adequately represented throughout Canada. I can best illustrate that by saying that Sir John A. Macdonald was beloved and followed in Quebec just as Sir Wilfrid Laurier was beloved and followed in Ontario.

An. hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I am glad to say that. Any Conservative would be glad to say that. That was a healthy situation for this country, and I believe we shall not have a healthy political situation in this country until that comes back again. I remember just before the last election a life-long Liberal friend of mine—I think I would be describing him correctly if I called him a Grit—said to me: "If you people can do anything to create a situation in the province of Quebec similar to that which prevails in Ontario where both old parties have substantial recommendation, you will have done a great thing for this country". We did not make a good job of it in the last election, but we are going to do better next time, and no fair-minded man who has the interest of this country at heart can for one moment deny that that is true.

Mr. CLAXTON: Deny that you are going to do better? That is denied.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I will say that we shall do much better.

There are two things to which I wish to refer as causing gaps in our unity: first, mutual distrust and suspicion, and the second in my opinion is the failure to make clear to ourselves what our true interests are. As to that distrust and suspicion it no doubt depends on a good many things, but I believe it depends on one thing to which I shall refer. I believe it is better to speak openly about these things and try to overcome them instead of pretending that they do not exist. It is better to face them openly and try to strike at the root of them and remove them.

I believe that one of the great reasons for distrust and suspicion is that there is a belief that there exist in this country a great many people who are not one hundred per cent Canadian, who somehow or other have a divided loyalty. I wish to say that outside of museum pieces such people do not exist. If I may for a moment speak personally, I am one hundred per cent Canadian both by birth and by conviction. Both my parents and some of my grandparents were born in this country. I say this about myself merely because I believe it describes virtually everyone else of my background in this country. I have a one

hundred per cent loyalty to this country. There is no division of any kind in my mind. I am loyal to the commonwealth to, because I am a Canadian and because Canada is loyal to the commonwealth. I say this deliberately because I believe that if what I say could be accepted throughout the length and breadth of this country a great deal of the suspicion which has poisoned our lives would be removed. I say without fear of contradiction that that has been true of the great leaders of this party, of Macdonald, of Borden, of Meighen, and of Bracken. I was reading in *Maclean's* the other day a cheery article about Sir John. When Canada was asked to send troops to the Sudan back in 1885, Sir John asked what the Suez canal meant to us—showing how remote we were at that time, and also showing how one hundred per cent Canadian Sir John always was.

The second point I wish to make is this: we need a true appreciation of the vital interests of this country. The suspicion exists that there are people about who are not one hundred per cent Canadian but who somehow or other have the interests of Britain more at heart than the interests of their own country. In that connection I would like to read from a speech made in this house on June 9 by the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Gauthier) in the debate on visiting forces, in which he said this—and I quote this because I accept it and because I think every Canadian can accept it:

> When you hear a member from Quebec speak in favour of an accord with the United States, or in favour of privileges to be given the United States army, it is not because we in Quebec want to turn our eyes away from the British empire or the British commonwealth of nations and turn them toward the United States of America for good, leaving the former alone. It is just because we have the experience of the last war, because we want those two organizations, those two nations or groups of nations, to stand firmly on their feet right in front of the menace from without and from within.

I say that that is satisfactory to me and I am sure it is satisfactory to the members of this party, and if it is equally satisfactory, as I believe it is, to gentlemen on the other side, then why should there be any division on that point between us?

The next point I want to make is this. Just as in war time we cooperated most effectively and usefully with the United Kingdom and with the United States, so it is necessary for us to do it still. We are still part of the strength of both. The United States are so nearly self-sufficient that our usefulness to them may be less. Nevertheless in a debate in this house not long ago it became clear that we were a useful and necessary ancillary to their military preparations.

When we come to the commonwealth, of course, the need of us is far greater. We know the grievous losses suffered by the United Kingdom, and we know the difficulties in which the commonwealth stands, difficulties which have suggested to some people, to my mind foolishly and prematurely, that the commonwealth is in the process of liquidation. I wish to make this point—and I do not think the Secretary of State for External Affairs will disagree; as nature abhors a vacuum, so the world of politics abhors a political vacuum. All the best commentators that I have ever read, notably Lippmann, whom I respect greatly, have noted with extreme alarm the possibility of the British commonwealth losing its power and its beneficient influence.

I suppose we must face the fact that we have a great part to play in that respect. It is not altogether easy, because, as I say quite frankly, I do not think there is unity among us. I think that governments, and this government among others, have probably had to do certain things by indirection, perhaps not making too specific just the course they were following. I am earnestly suggesting that if these misunderstandings which I spoke of can be cleared up then that would not need to be done.

I have referred to the experience of Great Britain in the world of diplomacy, and I should like to read to the house just a word from an interesting statement which was related the other day by Sir Samuel Hoare in his book "Ambassador on Special Mission". He was inveighing against the iniquities of the Falange, and he says this:

> The rector of the great Dominican university in Manila said to me, "You must not lose your temper. If the British lose their tempers, all is lost in Europe." It was perhaps worth showing irritation to elicit such a tribute to my fellow-countrymen.

I think we can be very frank. It is quite true that we do not always find Englishmen the easiest people in the world to get on with. They are different from us. I do not imagine that Mr. Churchill was always the easiest person to get on with. They may find tiresome the little things that we lesser folk are interested in. Nevertheless I should like to go back and say that we have had the experience in two wars that the British are great people to be with in a pinch. And what is more important, going back to my first point in speaking about the commonwealth, the future of peace which hangs on a quite slender enough thread, however optimistic we

allow ourselves to be, if you take the long view, the future of peace depends I believe greatly on the strength of the commonwealth. I remember a speech of Churchill which he made some time in the thirties. At that time he was speaking chiefly about the United Kingdom and its chance of survival. He based its chance of survival chiefly on two things. He said he thought the United Kingdom had as good a chance to survive as any nation, because it was more united and more experienced. It seems to me that just as the prelate in Spain said the other day to Hoare, that calmness, that self-confidence which we often find irritating, nevertheless is valuable to us all, just in the same way as our contribution to the commonwealth can be the plus quality of energy and of initiative and inventiveness which we have shown.

I am afraid that I have cheated a little on my indication to you, sir, as to the time I should take, but I am just about to finish. I have tried to make two points. I have tried to say something on this question of foreign affairs because I believe it is of enormous importance that people should come to know more about it. I do not see how they are to come to know more about it unless we of the House of Commons know more about it. Second, I have emphasized the question of unity in this country which seems to me of an importance which I cannot find words to express.

(Translation):

Mr. Chairman, I have almost concluded, but I wish to express another thought.

I referred to the importance of unity at home, in a world confronted with so many difficulties and dangers. I emphasized that our country needs all her might and that she can achieve it only if sympathy and friendly understanding prevail among all sections of our people.

Mr. MICHAUD: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Such sympathy and understanding will materialize if we desire them whole-heartedly. For my part I sincerely and deeply long for them.

Finally, I believe that a nation is fortunate if her people show such understanding and sympathy, but it makes for the glory of a country if her citizens have those feelings, and in addition strive to achieve a common objective.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Text):

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): My remarks shall be even briefer than those of the hon. member who has just taken his seat, not because I do not think there are many things that could be said about foreign affairs; but the more I consider the world situation at the moment the less am I convinced that any good could be achieved from what I should like to say. Consequently what I shall say under the circumstances may not be very important.

I missed a part of the minister's statement because of being called out of the house. If what had gone before what I heard was of the same quality as the part of the speech I heard, I wish to congratulate the minister on what he said.

The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell), who has just taken his seat, referred to the fact that we were not a united people. Taking the limited view of our affairs perhaps that is right, but I believe that today if the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent) stated correctly—and I believe he did—the foreign policy of this government, then the house is fairly well united on that foreign policy because it is based on the united nations. While there may be some disagreement between us on this or that point, so long as the policy of the country is based on the united nations charter I do not think there will be any wide differences between us. Of course today, for reasons of which we are all aware, the united nations organization moves extremely slowly in the settlement of world problems, and I believe that in various matters this country cannot wait altogether on the united nations. It must do certain things on its own behalf, so long as these things are not contrary to the principles of the united nations charter—and at the moment I cannot recall any of our relations with other countries which go beyond the charter. I too am in favour of the utmost cooperation among the members of the commonwealth. I am in favour of that to any extent beyond where the commonwealth would act as a block in opposition to member nations of the united nations. In my opinion nothing but good can accrue both to ourselves and to the world from the closest cooperation within the commonwealth. Today I think we are within a few days of the time when the self-governing nations which comprise the commonwealth will be enlarged by the addition of the two Indian sections which will remain within the commonwealth at least for the present. I think it is a matter for rejoicing that that transition was made in the way it was. To me at least it is an accomplishment of the greatest importance.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs referred to the necessity, if we were to have peace, that the political and economic affairs of the nations of Europe be put in order. I think we will all agree with that. It is said that man is a political animal, but I suggest that before being a political animal he is an economic animal, and that the first step in building peace and in putting the world's affairs on a stable basis will have to be the economic restoration of the world. And that includes, as a must, the reorganization of Germany and the setting up of self-government within that country. It will also mean the settlement of a peace treaty with Japan and the instituting of normal trade relations with that country. All these things are of the utmost importance if we are to build the peace for which the war was fought.

I think that one of the things that have retarded progress all over the world has been the demand in both Canada and the United States for an end to the restrictions and the cooperation which was so useful to us during the war—to get back to normal. The result of that is making it difficult for the countries of Europe today. They cannot reconstruct themselves, they cannot get back to stability without assistance from the United States and from Canada, and the removal of controls over prices has to a large extent nullified what these countries tried to do through borrowing. The values of these loans today are a fraction of what they were when the loans were made. That is so because of what has taken place here and in the United States and not because of anything that has happened in Europe. So I suppose what we shall have to do is to give as gifts what we cannot provide by way of loans.

It is the same conflict of interests that is making it so difficult to reach agreement in Geneva. It is not today at Geneva so much a question of conflicting ideologies as of conflicting economic interests between countries who have the same political points of view. Therefore until we resolve these economic contradictions in our system we shall find the restoration of normal conditions very difficult, if not indeed impossible.

The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario referred to the lateness at which these estimates were brought down, and he said that we have not time to debate them. The same was said last year and the year before, so I think that under the circumstances what must be done by anyone who wants to talk now is to talk, because if we forgo that we shall find the same obstacle at the next session. If we want to debate and question we shall have to debate it regardless of time.

As far as the Department of External Affairs estimates are concerned, we have had plenty of opportunity for discussion in the external affairs committee, and I doubt whether there are many items in the estimates that we disagree about. But again, as I said at the beginning, I do not think that any remarks I might make today would be of any great importance, and I shall leave it at that.

Mr. JOHN T. HACKETT (Stanstead): The minister is to be commended for having initiated this debate, because, to use his own opening words, it brings, stark realities before the country. I think that many of the causes of division of opinion in our land rest upon diversity of what is accepted as fact. I believe that our people as a whole, if they could agree upon the facts, would almost inevitably be in agreement on any course of action.

Mr. BLACKMORE: If we could find the facts.

Mr. HACKETT: That being the case, the minister is to be congratulated on opening the discussion, because as a rule discussion tends to throw the truth into the open and to make it available to all those who seek it.

The minister has said that this country entertains hostility toward no one and sentiments of peace toward all. He was quick to add that that is not a statement of foreign policy. It is a statement of the attitude of Canadians toward one another and of Canada toward the world at large. We are not seeking the lands of other nations, and we are not seeking to impose our will upon other peoples. We want peace, and if evidence of the truth of that statement were lacking, it is possible that events which have taken place in this city within the last fortnight would convince the doubting that the people of Canada are solicitous for the maintenance of peace and have turned their eyes and addressed their prayers to the Almighty that He might give this greatest of boons to Canada to this tortured world. Nevertheless within our own time peace has twice vanished from the earth and all the nations have been engaged in deadly conflict.

A great war is not always a matter of human choice. It sometimes marks the point where events pass out of human control. It is a kind of social convulsion, an eruption of forces which lie dormant like the subterranean forces of a volcano on the slopes of which men build their cities and cultivate their fields. Wars do come, and it behooves peoples to be ready to meet the scourge when it comes to them. There has been diversity of opinion

among Canadian people as to facts. An element in the country who are loyal citizens of Canada, who have been here for a long time, who are willing to make every sacrifice for the betterment of Canada and for the protection of her people, believe that we have no interest in wars which take place beyond our territory. That group is not extremely large but is eminently respectable, and it expresses opinion forcefully and not infrequently. Just to show how that element feels I turn for a moment to an editorial which appeared in *Le Devoir* a short time ago, in which the editor argued that the only way Canada could escape from the entanglements of war and financial difficulties was to cut loose from Britain. He states:

(Translation):

The only practical way for Canada to become independent is to proclaim herself a republic.

(Text):

Then he goes on to say that in South America states have become republican and in that way have achieved their entire independence; and he intimates that it is probably for this reason that they have escaped war. I do not think this opinion is universally held in the province of Quebec; in fact, I know it is not. I know it is but the opinion of a small element. But being an opinion which is held, I think it is well that it should be openly expressed—in our country everybody is entitled to his opinion—and it is well that such opinions should be brought to the touchstone of discussion and debate; that their value be tested.

A series of articles was printed in this newspaper about that time, and I do not think it is going too far to say that the opinion expressed there was that Canada had no interest in either of the great wars, that she had uselessly wasted the lives of valuable citizens, uselessly squandered her treasure and uselessly burdened herself for all future time by participation in these wars. The reason for that point of view as I understand it—and it is always dangerous to attempt to make oneself the interpreter of the motives of others; I have no right to speak for the element whose views are so forcefully set forth in this newspaper—is that the group feels that the enemy which it has to fear is an element or elements within Canada which might be hostile to the culture, the religion, the language and the way of life of the French people. They make frequent references to methods of taxation which they think are unfair, to reluctance to accord the privilege of speaking over the radio in their own tongue, and sundry other matters of the kind. As I understand the attitude of that group, the possibility of Canada being overrun by an enemy or subjugated by force of arms is something which has never come upon their horizon. The possibility that Britain might be defeated in the field, as I understand it, has never occurred to them. They believe in the enduring supremacy of British arms as ardently as ever any little boy believed in the supremacy of his father.

I am saying these things, not to be disagreeable, but in an effort to bring before the house an explanation for the attitude of eminently decent Canadians. They call everybody an imperialist who seems to differ from them on this point. When Canada took up arms with Great Britain, France and the United States they deemed that Canada was making a mistake and that she was urged into that position by an element which they style imperialist, by an element to whom the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario referred a moment ago, namely those people who, having to choose between Canadian and English or British interests, would always sacrifice the Canadian interests for the British or imperial.

I believe there may be some people like that in Canada because in most large groups of population one generally finds a few extremists. However I think their number is very limited. Some day I should like to meet a person of that kind because so far I have never met one. I believe all Canadians are devoted and loyal to Canada. They give their first, their abiding and continuous allegiance to Canada. If some have gladly taken up arms in other wars it is because they desired that Canada be a good place for their children to live in, exactly as the element to which I have referred, desired the same thing for their children. They conceive however that the peril is not a local one. These people who are called imperialists were the people who feared that if the world were overrun and dominated by a combination of Germans, Italians and some of their satellite countries, our country would be overrun and dominated by these elements, our liberties would disappear and our lives would cease to be the lives of free men.

These people loved Canada no less than the first group; but they are not in agreement with the first group as to where lies the great danger to Canada. And seeing that danger of foreign aggression they made common cause with the others to defend Canada.

A debate of this kind affords an opportunity to discuss coolly and, I like to think, quite beyond the scope of party controversy, these

questions of external affairs, where truth may be known in its fulness, and where wise decisions may be taken in the light of that truth. I am one who likes to believe that if frank and full discussion of this type can be had with reasonable frequency there would be developed a public sentiment based on the acceptance of essential facts which would do much to bring complete harmony to elements which may have been somewhat out of harmony in the past.

Oh, sir, I am not suggesting that people of one racial strain can be expected to have all the enthusiasm for the glories of the past of another racial strain that they have for their own. No; that is against nature, and it is not necessary. What we need is agreement as to essential Canadian interests. We want peace; we want it beyond everything else. We want to be free to live our own lives, to grow up and to develop; and as part of that programme we must be in a position to defend ourselves should war come.

And war does come, whether we will it or not. In the past it has come twice within the memory of all within sound of my voice. If we can so determine the course we are to follow as to bring ourselves into complete internal harmony, then I believe a great deal will have been accomplished to maintain peace. Nothing is more provocative of war, nothing does more to encourage the aggressor, than evidence of division among those whom he would attack.

Canada must realize the great treasure of which she is custodian. When I say "treasure" I refer not only to her wealth and her broad acres. I mean that she is the depository of the genius of two great civilizations which, if they have not fused, have so reacted upon each other as to engender a type of liberty, a type of freedom, a type of tolerance that has made us the envy of the world. We have that to protect, that we may ever hold it high as a beacon to those distraught nations which have suffered in the furnace of war. We have a double heritage: we are heirs to the culture of two great civilizations, the French and the British. We hold these as a trust. To be faithful we must defend them. The words of Victor Hugo depict this duty:

(Translation):

And, besides, true to the blood I have inherited from my soldierly father and my Vendean mother.

(Text):

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (Cochrane): Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the committee for a few moments. My primary reason for speaking at this time is the fact that I have the great honour and heavy responsibility of having been appointed chairman of the committee on external affairs in 1945. That was an honour which I greatly appreciated. I knew from the membership of that committee that its work was bound to be a success. I am glad to state now, and I think all hon. members will agree, that to some extent we made a success of our activities.

The deliberations of that committee were on the same plane as those we have had this afternoon. There was no trace of partisanship. We dealt with matters more or less in an academic way and in the abstract. We all realized what was involved in the international and national questions which were dealt with. In external affairs the pivot of things seems to shift most rapidly. We found in our deliberations that a thing which was new today might be expected to be old within a few days.

I considered with some trepidation the first order of reference to the committee. I think all members of our committee will agree when I say that we brought forth an organism which I believe has proved to the country and to parliament that that standing committee has a place in our national life. The next order of reference was the extradition bill. I speak for myself, but I believe I am voicing the sentiments of most members of the committee. Our committee did not have the same power as the external relations committee of the United States, but opportunities were afforded to people from every section of Canada to express their opinions on certain matters. A certain amount of good publicity was given to our deliberations which I think has proved beneficial to both countries.

Last session there was an innovation as far as the committee was concerned. We were given as an order of reference the estimates of the external affairs committee. The doors of that department were opened wide and to some extent we were given wider latitude than we had before. In a word, and without taking any undue credit, I believe we improved even on the activities of the sittings in 1945. Last year there appeared before our committee representatives of the Zionist organization and of the Arabs who gave their views on the Palestine situation. I think a certain amount of good resulted from having those representatives appear before the parliamentary committee. They presented some very good briefs which received a lot of publicity, and on that score I believe much was accomplished.

The thing that struck me in our first deliberations was the knowledge of some of our members, such as the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon), the hon. member for Rose-

town-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). These hon. members had had opportunities to see for themselves what went on in London, in Europe and in San Francisco. No doubt their knowledge and experience was an important factor in our discussions on international problems.

Early during the present session I had the good fortune to head a delegation of our membership to Flushing Meadows and Lake Success. I believe that every one who attended was greatly benefited from what he heard and saw. I was always a supporter of the old league of nations, and I am a still stronger supporter of the united nations. I am positive that some good is bound to come from the united nations. You cannot have representatives of 54 or 55 nations, representatives of all colours, all races and all creeds, meet sincerely in a deliberative assembly in an effort to solve the problems that confront the world as well as their own countries, without beneficial results. If I could have my wish at the moment it would be that every citizen of the world could assist in three or four or half a dozen of those meetings. I am sincerely convinced that they would come away converted to the necessity of the united nations and also of the great good it has accomplished and is bound to accomplish in the future.

I do not want to elaborate these matters because I realize the lateness of the session. However, I should like to pay a tribute to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) who was Secretary of State for External Affairs when the standing committee on external affairs was established. I want to thank him sincerely and every official of his department for the fine cooperation they gave. That applies just as forcibly to the present Secretary of State for External Affairs. Those two statesmen have brought honour, not only to themselves but to Canada as a whole through the way they have participated in international deliberations.

Speaking now as chairman of the committee I should like to pay a tribute to the members of the committee. I appreciated immensely the fact that they cooperated with me one hundred per cent. If we have accomplished anything it is due to every member of the committee, individually and collectively. One hundred per cent credit must be given to the members of the external affairs committee. I want to pay a sincere tribute to the officials who appeared before our committee. I can easily understand that when they were first called to appear before us they may have experienced some uneasiness, but the moment they realized the open-mindedness of our members, the moment they saw that there was no trace of politics in our deliberations, we received from them the finest cooperation possible. That was a revelation, not only to the members of the committee but to the whole of Canada through the reports of the committee. My hope at the moment is that that committee will continue to do in the future the good work it has done in the last three years. It has not been an easy job, but the government and parliament did the right thing in getting this committee to function. We must of necessity make our Canadian people more and more conscious of external affairs and international problems. No matter what we may think, we must at the moment to some extent be our brother's keeper. We cannot get away from that. We cannot erect a national wall around our country that will prevent us from seeing what is going on in the world outside.

One of the finest experiences I had when we were at Lake Success and Flushing Meadows this spring was to see the respect and love that the delegates of the united nations organization had for Canada and Canadians. That is easily explained. During the last two world conflicts we answered the call loyally and spontaneously to save democracy and fight for freedom and liberty, for Christianity and all the things we cherish so dearly, and now having gone into the battle to the limit so that our side may be victorious we go to the united nations organizations with an open mind. We seek no aggrandizement, no expansion of our territorial frontiers. We go there with only one objective in our minds, and that is peace, peace for Canada, peace for the whole world and for all time to come.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I rise to call the attention of the committee to the estimates of this department, amounting to $6,484,000, and to say that there is room for very wide differences of opinion on all important questions which relate to the peace of the world and foreign affairs. How does it come about that we have not yet had an opportunity, even though this be the one hundred and fifth day of the session, to discuss these very important matters? I would like to find out where Canada now stands as a nation in regard to external and foreign affairs. The old policy was: no commitments; parliament will decide. Just like the United States, which never had a foreign policy. They had a war with Spain and another war with Japan and two wars in our generation.

against Germany, yet until recently they never had a foreign policy. That was true of us. Our policy was one of wait and see; no commitments; parliament will decide. I was almost alone in this house between the two great wars in calling the attention of the government, especially before the outbreak of the second war, to the need of rearmament. But we saw the result of the policy that was followed.

And now where does Canada stand so far as our policy on external affairs is concerned? What are our commitments? As Mr. Walter Lippmann once said in his textbook on foreign affairs, our foreign affairs policy is something like an accounting system which shows you who are your friends and who are not your friends, and what are their commitments and debits and liabilities and assets. How do we stand as a nation, and is Canada able to carry out certain commitments? What are those commitments? And when, where and how are we to carry them out?

We were discussing the other day article 41 of the charter of the united nations. I looked up the Oxford dictionary definition to find out what "charter" meant. It gives: "written grant of rights by sovereign, or grants or privileges." The definition contained in the dictionary does not describe the charter at all. It is now turned into a phrase, Atlantic charter—U.N.O. charter. A lot of these charters are moonshine, or vague hopes of those who create them. When it comes to a showdown they do not amount to anything. What power has the government to carry out these Canadian commitments? Remember once before there was trouble with Italy in regard to Ethiopia, and this government passed sanctions. No sooner were the sanctions passed than we had to rescind them, if you please, because we were depending upon the league of nations and the league of nations depended on peace pacts and the Young plan, Dawes plan, scraps of paper and all that kind of thing. We saw the futility of it all. It led to the greatest war in history, and we shall be led into another one unless we stop, look and listen and do not make alliances unless we know how to carry them out.

What are those commitments, and when and where? Have they been made with the knowledge and consent of parliament? The answer is no. Parliament has never been consulted about them at all. One would think the officials were dealing only with their own personal affairs.

The last war closed nearly two years ago. The mother country and the dominions had to do it all alone for two and a half years during the last war. Two of our allies, Russia and the United States, came in because they were invaded. Russia no doubt had been in league with Germany. It came out in the evidence at the Nuremberg trials that Russia was ready to make a deal with Germany and call it off. Britain for two and a half years of the war went it all alone because of its pledge to Poland, save for the help of the dominions.

We have no foreign policy so far as the empire goes. We have ambassadors all over the seven seas. They occupy so many hotel suites and railway cars that it is appalling to think what is going to become of it all. It has now gone up by leaps and bounds to $6,500,000 a year—all the novice ambassadors and diplomats.

Where were we two years ago? Britain was at the zenith of her power. She had won the war; she was supreme. Where do we stand today, two years afterwards? We find that two of our allies who did not go into the war voluntarily but went in because they were invaded are now claiming supremacy, a place in the sun, and all that kind of thing, and dear knows what will be the end of it all. The empire will be dissolved if we do not have a foreign policy and allow things to go into liquidation, where the empire is now heading.

The Prime Minister has done a great deal of good work. He knows more about these matters than any of us, and I agree with what he said on Monday in regard to the treaties with Italy, Finland, Poland and other countries. Unless the dominions are going to hang together they are going to hang separately. None of us can go it alone. The Prime Minister was quite right when he said with respect to the treaties with Italy, Poland, Finland and the other countries mentioned in the resolution, that we could do nothing about them. We had ourselves to blame very largely for that, because we agreed to this settlement made at Potsdam, Yalta, Moscow and other places by the great powers. No doubt the best settlement was made, not in the interests of the peace of the world but because Mr. Stalin and the late President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill had agreed on certain things at several conferences that were held, and the small powers cannot alter a line of it. So we can do nothing about these treaties as a dominion, nor can the other dominions, nor any of the smaller countries. Once you signed at San Francisco the veto charter you signed your death warrant. You gave any one country of the four the right to veto the others. You used to play lacrosse, Mr. Chairman, and you know you could not talk back to the umpire or the referee. He had

veto power to rule you off, and one of the four great powers can refuse to play with the other three and veto it all.

What has been the result of this policy? The United States want our place in the sun, and they are going to get it because there is nobody to stop them. Talk about what happened in India. You will wake up some day and find out what is going to happen there. United States and Russia are two great countries; they were our allies in the war. We hope that they will continue in peace as they did in the war. If the various parts of the British empire would hang together with the mother country they are in every way vastly superior in resources on land, sea and in the air, to the other countries I have named. This is the fourth of July. I am surprised that at the opening of the session today not one word was said about it by the government or by anybody else. We are proud of our great neighbour and ally. I congratulate them today on their great anniversary. They left the British empire. We had the President over here the other day. He and the Prime Minister have done a great deal for the peace and security of the world. I think our United States friends will appreciate us far more if we were to talk out in plainer language and tell what is going on, express the views of this country. I have always contended that between the two wars and during the last war we surrendered too much of our political, economic, military and social initiative to Washington.

They are a great nation, and as I say, I am surprised that at the opening of the house today not a word was said about the fourth of July. There is no union jack on the building today. Some days ago the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fournier) told hon. members that two flags were sent all over the country to be placed on public buildings. Is that not right? That is what he said. He said the caretakers could choose either one, and that both were issued and they had his authority for it. When the President came there were quite a few union jacks around this building. I was glad to see them. There is still room for them, because parliament has not as yet adopted any change in this.

There is a very large body of public opinion in this country that is in agreement with the opinion expressed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) on these small treaties. I am glad to see the Prime Minister has chosen the twelfth of July as the day for prorogation, because there will be many union jacks on the streets that day. I hope my good friend, the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) will carry out what he said. He said he was going to ride in here on a white horse that day. I think he was talking in a humorous way, and to some new, young reporter who took it seriously. We appreciate what he has done.

Coming back to more sensible talk, I am surprised that we have not heard from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre on this question.

Mr. KNOWLES: You will.

Mr. CHURCH: He is an eloquent orator. We have not heard from him yet on this topic. I am glad he is going to speak because during the dark days before the war his party said that they were going to depend on pacts and peace talks and all that kind of thing. They did not need an army or a navy, but would just depend on Washington instead of London and Glasgow for defence. That is what some of them said. My hon. friend was not in the house at that time; therefore he is not to blame for these views.

We are spending $6,500,000 on this department. Away back in 1898 Sir Wilfrid Laurier went to the Diamond Jubilee. He was first in the Diamond Jubilee procession. He told the people over there, "If you want our aid at any time, invite us to your councils." What is badly needed in this country is an empire conference. I made reference to that the other day. We should have had an empire conference long ago instead of the present policy of just being informed of events. Are we to sit still in the house and in the country and see the empire made a scrap of paper, scuttled and dissolved as is being done all over the world? Are we not interested in it? A million men went from the dominions in the first great war on their own status of sovereignty, autonomy and all that kind of thing. One million men went over there under their own status of their own free will. They were all volunteers. They went over there and fought for the mother country on their own sovereignty, status and autonomy. One hundred and thirty thousand fell on the field of battle, and a great former prime minister said that by that action they "changed the history of the whole civilized world." In the recent war history repeated itself. Here we are today practically out of the empire. Separatism abounds in this country. There is talk of changing the flag and the anthem. We have embassies all over the world. We are making our own treaties. It is now proposed that privy council appeals be abolished. There is one appeal that can never be abolished, namely, appeal by grace to our sovereign king. Every British subject

all over the world today has the right of appeal by grace to the King of England who is King of Canada also.

In the British House of Commons the other day they discussed a change in the name "dominion". They have changed designation of the colonial secretary and all that kind of thing. They have struck out the word "dominion" and want to put in the word "commonwealth", to change our British North America Act or the term "Dominion of Canada". They cannot change that without an amendment in this country to that act. I warn them about that. We had a debate in this house on a motion by a private member which was rejected. That cannot be changed without amending the British North America Act.

The Statute of Westminster in 1932 was one of the greatest empire wrecking statutes we ever had. It was one of the reasons we had another war. New Zealand and Australia were exempted in five or six clauses, which they have only recently adopted. I believe an empire conference should be called immediately. I regret I was not here last Friday when tributes were paid to the late Viscount Bennett. Speaking in the House of Lords about a week ago he called for an empire conference. Mr. Casey and Mr. Fraser did the same thing. He said that an empire conference should be called to go into the position of the empire with the mother country for the future. He said that in the days to come the empire was going to be dissolved. He said as follows:

> We have not had an imperial conference for some time at which all of the commonwealth was represented and we have no parliament which speaks for all. We, therefore, are developing separate policies in the various nations of the commonwealth and you cannot have a commonwealth last long if all the nations that comprise it are developing separate policies.
>
> What we are facing is the greatest crisis this country has ever faced—and the epitaph has been written in cold-blooded terms just as accurately as far as guessing can be accurate. Many countries believe we are through.

Others have expressed the same view. We had the able representative of Australia, Right Hon. Mr. Bruce, in London for thirteen years. He is no longer the high commissioner now; he has retired from the post he held for thirteen years. He is a man who did a great deal for the empire and was a soldier in the great war. He appeared in 1923 as a representative of Australia, the high commissioner in the old country. He was a great supporter of empire preference, empire councils and empire meetings all the time.

Then we had the statement made the other day by Sir Thomas Blamey, which was quoted in the Sydney *Morning Herald* of May 18 last. They have a lot of newspapers down there, and you can find some of them in the reading room. He said:

> That the maintenance of the Suez canal and other strategic points in the east has had and will continue to have a far-reaching effect on empire relations is evident to all. The future of empire unity centres in the canal. The enemy could go through the Red sea and cross the Pacific. They are talking about abandoning Alexandria as a base, notwithstanding that it has been one of the life lines of the British empire. We are in danger of parting with the Suez, Hong Kong, Singapore and all our other bases the world over, but where would we have been in the last war and in this second war if Britain had given up all her bases on the seven seas? The result would have been that Germany would have won the war. We can grant rights to the use of raw materials and to the use of bases, but sovereignty, never! When Mr. Menzies was here, speaking with emphasis, he made light of the differences between the dominions. He argued for empire unity.

The policy in the United States is something like ours, continued world peace and friendship with all nations. That is all very well as far as it goes, but no one in this house has yet told the nation exactly what Canada's policy is in external affairs. No one really knows where we stand because there is uncertainty, evasion and inertia, and the country and the house are both completely in the dark. The people are not given the facts, but are blindfolded. We are given very little information. No statement has been made by the government about our commitments abroad, about the questions of defence at home or outside Canada, or what our defence will cost us. In other words, we are repeating the error we made between the two wars.

Mr. Attlee said that he was much disappointed with the united nations organization during the past two years and that we were as close to a third war as we ever were, and it is disappointing that no one can tell what Canada's foreign policy really is. An external affairs committee was appointed to study this whole question, but nothing has been done. Trivial matters are discussed but no attention is given to the grave problem regarding the dismemberment of the empire which has been going on day and night since the government now in office in Great Britain has been in power. After the last war, Lord Milner asked this very pertinent question in 1922 at Oxford, how it was that the dominions were all willing to make treaties with every nation throughout the world but apparently were not willing to come together and map out a common economic policy among themselves for the good of the empire in view of world conditions. The fact is that all import-

ant questions are being left to executive action of this government and we do not know what is even said or done.

What has the empire parliamentary association really done? It seldom meets and it is so Washington-minded it seems to pay more attention to pan-American affairs than to its duties to the mother country and the British commonwealth with a view to keeping the dominions and the old land together, for which it was founded. We have not had an interim report from the government on what has been taking place in that connection.

We are still a part of the British empire. We still belong to the empire, and if there is trouble again we shall have to depend upon common action on the part of all members of the commonwealth. I contend that we are not doing what we should to hold the empire together. We are not going to be talked out of it, but will have to be fought out of it. I warned the government, when I spoke in this house at the time, in 1945, that the conference at San Francisco would be a complete failure. I had no confidence in it. Churchill did not go to it, nor did Mr. Stalin. It was really President Roosevelt's idea, and it was most unfortunate that he should have died at that juncture, after what he had done for civilization. I am opposed to the policy that came out of that conference and the veto fiasco. I contend that the government of the day must bear the responsibility for the foreign policy of this country so long as it remains the government. The responsibility belongs to the government and not to the opposition. It is not for the opposition to propose a policy, though I would emphasize that all parties in the house should line up to treat this question in a non-partisan spirit. There is no room for party considerations so far as the foreign policy of Canada is concerned. We are faced with questions of life and death, if we do not work in peace as we did in war, with America, Russia and France.

After the last war we had the league of nations, and what did it accomplish? It was responsible for the rebuilding of Germany. Britain and Canada lent the Germans money, and so did the United States. The result of the actions we took at that time—and when I say we, I mean all the nations that had fought against the Germans—was to prevent any real recovery in Europe. We lost two of our allies at that time, France and Italy, because attention was concentrated on building up Germany through loans. All that led to the second world war.

Besides helping Germany through the loans we made, we foolishly disarmed and threw away the finest army, navy and air force the world ever saw. We had notes and pacts and all sorts of things which we thought would bring about peace. We thought we could have peace by means of agreements, but we found to our sorrow that the pen is not mightier than the sword, and it only led to another war. And now the nations are meeting again at Lake Success—with what success no one knows. All that has been accomplished has been talk. It has rightly been described as a modern tower of babel. That is what Churchill called it. It is that and nothing else, fifty-four countries, talking twenty-one different languages.

Because of our failure to get together within the commonwealth we are, I contend weaker as an empire in international affairs than we were after the last war. I hope no one in this country will forget for a moment that we are still a member of the British empire, that the British empire has been our best friend, and that unless we hang together, we will hang separately. None of us can go it alone. If anything should happen it will mean the complete disruption and dissolution of the empire and Britain will be, like Denmark, but a little island country in the North sea. Does anyone want to see that? It will happen, however, unless we bestir ourselves.

It is interesting to note the views expressed by the New York *Times* recently. That journal remarked editorially, only in June of this year, that from the day the American colonies broke away from the mother country the United States had been dependent upon the British fleet for protection. That newspaper said:

> The members of that empire are our best friends and our nearest relations. Their friendship and their earnest desire to work with us should be encouraged in every possible way. But instead of any effort to work with the empire we have the strange scene of the Geneva trade talks which the British empire has attended, not as a powerful unit, but as a scattered and unrelated number of countries. We are not allowed to know what is going on there but we can guess.

Britain used her fleet to make the Monroe doctrine a reality in the western hemisphere. That doctrine was made effective because of the existence of the British fleet. In fact, the British navy was the Monroe doctrine. It was the British navy that safeguarded the freedom not only of the empire but of this hemisphere as well. Britain got the world peace, justice and security for four centuries, in the wars with Philip of Spain, Louis XIV, Napoleon, and twice with Germany in our generation, by her great command of the sea.

It is interesting to recall on February 4, 1899, Rudyard Kipling's poem addressed to the United States was published in *MacLean's* magazine and entitled "Take up the White Man's Burden." No man knew better in his time the load of the buoyant and expanding British empire. Perhaps Kipling said what is happening to-day—a bankrupt Britain, unable to carry the load as of old.

Turn about is fair play—the royal navy kept the shores and ports of the Americas inviolate against the predatory powers. For a century or more. Britain maintained peace in all the troubled spots of the earth and now two gigantic wars, ten years in all, have sapped British resources, and talking about the royal navy when Dewey went to smash the Spanish fleet at Manila it was a British admiral who signalled to a German commander to shy off and not barge in, or else!

That is true today.

To come to these estimates, what has been going on? What value do we get from them? We see these vast expenditures of six and a half million. They are of little or no value, and involve duplication in countries where we have trade commissioners and other officials.

In a return made to this house, our ambassadors and their staffs and retinue are shown all over the seven seas: in Buenos Aires, Brussels, Rio de Janeiro, Santiago, Nanking, Bogota, Havana, Prague, Copenhagen, Cairo, Paris, Berlin, Athens, Guatemala City, Rome, Tokyo, Mexico City, The Hague, Oslo, Lima, Warsaw, Lisbon, Stockholm, Berne, Moscow, Washington; and away over in India where the civil war is today, the greatest civil war in history. Then coming to Ottawa you find ambassadors. In fact, we are building up almost a standing army of these ambassadors all over the seven seas. We are shipping them houses and coal at fabulous costs to the people of this country. I can tell you this, that there is a useless waste of money through duplication. As I said the other day, some of them do not know anything at all about diplomacy. They have never had any training in it. Yet it seems we have the ambassador cure for employment in the city of Ottawa, at large cost. They have food, clothing and housing, a first secretary, second secretary, third secretary and various other secretaries, and all that kind of thing; and the people have to pay for it by taxation, which they cannot afford. I hope something will be done to reduce it. Our ambassadors are only novices, who learn by experience.

Regarding this particular matter of Russia, she was our great ally, and as was stated in a great British paper, and as I mentioned the other night:

Russia is too weak to fight anybody now, and will be so for many years to come. Even if she had superior armaments of the most dreadful kind she would not attack, though she might grow provocative, to the point of disaster preferring to see the capitalist world break itself up, if possible, without embroiling the communist world in war. This does not mean that the soviet government is not the enemy of the west. It is, and it must be. There is no escape from this. But equally, there is no inevitability about a war. If we in the west can keep our own houses in order and base ourselves so firmly that there is no danger of internal collapse we have nothing to fear from Russia. Either the Marxist theory is right, or it is wrong. If it is right, there will be war with Russia whether we like it or not, and Russia will ultimately, though not by any means immediately, triumph. If it is wrong, it is up to us to prove it wrong by keeping our heads and refusing to play the Russian game.

Then it goes on to say:

Nor is any purpose served by quarrelling with Russia. If there is any good left in us, we can afford to agree to differ. If there is not, then nothing matters. Our task is quite straightforward. We have to organize the British empire and Europe, wholly disregarding Russian threats and feelings, on sound and decent lines which will make for the contentment of the millions.

That is correct, and I believe it is true that we should have open diplomacy with them, because they suffered terribly in this war. They lost twenty million men. The cities and towns in eastern Russia and on the border of Germany were reduced to rubble. They are suffering greatly. I hope that we shall get and keep together with them as we did in the war.

With regard to lease-lend, how did lease-lend come about? Britain gave up bases all the way from Newfoundland to British Guiana to America on 99-year leases. Those leases ought to be cancelled for the protection given in the Atlantic, which Britain and the dominions gave during and after the war, keeping the axis powers from America's shores. The leases should be cancelled accordingly, and charged to lease-lend.

The question of India has come up. The other day I referred to it. I quoted authority for it, the June number of the *National Review*, and gave the page and the book:

The Viceroy of India, Lord Mountbatten, is in England by request of the cabinet. He has appointed June 2 as the day when the plans for handing over India are to be declared. At this eleventh hour the truth must be apparent even to those politicoes who have created the present situation, and the truth is that there is no one, neither group nor leader, to whom India can be handed over. If the Indians had been capable of self-government, if any Indian prince had been capable of imperial rule, the British would never have been established in the great sub-continent. We unified India; when we leave, the structure we have created will fall to pieces. It is this tragedy we are about to see enacted with an amount of suffering and de-

struction that will make the Balkans seem peaceful. Under the viceroy, one of Queen Victoria's great grandsons, we are abandoning the helpless peasants and workers in India to the savagery awaiting them at the hands of congress and of the Moslems. The funeral pyre is built and the Indian peoples, millions of them, are laid on it. The torch is lit, the fire is already smouldering. Let our Crippses, our Alexanders and our Attlees look at their handiwork and realize for once what their false policies lead to. Never before in our history has there been so bitter a betrayal of trust as this English scuttle from India. But Conservatives cannot lay the whole blame for this shocking chapter in our history on the Socialists and Liberals. True, they started the fire and fanned the flames, but it was under a Conservative Prime Minister, Lord Baldwin, that the India Act, which has led to the present chaos, was passed, and it was a Conservative viceroy, Lord Halifax, who threw the mantle of his great influence over the disreputable affair. Do any of these men realize even now their personal responsibility? We doubt it. They are unaccustomed to understanding what they see and quite out of practice in regard to the appreciation of reality. The news which fills our papers daily with accounts of massacres and burnings in Lahore, Amritzar, and elsewhere is the curtain raiser of the much greater tragedy that lies ahead. The destruction of wealth is already incalculable. Money and goods are looted and burned, hospitals are full of wounded. There are no longer enough English people to keep even a semblance of peace. The few remaining British officials have warned the viceroy that they cannot maintain order. Never was there so shabby an affair as this of our letting ourselves be tumbled out of the empire to which for two hundred years we have given order and justice.

I have about concluded, Mr. Chairman. I should like to say this, that had we not gone over the heads of the dominions we would have had an empire conference and this would never have happened, nor would we have the Indian situation, or the Palestine or the Suez situation. See what happened in India because we adopted a policy which has been against the security of this dominion, the other dominions and the empire. I can tell you this. It is a retrograde step for the people of Canada, the way things are going, and the loss of Suez is deplorable.

In conclusion, may I say that I am glad the government has given us an opportunity to discuss this. I have always been opposed to private meetings. I do not think there is anything in them. I believe the Prime Minister was quite right in what he said the other day, that the agreements with Italy, Poland and Finland should be studied, so far as we can study them. After that, in the recess of parliament, the executive or cabinet has full power to act for us. There is no doubt we shall be through by July 12, a fine time for get-away day. We have been here for seven summers. Last year we were here to Labour day.

I think it is the duty of the opposition to give the government every support it can, as long as they are right. But it is also the duty of the opposition to try to express some sentiments on these matters and criticism of them. I am glad there is enough freedom in this free parliament for me to express my views, because they are not only my views, but also those of a large and intelligent body of public opinion. I have always held consistent views. I believe that the British empire, for the past two or three hundred years, has been one of the greatest influences for peace, truth and justice. I am sorry to see what is happening to it by dissolution throughout the world, because I believe that the British empire, next to the Christian church, has done more for the world and for peace, justice, religion and civilization than any other organization or agency in all history.

Mr. BENOIT MICHAUD (Restigouche-Madawaska): Mr. Chairman, I believe I can say in about two minutes all I have to say in reply to the remarks made by members of the official opposition. I refer particularly to the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell) and in passing, may I say that on a couple of occasions this afternoon I heard him described as the hon. member for Ontario-Muskoka. I am wondering whether since the redistribution committee began working on it, the name of his constituency has been changed. I knew, of course, that it had been eliminated, but I did not know it had been changed.

Mr. GRAYDON: Like Madawaska-Restigouche?

Mr. MICHAUD: The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario referred to a lack of national unity in this country. It seemed to me that he exaggerated somewhat a cleavage that is no more serious than is found in other places. As a matter of fact, I feel we are much more divided in financial matters, labour relations and controls, taxation, the united nations and other international organizations, private enterprise and nationalization. So I say that, so far as national unity is concerned, we are in no worse position than any other country.

Let us remember that in times of peace national unity is necessarily limited. In the United States, the United Kingdom and France there is considerable diversion of views on principal items of interest. We have the so-called union sacré in time of war only.

So I believe we should not be disturbed too much when we find that occasionally we disagree, or when Quebec disagrees with Ontario, or the maritime provinces disagree with western Canada.

I believe it was the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett) who, speaking along much the same lines, dealt with what we might call the isolationist movement in some parts of the country and, in that connection, referred to Quebec. I suggest that this isolationism is not peculiar to Quebec. We saw it in the United States before the war. Indeed it was much stronger there than in Canada. Had there been no Pearl Harbor attack, I doubt very much whether the United States could have been induced to get into the last war. The same thing happened in world war I; if the *Lusitania* had not been sunk, perhaps they would not have entered that war.

So I do not believe we should be disturbed unduly over the so-called isolationism which may exist in some parts of Canada. On this point I would say a few words to the hon. member for Stanstead. I believe the greatest isolationist movement in Quebec at the present time is that conducted by the present premier of that province. Pick up any of the larger daily newspapers of Quebec and you will find, practically every day, one of those large-sized advertisements, published under the auspices of the Union Nationale, in which a concise and vicious statement is made some what along these lines, "Duplessis gives to the people of Quebec; the Liberals give to strangers." If there could be anything designed more accurately to cause isolationism and lack of unity in Quebec, I fail to see what it is. I believe that is the worst thing that could be done so far as national unity is concerned, and so far as any isolationism may be developed.

My advice to the hon. member for Stanstead would be this. His party is on friendly terms with Premier Duplessis. Indeed, we hear of talk of possible union before the next election between the forces of Duplessis and the official opposition. If the hon. member for Stanstead is in earnest about developing a greater amount of national unity in this country, let him bring his influence to bear upon Mr. Duplessis, and induce him to cut out this most despicable kind of political propaganda.

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West): Mr. Chairman, first of all, may I express my appreciation to the Secretary of State for External Affairs for the statement he has made this afternoon. I followed it with keen interest, as I am sure all hon. members did, and I believe the people in this country will be pleased to read that statement. I support it whole-heartedly because he announced definitely this afternoon the policy of the Canadian government and its whole-hearted support of the principles of the united nations.

I have followed with interest the meetings of the external affairs committee. I believe the work that committee has done this session is a considerable improvement over what has been accomplished by it in past sessions, if I may draw an accurate impression from a reading of the minutes of the proceedings of this and previous sessions. In my opinion, the reports now issued periodically by the Department of External Affairs are excellent, and I believe it is wise to supply hon. members with reports of that type. As a member of the house may I express my appreciation of that arrangement.

I also support whole-heartedly the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) and other hon. members to my right who have urged the closest possible cooperation within the British commonwealth of nations. We often hear criticism of sections of the British commonwealth throughout the world, but I believe anyone who reads history carefully must recognize the great contribution the British commonwealth has made to the world in times of crises, and what contribution it is capable of making in the future.

I would ask hon. members to bear in mind that all empires have had some things to their credit, and that all have had disgraceful things in their records. That must follow in the nature of events as empires. But where in the history of the world would one find such a voluntary abdication of power on the part of a great nation as is found in the giving of self-government to the Indian people at this time by the government of Great Britain? Surely this indicates great progress and the possibility of development within the framework of the British commonwealth.

I believe the people of Canada—and I have met a great number of them, of all classes,—are anxious to have the truth. They want an objective approach to all these international questions. Give the people the truth. Let parliament and officials of the government have an objective approach to all international questions, and I am sure the Canadian people will be satisfied.

One hon. member speaking this afternoon said that world peace cannot be achieved unless it is based upon a sound economic foundation in all parts of the world, or words

to that effect. I wish to direct my thoughts for a few moments along those lines. I believe our present international difficulties will not be solved unless we have great improvement in the economic condition of many millions of people in Europe and Asia. In that respect we hear the constant demand for the giving of materials and the lending of money to those people. I support such demands. But I say it is useless for us just to suggest that the government lend money at a low rate of interest or to furnish materials on a lend-lease basis to other nations, unless we are willing to support words with action.

If we are to be successful in doing anything to improve the economic position of these sub-standard peoples I maintain that we shall have to have sacrifice from all groups of the people of Canada. Industry will have to be satisfied with a lower rate of interest. Labour will have to forgo some of the immediate benefits which would flow from our productive machinery. Farmers, too, will have to make some sacrifice. But I am convinced of this, that if the government would give leadership to the people of Canada in an effective mobilization of our people, far beyond the confines of partisan politics, in support of a programme for peace based upon production, and toward the assistance of under-standard people, I believe without doubt the Canadian people would respond.

If the facts and necessities of such a programme were presented, the people of Canada would be willing and ready to make temporary sacrifices for peace and future development. If that were done, the unity of purpose so splendidly expressed in Canada during the war would return to serve the purposes of peace.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, I should like to say just a few words. First of all, I want to express appreciation, which I think will be shared by all who are present, of the fact that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has found it possible to remain during this debate. We know of his heavy responsibilities, and the fact that he has stayed indicates his realization of the great importance of these matters, not only to Canada, but to the entire world. There is one suggestion I should like to make to him in his capacity as leader of the Liberal party. As we all know, each of the parties in this house has certain free time on the national hook-up of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and I should like to suggest that at as early a date as possible arrangements be made for the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent) to speak to the people of Canada along the lines that he followed when speaking to this house today.

These are times when the headlines in the papers from day to day tell us of the discouraging things in the world situation. We must be realistic; we must know about these things, but it is also important to have our attention turned to fundamental things as the Secretary of State for External Affairs did in his remarks when opening this discussion. It seems to me that more attention should be paid by all the political parties in this country to international affairs in an endeavour to educate our people more about these matters and also to dispel fear by instilling faith in the things that are fundamental.

I am not going to attempt to make a poor rehash of the remarks of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but I did appreciate in particular his reference to the fact that the united nations must be the cornerstone of Canadian foreign policy. I was impressed also by his reference to the fact that the source of our strength in this country and in other western countries is in our fundamental unity. I suggest that there is in those words the goal at which the entire world must aim. I suggest that we shall not have peace and the strength that goes with it until we achieve more unity among the peoples of the world.

I urge that in Canada we should place all the emphasis we can on the things that unite the peoples of the entire world. As I was listening to the remarks of the minister, I felt that there must be in his mind the wording of the charter of the united nations which is cast in these terms, "We, the peoples of the united nations." He spoke about the united nations and the attempt to achieve the collective will of all the people. In other words, there is in that approach a recognition of the fact that what we are trying to build in this world is not just a great get-together of nation states; we are trying to achieve the will of the peoples of the entire world for peace and human accord.

The fact is that all peoples do desire peace. That is one of the things which can unite us. I urge that we place more emphasis upon that fact. It is easy enough for us to recognize in others tendencies in the opposite direction, but I think we should go out of our way to discover the desire for peace that is in the hearts of the people of the world around. There is also a desire all over the

world for economic reconstruction and economic well-being. I urge that our foreign policy and our discussions and talk about these things should centre a great deal more around that fact.

There is also a common desire among the peoples of the world to live and let live. We do not always appreciate that fact; we usually think that is our attitude, but that is not the other fellow's. The tragedy is that the other fellow thinks exactly the same way, that he is prepared to live and let live, but that we do not accord him that privilege. I suggest that we who want peace, we who pride ourselves on being in a democracy, on being in a part of the world that is free, should go out of our way, go more than half way if you like, to establish as much as we can the realization that the world around there really is this desire to live and let live. Let us place emphasis on the desire that there is among all peoples to preserve the things that are sacred to them. From our experience in our own country we know that these things vary. There are things that are sacred in different parts of our land and these things vary from part to part.

Let us place emphasis on the fact that there is a desire on the part of all peoples to resolve difficulties without resort to war. We have that desire even when things get pretty dark and sombre, as they are at the present time. It is still our hope that we can resolve our difficulties and get together. Let us realize that there is some of that same attitude on the other side. With all the effort that we must put into economic reconstruction and into devising a foreign policy that is concerned about our own welfare and our own well-being, let us do our best to keep the door open, not just for one nation or another, but for all peoples of the world. We must realize that if we can place more emphasis upon the things that unite us there is still hope that we can achieve the high ideals which bound so many nations together in time of war and which can bind us together in an attempt to win the peace.

I urge upon the Prime Minister most seriously that he consider the suggestion that I made when I rose to my feet, and also that all political parties give more attention in their work in this country to the educating of our people in foreign affairs.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I desire to make a few general observations before this first item carries. First of all, I should like to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, to the minister and to the members of the committee that I consider it a great privilege to me to have served in a humble capacity for the last three sessions on the committee on external affairs. That service has been made happier because of the splendid chairmanship of the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette). A few minutes ago the hon. member paid a generous tribute to the members of the committee. May I say that if the membership of the committee did a good job, which we hope we did in some small measure, it was largely due to the fine and diplomatic handling of the committee by the hon. member for Cochrane.

I should like to make one or two suggestions with respect to minor matters before I go on to deal with some general matters which have come to my mind. This is the first session in which we have had a separate minister of external affairs. I think that was an innovation which everyone in the country and in this parliament was glad to see brought about. Of course it was inevitable, and I fancy the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), as well as everyone else who was close to the picture, realized the inevitability of a separate ministry of external affairs as soon as conditions and situations generally warranted that change. We were glad to welcome a separate ministry with a full-time minister in charge.

There is another suggestion I should like to make which perhaps may be only one of convenience. This is the first session in which we have had a full-time minister, and I think the awkwardness of his title is no doubt an embarrassment to him as it is an embarrassment to those of us who from time to time have to rise in our places and address him. More than that, it is a great embarrassment, I fancy, to anyone who has to call the under-secretary of state for external affairs even on the telephone, and by the time you get to the associate under-secretary of state for external affairs, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) suggests, you really have a long chain, which makes it very awkward indeed.

May I make this suggestion to the government? I know it would take legislation to change the name, but I suggest that next session we do change that name. There have been many suggestions as to what it should be. There may be objections to "Foreign Secretary" and to "Minister of Foreign Affairs", but there is no reason why the name could not be changed to either Minister of External Affairs, which he is largely called by most of us for convenience sake, or Minister of International Affairs. Such a change would be helpful as well with respect to the under-secretary, who, of course, would then be known as the deputy minister of external affairs or the deputy minister of international

affairs. I make that suggestion by way of perhaps a small reform, but nevertheless one which would add greatly to the convenience of the department and of the members who are from time to time interested in the affairs of that department.

As this debate is being instituted and as it progresses, we are facing a serious condition in world affairs which needs little elaboration by anyone as humble as I in the international field. Nevertheless to a layman it is a startling and alarming condition. I am one who believes that we should not emphasize unduly the alarming and startling condition of our world affairs, because these are days when cool heads and calm judgment will be needed in the top as well as in the lower levels of international life in a way which we have never demanded or needed before. The safety and security of the firesides and the homes of the people of Canada demand that public men and people in private life should not utter statements or make decisions which will in any way make it more difficult or harder for our statesmen to keep the peace along with those of like mind all over the world. Having that in mind, may I say this, that while we must take that attitude at all times, still we must face this reality. I wonder if the members of this chamber or the people across Canada fully realize that today in the world, after two years of peace since the German collapse, there are no fewer than 19,000,000 men under arms. Not only that, but I wonder if we all realize too that exclusive entirely of other kinds of preparation, not for war perhaps but for defence, there is being paid out and budgeted for no less than $27 billion for the upkeep of these armed forces from one side of the globe to the other. That, I think, is enough of the story. Nothing further need be said to emphasize to this house the importance of Canada's position as well as the position of other nations in an uncertain and certainly a very restless and uneasy world.

So I would say to the government that I appreciate this opportunity, even though it comes late in the session, of having an expression of opinion by men and women from all sides of the house on the question of our external relations and our external policy. After all, 245 heads ought to be better than two or three. I think everyone in this chamber is anxious that, so far as we can, we should try to find common ground on at least the major points of our policy with respect to world affairs. That, of course, does not necessarily mean that there should not be the ordinary parliamentary criticism of these estimates, because it would be a denial of the people's rights were that policy to be adopted by the opposition. Our job is to see that the government keeps on its toes and does things right.

External affairs are in a slightly different position from domestic matters. I have always been one who has felt that so far as humanly possible, whatever may be our differences at home, we should try very hard to have one voice for Canada in the councils of the world. I think we can best have that one voice by having more frequent discussions on external affairs on the floor of this house. There is no way in which we can capture the one-voice idea of parliament better than to find it from time to time through the voices of the representatives of the people reflecting what the people at home are thinking.

Do not let us make any of the mistakes of the past. Peace will not be kept in this world of today just by professional diplomats, no matter how good they may be. We have moved past those days. The peace of tomorrow will be a permanent and lasting peace only if that peace has the support and the unanimous support of the common peoples the world over.

I was interested in what the hon. member for Cochrane said a little while ago this afternoon, that he would have liked the common people to witness what went on at the united nations discussions at Lake Success and Flushing Meadows. I have long been an advocate and hope I shall continue to be an advocate of having the common peoples the world over understand other common people all over the world, because when that is done you will have all over the world the same condition that exists between two great friendly countries separated by that parallel of latitude between Canada and the United States. Just think for a moment how far a professional diplomat or a high level politician could get on either side of that boundary if he attempted to excite bad feeling between these two countries. Why, if any professional diplomat or politician or high-ranking member of the armed forces were to attempt to put any defence ramparts between this country and the United States the common people of Canada and the United States would tear them down next morning. That is the kind of peace that lasts; that is the kind of peace that is enduring; that is the kind of peace that is worth while.

I am afraid that one of the difficulties of the past has been that the common people of some lands have not always understood the

views and the aspirations of the common people of other lands. The sooner we do something to bring these lines of thought together, the sooner we can be assured of the permanent peace that we all desire. That brings me to this point. The House of Commons being what it is, a great forum for the discussion of domestic and external matters, this parliament ought to take into consideration the suggestion which was concurred in by the house last session, and which came originally from the external affairs committee itself. While from time to time we spend a good deal of time on domestic matters, as we should, I do not think that in the past—and I am not sure that it is doing it now—parliament has spent enough time in discussing international affairs and exchanging ideas, having in mind the gravity of the world situation and the importance and vitality of international issues as they affect the very lives and property of our people. Unless we exchange these ideas, it makes it just that much more difficult for us to speak as a united voice in the councils of the world.

Hon. members will remember what happened in 1936. I remember very well an important journalist who was in the press gallery at the time taking notes. Being interested in statistics, that journalist made this report to his paper. During one of the great crises in world affairs which was taking place at that time, which was about the time that we were discussing the United States trade agreement, that journalist, after careful consideration and a review of the statistics of the time taken, told his paper that only twenty-seven minutes had been spent upon external affairs and over eight hours had been spent upon the tariff on asparagus. I am not one who is in any way going to detract from the importance of the tariff on asparagus, because we grow a lot of it in my part of the country, and I know how important it is, but I say, having regard to the time spent on external affairs in those days, it was little short of a scandal. It has not been very much better in recent times so far as the time that the house is actually putting in on a discussion of external affairs. Last session, while we had some twenty meetings of the external affairs committee, the sittings were limited to a certain number of hon. members. Certainly the sittings could not be regarded in any way as an opportunity for members generally to debate international matters. While we did have twenty meetings last session, only two days out of 119 sitting days were used in the discussion of international affairs. This session there has been some improvement; but, Mr. Chairman, I want the government to go farther. I would like them to adopt that recommendation of the external affairs committee of last year which was concurred in by the house. The committee recommended that a set period every week, in addition to the normal channels and avenues of debate, should be granted to the house, during which external and international affairs could be discussed on the floor in the same way as certain rights and privileges are given in connection with private bills and certain other debates that we find useful in parliament from time to time.

The time has come when parliament has to keep abreast of our changing and expanding position in external affairs. The under-secretary of state for external affairs, in an excellent report which he made to the minister, which was later tabled in the house this year, and which was repeated by the Prime Minister in his opening address this session, indicated the expansion of our external affairs work in a practical way. In 1939 this government had official representation at seventeen international conferences. In 1946 this government had official representation at ninety-eight international conferences. The whole story can be repeated, continued and enlarged by reference to the work of the external affairs committee and the expansion of its activity. While that has expanded in the way it has I ask you, Mr. Chairman, and the government if you think we are keeping abreast in parliament of the great expansion that is going on in the department, having in mind our various and multitudinous international obligations all over the world? This parliament must keep abreast; but it cannot keep abreast if only three, four or five opportunities during the session are given to the people's representatives to reflect the opinion of the people as it comes from various parts of the Dominion of Canada. I ask the government if it will not consider giving this parliament some additional opportunities during the next session.

There is one other matter with which I wish to deal. It has to do with what I have been speaking on. I refer to the question of this so-called secret session of the external affairs committee. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I am not one of those who feel that we should be looking for difficulties at every turn, and I am not trying to criticize for criticism's sake. We should not really be going into a secret session of the external affairs committee on the question of international policy until we have at least exhausted the normal channels and avenues of discussion of policy in open session in that committee. I say that in all seriousness and with every bit of gravity that I can

summon to my command. This is what has happened in the experiment of sending the estimates of the external affairs department to the standing committee. It is an experiment; it is an adventure. Having that in mind, let us see where our mistakes have been made. If the external affairs estimates are to be made the guinea pigs for the estimates of other departments—and I am pleading with the government not to overlook the importance of having other estimates sent to standing or special committees for discussion, because in the main this committee's work has been reasonably satisfactory and successful except for one particular thing—I would hope that if estimates of other departments are sent to committees this will not happen. In the committee we have not had the opportunity of discussing government policy, and in external affairs that is of tremendous importance. We have had the under-secretary of state for external affairs and we have had others in the department come before us, all of whom have been frank as they could possibly be in connection with certain matters. But what we need, in addition to that, is to have a wide discussion on the policy underlying the administration of the department. I do not think it was ever intended that the policy of the department should be relegated to a secondary position and that we should spend most of our time in dealing with the question of the administration of the department itself. What will happen in the secret session is this. Instead of having a wide-open discussion on policy in the committee, we are to have a discussion of policy behind closed doors. I want to make that objection; I want to make that criticism, because when the Prime Minister replied to me on Monday of this week when I asked that the peace treaties be sent to the external affairs committee—and I made that suggestion because I felt that broad matters of policy would come out in the discussion of the treaties—I did not feel, nor did anyone else, that the treaties would be changed because they had already been signed; nevertheless the background and the European position generally was one which was of great public interest and value. Because of that I felt that the peace treaties might normally have come before the committee—

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend has referred to me. May I say to him that at this very time this house is discussing the policy of the government on external affairs. The minister has stated the government's policy in the preliminary statement he has made this afternoon. It has been referred to by several members this afternoon as something they were glad had been stated in so clear and frank a way. In regard to the meeting referred to the other day, my remark was a mere chance remark, one might say, as to the opportunity which the committee on external affairs would have with respect to obtaining particulars as to procedure with respect to treaties in general which it has been suggested the reference of the particular treaties being discussed would permit inasmuch as the committee was having a meeting within a few days and the matter could be discussed there without any reference to the committee or the treaties themselves. My remark could not be given the significance that the government in some way was trying to disclose policy in a secret meeting. In fact, it was while I was on my feet that I was informed there was a meeting the next day, and the word "secret", as far as I know, did not have any more significance that is usually attached to meetings held by the external affairs committee where they discuss things freely, sometimes in secret.

Mr. GRAYDON: I do not think the explanation alters the picture as I understand it. The Prime Minister did make the statement that there was to be a secret meeting of the external affairs committee, and he used that as a buttress to his argument that the peace treaty should not go before that committee. He added, of course, that no one had asked for them to go to the external affairs committee before. After all, the government had not brought the resolution before the house until that time so that we did not have an opportunity to allow them to go. But the Prime Minister did not attach very great importance to the question of timing, as I remember his argument. His argument was that this secret session now would perhaps take the place of any question that might arise relative to the peace treaties and a general discussion of policy.

I think the Prime Minister has perhaps missed the point I was trying to make, and I hope this will be taken to heart by the government. It is that next year, in the external affairs department, we should have the minister before the committee more often than he appeared this year. I wish to exonerate him personally in that regard, because it is hardly fair to ask the minister to be present at all times, when he is Acting Prime Minister under the circumstances of this year, which perhaps presents some special reason for his not being there. I say that to him personally because I am not suggesting that there was any remissness on his part.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I should say on my own behalf that I attended the first meeting and declared that I would be at the disposal of the committee whenever invited, and I do not remember having refused any invitation.

Mr. GRAYDON: We did not understand that as much more than a formality, and from time to time, as the discussion came on, the minister may have been overlooked. But I will assure him this time that he will not be overlooked next session. He will have full opportunity to deal with policy.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I hope my hon. friend will not consider that the statement of my readiness to attend was any more a formality than the statement he has made this afternoon about my not being there.

Mr. GRAYDON: Perhaps we can call it a draw.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: And the Prime Minister can be referee in this case.

Mr. MITCHELL: It was a one-sided draw.

Mr. GRAYDON: And that is a one-sided opinion. The Prime Minister a moment ago talked about a policy that had been laid before the committee today by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. One of my objections to the statement, in criticism of the minister this afternoon, was that he did not lay before this committee any detailed policy of the government on many of the most important matters upon which the country would expect a policy to be laid down. For instance, this country is interested in the reaction, as well as in the policy, of the government toward the proposed Pan-American invitation. This country is interested also in the recent discussions which call for some hemispheric meeting in Brazil a little later this year. The country is interested, further, in the whole question of our relations with the Soviet Union. Two points in particular, as regards these relations, are first, that which was raised by the minister himself a few days ago with respect to Canadian citizens who are in that country and are not allowed to come to Canada, and, second, the whole question of our diplomatic relations with Russia, having in mind that neither country, now or for some considerable time, has had a normal diplomatic relationship so far as the senior diplomatic posts are concerned.

None of these things was touched upon in the minister's statement. He may not have attempted in any way to gloss them over, and I appreciate the fact that he said the cornerstone of our international policy was, of course, to be adherence to the united nations organization. I was glad indeed that he made the statement he did, but there are many other matters which ought to have engaged the minister's attention when he was making a statement that was supposed to be on a question of the policy of the government.

During the last week we have come closer as nations to a parting of the ways than perhaps we have been at any time since before the last war, but I share the view that has been expressed on one or two occasions this afernoon that, after all, we should not give up. We should not be discouraged by the difficulties which arise and the obstacles which have to be overcome. But one thing that greatly concerns me—and I suppose it greatly concerns everyone in the country—is this. In our relations with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics I do not think we always get to the real root of the trouble that sometimes seems to arise. I say openly and frankly that, in my opinion, one of the great difficulties is that, so long as any nation engages in ideological paratrooping with fifth columnist activities, it makes it very difficult for nations to sit around the conference table. Certainly it would make it quite difficult for me, if I were sitting at a conference table, to feel that someone sitting opposite was anxious that the government I was representing ought to be changed to another system altogether.

That is not the neighbourly thing that we expect. As I said in this house a year ago—and I repeat it now, because as time has gone on it has emphasized itself more and more in my mind—I think the way for nations to get along is to do what people on the farm always did in your community, Mr. Chairman, and in mine. The best neighbours in farming communities are those who are always ready to help you when you are in trouble and who are there, when you are in distress, ready to do a good deed at the right time.

Mr. JAQUES: As well as mind their own business.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I be permitted to proceed? It is difficult. I cannot hear what hon. members are saying.

Mr. McIVOR: It does not matter.

Mr. GRAYDON: I was going to say this so far as farm neighbours are concerned, that not only are those the attributes of a good

VICTORIA
PUBLIC LIBRARY

neighbour, but the people next farm were never regarded as good neighbours if they were trying to interfere in your domestic household. I think that is a lesson which countries all over the world should take, because nations are not different from individuals. After all, we are all just groups of people, the world over. Human nature runs through all peoples, classes, races and colours. Having that definitely in mind, I believe we could be assured much more easily of relationships of a permanently peaceful character throughout this whole world if the nations of the world, in the days that lie ahead, would leave alone other nations' systems of government and ways of life. That is one of the things which has impressed me as being almost a prime essential in order that nations may have friendly relationships in the days that lie ahead. I hope we shall reach the stage where we shall have a permanent truce with respect to that kind of ideological aggression which seeks to overturn the systems of government which are enjoyed at the moment by other nations that wish to be friendly, and which they feel is best.

I have not much more time, but I just want to say this other word, while we are talking about the heavily endowed security council and all our enforcement measures of power and strength, and so on. I am not so sure that that alone will ever guarantee world peace. If we are to remove war, we must remove the root causes of war. Of course we shall not all agree in some respects as to what are the root causes of war; nevertheless I think that is one of the things that are of great importance. Having in mind the competing ideologies of the world, I think the democratic way of life must display, exemplify and exhibit to the other types of ideology that, after all, our way of life is founded on the cornerstone of economic and social justice; that democracy does guarantee freedom to the individual, but that totalitarianism denies it; that under a democratic way of life, the ordinary common man or woman the world over has a better chance to succeed, a better chance to enjoy an abundant life than he or she has under any state of regimentation, oppression or totalitarianism which has so far been known to the world. I think those are things, along with the necessity of seeing to it that armed aggression does not threaten the peace of the world, which are important. Men and women in every democratic land have a duty to see to it that there are no drones in the democratic beehive, so that we, in the end, may show to the world that we have the answer to the happiness, contentment and economic success of people everywhere in a greater way than has any other new system which has so far been evolved. That way lies security; that way lies happiness; and, Mr. Chairman, that way lies peace.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at seven o'clock.

Mr. ANTHONY HLYNKA (Vegreville): Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would express my deep appreciation for the courtesies and assistance extended to me by a number of Canadian representatives whom I met while visiting the United Kingdom and several other countries of Europe. I believe that too few Canadians appreciate the tremendous responsibilities which our foreign representatives must carry. I had the privilege of meeting with a number of them and discussing the important problems of the day. I must say I was most favourably impressed by the calibre of men the Secretary of State for External Affairs has sent out, and of course I approve those who were in the various countries before he took over.

During my several weeks in London, I met Mr. N. A. Robertson, whom we all know, Canada's high commissioner in London. He is dependable and able, and is giving a good account of himself. I believe he is doing a good job for Canada, and if he is left in London long enough he will gain valuable experience from experienced British statesmen, which, in turn, will bring benefits to Canada.

In his first secretary, Mr. J. W. Holmes, he has an able, young and dependable general assistant. He also has with him as third secretary a young man named P. T. Molson Mr. Molson is a likeable young man with a fine personality. While I listened to a meeting of the intergovernmental committee, I noted that Mr. Robertson took young Mr. Molson with him so that he might gain the benefit of experience. It is good for Canada to have our young men in foreign service benefit from all the experience they can get.

I would mention two other names. First, there is H. W. Kember, our passport officer, who does a great deal for every Canadian calling at Canada House. I would mention, too. Mrs. Western, who, I believe, is a former Canadian and who, too, is doing a good deal for many Canadians who visit Canada House.

Then, when I was leaving London for Berlin I had the privilege of travelling in the same aircraft as the head of the Canadian

military mission in Berlin, General Maurice Pope. General Pope impressed me most favourably.

Mr. POULIOT: He was born in Rivière du Loup.

Mr. HLYNKA: He really has a thorough grasp of international problems, and takes a broad view. He does not believe that Canada should take a narrow view on any matter, but that we should be ready to play our part. General Pope was kind enough to invite me to his home for luncheon, and in the evening I had the pleasure of attending a gathering at which were representatives of fourteen nations. I had the privilege of meeting them and discussing with them those problems in which we were all interested.

General Pope had with him Professor S. M. Scott who, I understand, taught history for several years in one of the United States universities, and who was asked by the Canadian government to assist General Pope in Berlin.

Then, there was Colonel J. G. McQueen, formerly of Medicine Hat, Alberta. This young man is doing a fine job. He is most efficient, and I am only sorry that Canada has not in foreign service a greater number of men of the calibre of those I met in Berlin and throughout Germany.

I also met a young gentleman named J. A. McCordick, who, I believe, was first drafted by the Department of External Affairs in Canada. I believe he will make a name for himself, because he has a keen brain, he is young and most likeable. He is the type we should train for service in foreign countries.

In my view Canada should begin to pay a little more attention to foreign affairs. I realize that we are only beginners in the field, and I appreciate the fact that the minister took over this portfolio when Canada faced many important problems.

While I should not like to subscribe 100 per cent to everything done by the department, or to everything it may do, I believe the minister is doing a good job in his department. While travelling in Europe, I found that Canada was not represented at all points at which she should be represented, bearing in mind our financial contribution and the contribution by way of man-power we made during the war. I believe there should be more of our young men holding the various positions in such organizations as UNRRA, the intergovernmental committee, and the like. Wherever I went I found very few Canadians. At times I would travel for a week before meeting one. I feel that we made a mistake by practically pulling out our men as soon as the war was over. Young Canadians who fought in the war should have been given the chance of getting experience with these organizations, and they should be given the necessary training to fit them for the future.

Our representative in Rome is Lieutenant-Colonel James P. Manion, son of the late Doctor Manion whom all members knew. Mr. Manion is our commercial representative in Rome and he was the only Canadian I met there. My impression was that he was capable and is the type of man who should be retained in the service. I was shocked, if I may use that term, to find that Canada had no embassy in Italy. Mr. Manion had a staff of two or three people and that was all. Canada should have an embassy in a country like Italy, even if that embassy served only as a listening post. Surely it is important that Canada should have a representative in the important centre of the Catholic world. Like other hon. members, I never paid much attention to the matter; I took it for granted that we had our representation there, but when I arrived I found that there were no Canadians in Italy. I recommend to the minister that he do establish an embassy in Rome.

From there I went to Paris, France, where I met Major-General G. P. Vanier, head of the Canadian embassy in Paris. He also made a fine impression on me because he is the type of man who commands the respect of all who meet him. He is courteous and well versed in matters that come within his scope. His capable first secretary is Mr. Jean Chapdelaine, a young man who, I believe, comes from Montreal.

There is something else that I noticed while I was in these countries. We seem to treat our representation in foreign countries as temporary rather than as a permanent service. For instance, the Canadian ambassador in London has not a permanent residence. He is forced to rent such homes as are available, and of course that works a hardship on any representative who must get acquainted with the people. This applied also to our representative in Italy who had to spend weeks and weeks before he could find a home he could rent. I am not certain what arrangements have been made in Paris and other places, but I take it that we have not purchased homes for our representatives there either.

I should now like to make a few general suggestions. Canada should train young people, and of course those of mature age also, for foreign service. I want to congratulate the minister upon the wisdom he has

shown in putting through a measure to provide pensions for our representatives abroad. The only shortcoming that I can find in that legislation is that these benefits are not extended to all the personnel in our foreign service. If we want to encourage these young men to serve Canada in this field we must guarantee their future. A number of the young men who spoke to me told me they felt that their futures were insecure, that they did not know whether they would stay or leave. These pension benefits should be extended to every person who serves in foreign countries.

I am repeating what I said, that we should establish embassies in countries where we feel such representation would do a certain amount of good. We should strengthen those already in existence. There is plenty of room for strengthening our embassies. Canada is new in this field; we cannot begin to compare our experience with that of the British, but the only way to learn is to apply ourselves to the task.

I repeat again the suggestion that Canada should build permanent homes for the heads of our various embassies and provide accommodation for their assistants. That is a necessity too, which will encourage these young people to stay in that field.

I should like to offer two or three other suggestions to the minister. One is in regard to the emphasis which Canada places on the united nations. I have no objection whatsoever to Canada supporting the united nations and staking a small card or two on that organization. I do not think it would do us a great deal of harm if we risk a deuce or a trey or a four-spot on it, but I would reserve the aces and kings and queens and place them on a surer bet. I would reserve these high cards and place them on the British commonwealth of nations. It is a fine thing to dream and speak of the united nations. I have made the statement in this house before that I do not believe there is such a thing as the united nations, because there is more disunity among them now than there has ever been before. But the term "united nations" is used perhaps cleverly in this regard to cover disagreements, or perhaps because it is the objective towards which the various nations would like to go. It is a fine thing to support new ideals and aim at noble objectives and perhaps think of the time when some of the problems of today may be solved, but at the same time it seems to me that neither the mentality of the nations of the world nor their problems have changed very much, and for that reason we must place our most important cards on the British commonwealth of nations.

I should like to make one more point. It does strike me as strange that a certain group of people now consider that they can no longer support the United Kingdom because of a change of government there. That seems to me to be the wrong attitude to take. It is an unrealistic attitude; it is not the right stand to take. Nor was it right for another group to say that they did not want to have anything to do with the United Kingdom so long as a certain form of government was in power there. It seems to me that Canadians generally should be bigger than that and that their loyalty, if you like, should be to the people of the United Kingdom and not to one form of government or another in that country. The form of government in the United Kingdom can change because one government can be put out and another put in in its place, and the same thing applies to Canada. So I say that various parties in this house would be well advised to consider, in the first place, the British people, and not the form of government that may be in office there today and be put out tomorrow. So my own stand has been in the past and still is and, I am sure, will continue to be to approve and have every confidence in the British commonwealth of nations and in the British people.

I should like to make one final suggestion to the minister and that is that Canadians, at least those Canadians who occupy important diplomatic posts and those in various departments of the government, should take more interest in the various peoples of the world and study their background and their history and their problems in order that we may better be able to deal with both their problems and our own. I find that Canadians generally—this is no reflection on the people of Canada or on the civil servants or representatives—do not make a deep study of the history or the origin of the various peoples of Europe and their problems, but rather feel that we are living on this continent and we are not going to bother with Europe. As a matter of fact I directed a question to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) two or three years ago on a matter that touched many Canadians deeply. It was about displaced persons. The Prime Minister replied, in effect, that that was a European problem and did not concern Canada very much. It seems to me that if Canada is to play a more important part in the affairs of

the world we should be interested in European problems, because many of these problems are tied in with our own. I am satisfied that if Canada continues to lead the so-called smaller nations of the world in the fight for what are really and truly human rights and fundamental freedoms there will no doubt be a great future for this nation, and if we cooperate with the British commonwealth of nations and with our great neighbour to the south of us and other nations there is hope that the world will achieve the objective at which it aims.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Chairman, I rather think the Secretary of State for External Affairs has had more than his share of speeches to listen to today, even though they have been good ones. I should like to ask one or two questions just for a change. First of all, with regard to this situation as it has developed in Europe within the last week or two, I think no one will disagree with the statement that those happenings have been of the utmost importance to the whole world, including Canada. It does seem to me that we shall never get world affairs straightened out until we have Europe again on its feet, and I wish the minister would tell the committee just what the position there is from the point of view of the Canadian government, and also tell us whether there is any way in which Canada can help solve that problem. Great Britain and France called several other nations into conference to get things on a more satisfactory basis, and the United States has offered to give great help for that purpose. It would seem that there should be some way in which Canada too could lend a hand. When the minister has answered that question I propose to ask one or two about the Pacific, but I should be glad if he would give us, first, some statement with regard to the European situation and Canada's attitude in regard thereto.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I am afraid that the hon. member has set for me a task that it is practically impossible to discharge.

Mr. GREEN: I mean only recent developments in Europe.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The recent developments have been very important and interesting. There has apparently been a feeling expressed in the United States that Europe should show some concrete desire to put itself in order and to contribute to that with everything that its resources make available. I think we were all very favourably impressed when we heard that the foreign secretary of the United Kingdom was taking the lead in trying to bring together those who could draw up a concrete plan that would show some prospect of being successful. Apparently the three foreign ministers, Mr. Bevin, Mr. Bidault, and Mr. Molotov had serious discussions, and Mr. Molotov does not appear to have shared the views of the others, and does not appear to have felt that what they were proposing to do would be apt to bring about the desired result.

From what we gather from the newspapers —and that is all I have to go on for the present time—Mr. Bevin and Mr. Bidault feel that the possibilities are sufficient to warrant their attempting, even without Mr. Molotov, to draw up a plan that will show some reasonable prospect of stabilizing the European situation. I am sure we, on this side of the Atlantic, would all have been more optimistic about the future if we had evidence that there was going to be a genuine desire to cooperate between all three great powers; but in view of the unwillingness of one of them, I think there is reason for us to hope that the other two can still achieve results which will help to bring about that restoration of the European situation which is, I think, almost indispensable to the prosperity of the whole world.

Mr. GREEN: And possibly to the peace of the world.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: And possibly, even probably, to the durable peace of the world; because we can hardly hope for a durable peace that is not at the same time the kind of peace that will make reasonably prosperous conditions for humanity. It is unfortunate that there should not be working together all those whose interests seem to be the same, but I hope that there will still be a large number, and that it will not take the form that can be looked upon by any other group as aggressive.

Mr. GREEN: Of course there was no aggressive intent at all.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I am sure that there is no other desire than the desire to bring about the betterment of conditions of those who inhabit the European continent and the British isles. I hope that it will be possible for some plan to be worked out which will be beneficial to the largest number of states. The more there are benefited by it, the surer will be the foundation for our hopes for durable peace resulting from it.

Mr. GREEN: The minister did not deal with the Canadian position. I hope the Cana-

dian government is willing to do everything possible to help Great Britain, France and the nations which join with them to rehabilitate Europe. Apparently the Americans have taken a fine stand in their offer to help. Is it a fact that the Canadian government is also prepared to help?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Well, I should not like to make any other declaration of policy of the Canadian government than would conform with decisions that have already been taken. Canada has never been backward in its contributions to the betterment of world conditions. The only concrete problem that the government has had to deal with has been with respect to post-UNRRA relief. I should not say that is the only one; that is the most recent one. That was a concrete problem. It has been dealt with and the Prime Minister has already announced to the house that in the supplementary estimates the government will recommend a vote of $20 million which is practically in the same relation to the vote of the United States congress that our contributions to UNRRA were to the contributions of the great American republic to UNRRA.

With respect to displaced persons, we have even preceded action by our United States friends. The proposals of the United States government have not been formulated in any such fashion as would enable our government to make a concrete decision about it. There is no doubt that Canada realizes that it is as much concerned as is the great republic in the restoration of good conditions throughout the world.

Mr. BROOKS: Has Canada been asked by the United States to assist in any way in her latest proposals for the reestablishment of Europe, the Marshall plan?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No; there have been no representations made to Canada as to what concrete action it could take to be of assistance in respect of the implementation of that plan which has, of course, to remain rather vague until the European nations themselves have surveyed their situation, and assessed the resources they have themselves and how they can be used for the general welfare and what additions would have to be made to enable a reasonably satisfactory result to be achieved.

There have been declarations by the Secretary of State and by other spokesmen of the administration, but they have had necessarily to be in very general terms. They are not in such form as would make it possible for them to make any concrete suggestion to anybody else.

Mr. GREEN: I take it that the intention is to cooperate to the full.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No one minister can by declarations in the house commit the government to any line of action. Speaking as one of the members of the government, all I can add is to remind the committee that Canada has never been backward over the last several years in its contributions to whatever measures were devised as being proper to help the situation of the world at large. That has been the attitude of the Canadian government, of the Canadian parliament and of the Canadian people, and so far I have not found that any of us have regretted what we have done, nor have I found any evidence anywhere of any desire to follow any other line of conduct. I cannot go beyond that, because no specific matter has come up for actual decision by the government.

Mr. GREEN: I thank the minister for his statement. Then, with regard to the Pacific, nothing at all has been said today about the position in the Pacific area and it would be helpful if the minister could give an explanation of the present position there and of Canada's policy. For example, I would ask him to deal with the far eastern advisory commission on which Canada has membership. I should like to know what work that commission has been doing, whether there have been any reports by the commission, and, if so, the general tenor of those reports. I believe there is also an allied council for Japan on which Canada has a member or at least an observer. I would ask the minister to let us have a statement with regard to the work of that body. Then, there is the question of the possible treaty with Japan. The minister advised us a few days ago that Canada was to be represented at the commonwealth conference in Canberra next month, the purpose being to discuss peace terms for Japan. Will he let us have a report with regard to that situation and also with regard to the question of reparations? Apparently there are to be some reparations from Japan. I should like to know whether Canada is making a claim for a share of such reparations.

Finally has any thought been given to the setting up of a regional organization in the Pacific? I believe there is what is called a South Pacific commission, the members of which are Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, the United States, France and the Netherlands. Their function is to deal with the territories south of the equator. Presumably they have nothing to do with the territories north of the equator. In addition, there have been press reports with regard

to the possible formation of a Pacific economic and defence council. I cannot find out whether those reports are correct or not.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: What was the last?

Mr. GREEN: The Pacific economic and defence council. I saw that in an editorial in the *Gazette* on September 6 of last year. The editorial was headed "Canada blind to Pacific obligations". It stated that a preliminary conference had been called, leading to the ultimate formation of a Pacific economic and defence council to promote peace and industrial development in that area, and that originally the discussions would be limited to the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand, but that it was intended to invite the United States, France, the Netherlands and Portugal. That may have collapsed; nothing further may have been done. On the Pacific slope of Canada we are very much interested in the Canadian policy for the Pacific area, and I would ask the minister to make a statement on these subjects.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: With respect to the far eastern commission, the hon. member knows that this commission is made up of representatives of Australia, Canada, China, France, India, New Zealand, the Netherlands, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States. It has met regularly in Washington through the past year and has continued to perform its functions in accordance with the terms of reference laid down at the Moscow meeting of foreign ministers in December, 1945. Policy decisions have been reached on a variety of subjects, including a new Japanese constitution, interim reparations removal programme, the level of postwar economic Japanese life, trade relations with the allied powers, trade unions, education, war criminals, aliens in Japan, and Japanese atomic research. These policy decisions have been the basis for directives issued by the United States government to the supreme commander for the allied occupying forces in Japan. Canada is represented on the commission by the Canadian ambassador to the United States, Mr. Wrong, and by his alternate, Mr. R. E. Collins, a member of his staff in Washington.

With respect to the reparations team, following the receipt of the invitation extended to member countries of the far eastern commission by the supreme commander of the allied powers, the Canadian government, in February, 1947, established in Tokyo a three-man team to look after Canadian interests in Japan with respect to restitution and reparations. This team is under the chairmanship of Mr. J. E. Kenderdine, special representative of the Department of Trade and Commerce on the staff of the Canadian liaison commission in Tokyo. The allied council is a military-control body on which Canada is not represented.

Mr. GREEN: What nations are on that council?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The United States, Russia, France, the United Kingdom. I believe there is one representative for the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and India. There is one representative for those four commonwealth nations. Canada's liaison officer and the official through whom the Department of External Affairs is kept informed about what is going on, is Mr. Norman, who has been stationed in Tokyo for several months now.

The hon. member asked about the Canberra conference; that has now been arranged to be a conference on ministerial level; that is to say, each one of the commonwealth nations is expected to have a delegation headed by a minister.

Mr. GREEN: Who is going from Canada?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: That has not yet been determined. For several weeks past the Canadian government has been giving much of its time and attention to the proceedings of the Canadian parliament, and since that conference is for the end of August, it was felt that we could reasonably hope to reach prorogation early enough to have some time to arrange it thereafter. There are several requirements that will have to be met, and all those, except the one that has been announced so far, will have to be considered together in making the arrangements. It has already been announced that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin) will be going to the economic and social council, which is in July. That had to be decided in advance because the date was earlier than the others. There will be other engagements for ministers which will have to be considered at the same time consideration is being given to the selection of a candidate for this Canberra conference. The Canberra conference is preparatory and exploratory. The commonwealth nations are getting together to communicate to each other the information they respectively have and to explore the situation; but not at all, to use a local expression, in the spirit of ganging-up to make their views prevail. They are going to discuss, as they do constantly by dispatches and correspondence, their respective interests, so that each will know what data is available to the others and what repercussions

each may expect on his own situation from any given decision. It seemed to be proper that that preliminary and exploratory meeting be held in the Pacific area because it had to do with the situation which was of more concern to Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. GREEN: But it is of great concern to the west coast.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes, it is of great concern, but it appeared to us to be of even greater concern to Australia and New Zealand—

Mr. GREEN: Oh, that is right.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: —and that they had grounds for urging that the meeting should be in their zone rather than in any other zone.

On this matter of the South Pacific commission, I must say that I remember that some months ago there were dispatches in the newspapers about it, but I do not think it was ever set up. There have been in the department no official communications about it.

Mr. GREEN: Has any thought been given to the setting up of a Pacific regional organization under the united nations?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No doubt there has been thought given to it, but I cannot say that is one of the most probable solutions which will be agreed upon for the Pacific situation. From everything I have been able to see, there is no doubt that the allies are firm in their desire to establish conditions under which Japan is not apt again to become a menace to peace in the Pacific. As to the methods which will be adopted to that end, the matter has not progressed sufficiently for me to be able to speak with any definiteness about it. It may be felt that something similar to the system which will have been devised to prevent Germany from again becoming a threat to the peace of Europe will serve as a model for what will be adopted with respect to Japan. I think the most that can be said at the present time is that there appears to be substantial unanimity on the determination that the proper machinery must be found to achieve that end.

Mr. GREEN: Is it clear now that the peace conference for Japan is to be an eleven-nation conference? Has that yet been settled?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No, that has not yet been settled; though there has not yet arisen anything which would appear to prevent effect being given to the desires of the United Kingdom, the United States and other nations that that be the body used for the purpose of drafting the treaty. That does not mean that our Russian allies may not have the same views with respect to the eastern situation as they have expressed, and so far adhered to, with respect to the German peace settlement. But the eastern situation has not developed to the point where that has become an expressed statement of soviet policy.

Mr. GREEN: The minister has mentioned the work of the far eastern advisory commission, on which Canada has a member. Apparently we get no reports from that commission. Would it not be possible for those reports to be made available? I take it from what the minister says that they are reporting direct to the United States government. But it is not a United States commission; it is a commission composed of representatives of various nations. Surely we should be entitled to get reports from the commission in just the same way as the United States government gets those reports.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: We get communication of the decisions which are communicated to the United States government, so that the United States government may give directives to its commander in chief; but they have always been marked "confidential", and we could not attempt to publish them without the consent of all the members of the commission. Even if it were felt desirable that some portions be made public, there would no doubt be some portions of those directives which it would not be felt proper to make public until they had been carried out. They are the kind of directives which, through the far eastern commission, the eleven nations communicate to their representative; because, of course, General MacArthur not only represents the United States government but acts for the united nations, and these recommendations have been regarded as matters which are not for publication.

Mr. GREEN: Would the minister look into the possibility of making some sort of reports available for the Canadian public and the Canadian press? I dare say very few people in Canada realize that Canada has any representation at all on that advisory committee. The general impression is that the United States is in sole charge in Japan. From the point of view of informing our own people and keeping them advised of what is going on, I think some method should be devised by which at least portions of the reports of that commission may be made available to the Canadian public. We are a Pacific as well as an Atlantic and Arctic power, and it is important that this information get out to the public.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes, but it does not even get out to the United States public. I can say this much; there is not always immediate unanimity as to the directives to be given to General MacArthur. There are decisions arrived at; then there are directives which are given to him, and he announces in Japan the policy he is going to implement. That is about as much as the public gets.

I can have inquiries made to see if the far eastern commission could not have a report which would be available to the public of the eleven nations it represents. But it would have to be something agreed to by the commission itself. We know there are many matters of administration upon which at the start there may be divergence of views. Finally a decision is arrived at, and directives are given on behalf of the commission to General MacArthur who announces the policy to be implemented in Japan. However I shall see if it would be possible to have a report which would be available to the public of all the nations represented on this far eastern commission.

Mr. GREEN: We hope to take part in the peace conference with Japan, and I think it is essential that the Canadian people should have just as much information as possible with regard to the facts on which the peace treaty will be based.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The importance of having in advance information for the public at large is also a matter concerning which there is not unanimity of opinion. There are many who feel that the attempt to determine peace treaties with the satellite powers at Paris, in the full light of publicity, was not helpful to the achievement of the best possible results.

Mr. GREEN: I did not mean the full light of publicity; I meant that we should have as much information as possible.

Mr. QUELCH: Could the minister say what are some of the main features of the Marshall plan? For instance, would it entail Russia's becoming a party to the Bretton Woods agreement in the same way as Great Britain was forced to become a party to it in order to obtain a loan? Would it also entail Russia's agreeing to a policy of non-discrimination in the same way as Great Britain was forced to, in order to get help with respect to the United States loan?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I cannot say anything more about the Marshall plan than I have learned from the newspapers. I am not saying I did not get some confidential reports from our representatives in Washington, but we have had no official communication from the United States government as to what the Marshall plan is, and I cannot venture to state here what I think the conditions are.

Mr. QUELCH: May I say that I believe that, until we know what the conditions are, we are not in a position to judge as to the actions of Russia. If part of that agreement meant that she had to become a party to the Bretton Woods agreement or that she had to agree to a policy of non-discrimination, then I think Russia can be complimented upon having viewed it as she did.

Can the minister tell the committee what is chiefly responsible for holding up agreement at the Geneva conference today? I remember when the nations first met we were given to understand that they were likely to reach agreement in a few weeks. Now it is going on for some months, and still no agreement has been reached.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: My hon. friend's impression differed from mine. From the very start I was told by our representatives who had returned from the preparatory conference in London that they expected the conference would last until September, and they were looking to the date of the meeting of the general assembly as something which, toward the end, would help bring matters to a head.

Mr. QUELCH: Can the minister say what the main point of disagreement is?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I do not know that there is any disagreement. I understand that for several weeks there have been negotiating teams dealing with specific requests of one country or another for modification of tariff arrangements. I am told that at one time there were forty-six different teams which were working on these individual items.

Mr. QUELCH: When the minister says that what he understood is different from what I understood, let me say that we are dependent upon the press. We have never been able to get much information from the government as to what has occurred there, so that naturally we are in the dark.

Can the minister say whether or not any consideration has been given to trying to reach some form of agreement with the United States along lines similar to those of the Hyde Park agreement, in order to deal with the adverse exchange position of today?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I am afraid I would have to see the terms of that question before

venturing to answer it. I can say, however, that the Canadian and United States authorities have been discussing for several weeks the difficulties arising throughout the world out of the shortage, on the part of consumers, of United States dollars, and have been examining what they consider to be every possible angle of things that can be done to help relieve that situation.

The Hyde Park agreement is something which it is rather difficult to define in terms sufficiently specific to say that another thing resembles it or that in some particulars it differs from it.

Mr. QUELCH: May I clarify my question? About two weeks ago I read a press dispatch to the effect that the United States might possibly buy Canadian wheat to ship to Europe, in the same way that she bought Canadian munitions to supply Europe. In that way the United States would be supplying us with American dollars while providing goods to Europe. In other words, instead of our providing goods to Europe and accepting sterling we would be supplying via America and receiving American dollars, which would greatly help to offset the difficulty in obtaining American dollars.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: That specific form has never been officially discussed.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): I have a double question to ask. What did we gain in the past two years from our association with the united nations? Secondly, what are the serious grounds, if any, for future hopes? I ask these questions because I have met many people who have told me the united nations are our only hope. I have asked them, "Do you believe in the government of Russia, of France, of England—as the government exists now—of the United States or of China?" They have said no, when the question has been asked with respect to each of those individual countries. They do not agree with the governments of each of the separate countries, but they are ready to accept the government of the whole of them. I ask them, "Why do you say that?" And they reply that there is nothing else. A stone has never been a life-preserver.

I understand the difficulties we face there, and I will tell the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), for whom I have the greatest admiration, and who has asked some timely questions—and I congratulate the minister upon having answered them so well—that when he wants to know, not only the Canadian position in international affairs, but also the foreign situation at large, he has only to read newspapers such as the New York *Times*, the New York *Herald Tribune*, the New York *Sun*, or some of the Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec, Vancouver or Toronto papers. They will give him full information. He will be able to get more information from the papers than he can get in the house. Strangely enough, it has happened that I could not get, through official channels, some official papers which were published verbatim in United States papers.

I will tell him something else about representation. He may have read the book by a former leader of his party, entitled, "Canada and the Commonwealth" by Sir Robert Borden. Sir Robert referred to the Washington conference held after the first war, and he said that South Africa was mad because the dominions had not been invited; it was only the big powers. There was a compromise, and Mr. Balfour, who represented the United Kingdom, represented a couple of the dominions, particularly South Africa. I do not see any use in such dual representation.

I will draw the attention of my hon. friend to something else. The ideology of Canada and the ideologies of the Big Five are entirely different. The Big Five are imperialistic powers. They all want to get more and more. Great Britain is trying to save all she can.

Mr. GREEN: I do not think so.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend has a pious view of the whole thing, but I have my own opinion. He may be right or I may be right.

Mr. GREEN: Perhaps we are both wrong.

Mr. POULIOT: France is fighting to save Indo-China. China is trying to save all she can of Mongolia and other parts of the country. What about Russia? My hon. friend will not tell me that the United States is not an imperialistic power. So we have five imperialistic powers, or perhaps we may except Great Britain for the sake of argument. But at least four of the five are imperialistic. They decide everything; we decide nothing. We have to take it for granted that they are right when they quarrel and set a bad example to the world. I think it was the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Hlynka) who said that "united" is a false label for the united nations; that it should be "disunited".

Foreign policy is a bluff from beginning to end. For instance, take the Canadian high commissioner in England. What difference is there between the position of the present incumbent and that of Sir Charles Tupper when Canada was described as a colony, as she

should be now? There was no difference at all. At the time of Sir Charles Tupper the high commissioner reported to the colonial office. After we went into the commonwealth they did a great thing; the colonial office was split in two, one branch being the dominions office and the other one the colonial office. From then on, the high commissioner of Canada got in touch with the dominions office. They now propose to change it to this commonwealth relations business. Is that being done to please us? Is it being done to satisfy Canada? The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said that Canada had been informed about the change but had never asked for it. It is done because India is no longer an empire and the King of Great Britain no longer can describe himself as the Emperor of India. From now on, India will be a commonwealth and Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Nehru and the Moslems of India have all agreed to the change. It is just a change of words. There has been nothing more than changes of words since the beginning of the British empire at the time of Queen Victoria.

Mr. GREEN: That is where you are wrong.

Mr. POULIOT: I may be wrong and my hon friend may be wrong, but I want to try to make my point. I want to try to convert him, although I may not succeed. I want to explain my views to him. British foreign policy with regard to the dominions has been bluff from beginning to end. I will start, first, with the Statute of Westminster. As a lawyer, my hon. friend knows very well that the main provisions of a law are never found in the preamble.

An hon. MEMBER: Do not forget that he is a Tory.

Mr. POULIOT: Perhaps he will have a different interpretation of the law because of that; nevertheless he is a fine fellow.

Mr. GREEN: Do not try to convert me, for you will be wasting your time and the time of the committee.

Mr. POULIOT: I would not be wasting my time. I have converted Orangemen, and I have letters to that effect written in French by their own hands. I am very persevering. One way to gain the attention of an audience is to address one individual. When you convince that individual he radiates his conviction. That is the best way to turn a noisy meeting into a sympathetic one. Let us consider the Statute of Westminster which was passed in the first year of the reign of the late Lord Bennett. I will not try to convince my hon. friend as a Progressive Conservative member of parliament; I will simply appeal to his intelligence and knowledge of the law. He knows very well that the preamble of a statute is nothing more than a description of the provisions which follow. There is nothing in the following provisions with regard to Canada except the abolition of the colonial laws validity act. That does very little, because the disallowance provisions are still in our constitution which permit the nullification of legislation passed by this parliament. The disallowance provisions are enough; it was not necessary to have the colonial laws validity act.

By means of the Statute of Westminster they tried to create an optical illusion that the dominions were getting more than they had before. It was drafted by Lord Passfield and some other Fabians with the same ideology. They set out to create an optical illusion for the representatives of the dominion. Since Mr. Bennett did not believe in the commonwealth but in the British empire, he was satisfied with it. It was an effort to put something over on the colonies of the British empire. They were given the illusion that they were gaining some rights when in reality they were gaining nothing. In French we say, "Un beau rien tout neuf"; the new nothing, the new nonentity. Notwithstanding the suggestion of some nationalists or the celebrations over the passing of this Statute of Westminster, the fact remains, as my hon. friend knows very well, that there is a provision in the body of the act to the effect that nothing in the British North America Act is changed.

Mr. GREEN: I feel guilty for wasting the time of the committee by bringing this lecture on it and on myself. Does the hon. member question the fact that the British government would pass any sort of amending legislation that Canada requested with regard to that statute or any other law having to do with Canada? Is that not a fact?

Mr. POULIOT: First, I want to tell my hon. friend that I am not lecturing him; I am simply expressing my views, after deep study of the matter. Answering his question, I will tell him that imperialism is not so much in the United Kingdom as it is in the minds of colonial Canadians, and that is precisely because colonial Canadians have an inferiority complex in regard to the United Kingdom. They consider themselves the little ones who are not on a footing of equality with the great geniuses of the United Kingdom.

Mr. GREEN: Where do you find Canadians like that?

Mr. POULIOT: Right here in the House of Commons. I have not to go outside the

house; I find them right here. They do not realize that they have an inferiority complex concerning everything that is done overseas. I remember when some anti-nazis were put in concentration camps in Britain during the war after Dunkirk, when the British made a round-up of all the people of foreign extraction on the soil of Great Britain without any distinction. These anti-nazis were put in concentration camps in Britain and later were transferred here. One day in the house I asked information about that move from Colonel Ralston, and another minister told me that he knew nothing about it. Yet the camps were under Colonel Ralston's jurisdiction. I asked the minister how it came about that he knew nothing about these anti-nazi prisoners in concentration camps in Canada. I was indignant about it, and one of his colleagues told me: "Do not bother; so long as we tell the story that it has been done by Great Britain, it will be O.K., and the Tories will not discuss it." That is their frame of mind. So long as it is done by Great Britain, it becomes a precedent. They bow deeply and everything is O.K. I have noticed that feeling here and it is an anti-Canadian feeling.

I have something more to tell my hon. friend about the Statute of Westminster.

Mr. GREEN: Tell the rest of the committee.

Mr. POULIOT: I will address the Chair so that everything will be strictly in conformity with the rules. I do not want to offend my hon. friend because he has been kind to me. I believe that a man of his intelligence should have another conception of this whole thing.

Going back a little, we heard a lot about the imperial conference resolutions of 1926. Those resolutions—what were they? They had no force of law at all. They meant nothing. The representatives of the dominions were gathered together in London and the resolutions were just their good wishes. I wish for fine weather tomorrow. It may rain. But it is a fine wish anyway. Those resolutions were not embodied in a statute. They were just wishes. But the colonials were so credulous and so naive that they thought it was very important that they had expressed wishes at an imperial conference.

Afterwards there was the imperial conference of 1930. More wishes. Finally came the Statute of Westminster. Then there was the beating of the drums and the commonwealth was saved. The empire was gone. It was replaced by the commonwealth. When I asked the Prime Minister of Canada what the difference was between the British empire and the British commonwealth he told me that the two words were interchangeable. That will be found in *Hansard*.

Mr. Massey in a lecture in Montreal last fall said that on account of our war effort Canada had gained a high rank and had risen from a small power to a middle power. When I asked the minister of external affairs whether certain middle powers existed in virtue of the UNO business he said: "No; there are only small countries and the big ones."

The big ones are on the security council. So there is no middle power. There are the big and the small, the giants and the dwarfs. The giants are the imperialists, and the dwarfs are the nice little fellows who are always ready to act according to instructions received from the big ones. This is a true picture of what has been going on everywhere.

I have something else to say about the Statute of Westminster. My hon. friend knows that some people have said serious things; that the great advantage of the Statute of Westminster is that, before that, the governor general was representing the king and the British government. That was a wrong thing; it was beneath the dignity of the British government. Then it was decided, after the Statute of Westminster, not by the Statute of Westminster but after that, to have somebody in the dominion to represent the king and another person to represent the British government. I find that a wrong decision. I do not see what progress there is in having these two people. It is all right to have the governor general who represents the king and the British government, and I think the British government should have felt honoured to be represented in any country by one who is good enough to represent His Majesty the King. But what happened? These high commissioners came into this country and their offices were at times a nest of intrigue and of plotting and a nest of spying as we have seen by the trial of a woman who was in one of those offices since 1932, since Sir William Clark was here, and while sheltered under the roof of the high commissioner she was supplying to another country information as to what was being done in Canada.

It was a bluff to say that the present incumbent of the post of high commissioner in England is greater than Sir Charles Tupper, who has been dead and buried for almost half a century. There has been no change of status. It has been a change of words only. Now they are coming again with another change of words. It is not to offend India. It is not to please Canada. This policy of to please or not to please is not the right

one. The policy we should have should be in accordance with the needs of the world, and the needs of the world are more spiritual than material. Of course we cannot discuss with those empires their objectives because their objectives are material, the gain of more power. The objective of Canada—and I give credit to the right hon. minister—is a spiritual hope, the hope of improving the conditions of mankind and preventing a future war. Some at least of the big powers are apparently ready to go to war at any time, to get more. They are ready to destroy each other to get more. We want peace throughout the world. That is the great difference.

I wonder if my hon. friend has read the book written by Elliott Roosevelt about his travels with his father and meeting with the big leaders throughout the world. I imagine Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill there on the white sands of Casablanca, discussing the future of the world as they could see it. They were satisfied with themselves, and quite rightly so. They were two big men together, and they tried to make their own peace to be accepted by the whole world. Of the big three, Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin, there were only two that were agreeing, and my hon. friend knows it. It was Roosevelt and Stalin. Perhaps if Mr. Roosevelt were alive today the world would be in better condition than we are now, although to a certain extent I admire the qualities of Mr. Churchill. It must be admitted, as I said in this house when his son was in front of me in the gallery, his role as a diplomat has been a failure because he never succeeded in gaining the confidence of Stalin. It was not because they sent each other birthday greetings once a year that the world should be satisfied with what happened between them. If my hon. friend, the member for Vancouver South, had been there in the place of Churchill meeting Stalin on so many occasions, I am sure that with his genial disposition he would have gained the heart of Stalin and that today we would not be in the bad condition in which we are. It is not to bring discredit and disrespect on our own men. They are just as good as anybody but they are not given a chance to do anything. They are not given a chance to give advice to any of the big powers. If they did so they would be told to be quiet. Ready to sit at the table but no advice should be given by the small powers to the big powers. That description of small powers is the invention of Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin, who wanted to share the world together after the end of the war, or to dispose of it as they thought best. It is history.

Here in this chamber it is impossible at times to do otherwise than follow the fashion. Fashion is established, the fashion of the united nations, and we are bound to accept it without discussion. It has been established by certain big men. We have the united nations. The united nations will rule the world. I am opposed to that ruling; I am opposed to that world government because I am not satisfied with what the united nations have done so far. They have done nothing useful for the peace of mankind.

Mr. BROOKS: I would think that makes it correct.

Mr. POULIOT: I would tell the hon. gentleman that I am not joking now. If I were he would find it painful, but I am talking very seriously. I have some concern, although I am not jittery. I have some concern because, according to the old saying in the bible, *Desolatione desolata est terra quia nullus est qui recogitet in suo corde,* from desolation the land is desolate because there is no one who thinks in his heart. Everybody is ready to accept canned ideas; everybody seems to be satisfied to be invited to these great gatherings, which may satisfy personal vanity and similar human feelings. Those who are there are given the impression that they are accomplishing something, but they are accomplishing nothing. They are there sitting at the conference tables just the same as we are sitting here in the House of Commons. We have the impression of accomplishing something; we are working hard but we accomplish nothing at all, and it is the same result that comes from these conferences. I am sorry. When I asked if we were represented at Teheran and Cairo the Prime Minister said no. I asked, further, if we were bound by the decisions reached at these conferences. He said no, but added that what has been decided by the great powers at these conferences must have some weight with the other united nations. If I have not given the exact words, it is the true meaning of what he said. In those cases we were not represented but even when we are represented nothing else is changed because of that inferiority complex of the small countries, not only Canada, but all small countries, with regard to the big powers.

I have the deepest admiration for South Africa and for Australia and for the stand that they have been taking at world conferences. They have been defending the rights of the small powers. Why? Because the rights of the small powers were right, and the ambitions of the big powers were just greed. As a lawyer, and as a man who has respect for the law and moreover, a respect for jus-

tice, which is more than respect for the law, because law is not always in conformity with justice, I believe that, leaving aside for the moment the consideration of spiritual values, we shall have peace in the world only when the small nations are given the same rights as the big ones. The question of right, the question of justice, the question of equality, the question of autonomy, are foremost in importance, and there can be no equality within the British empire when all decisions are made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, even if we are young enough and childish enough to be represented by these British ambassadors at large who have not our feelings, who have not our views in the settlement of past disputes and the establishment of peace for the happiness of mankind.

I will not say any more now, but I could say much more. I come back to my question and ask the minister to be kind enough to tell us what we have gained in the last two years from our association with the united nations and what are the serious hopes of a better future and the establishment of peace, if any.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The hon. member has displayed such a wide knowledge of facts and perhaps some fiction, that I am sure no answer I could give would change his interpretation of the facts or fiction in any degree.

Mr. POULIOT: I rise to a question of privilege. I have a high regard for the minister but he misjudges me. I did not display any complete information about the matter, and that is precisely why I have been asking questions.

Mr. NORMAN JAQUES (Wetaskiwin): Two great nations have celebrated their national birthdays this week. The peace of the world depends more than anything else on preserving good feeling between the British and the United States people; but it is clear that there are forces which are working to destroy these friendly relations and to stir up hatred between the British and the United States people. I might mention two of these forces. One is political zionism and the other is international finance which we can sum up by the name "Wall Street". May I quote the Cardinal Archbishop McGuigan at the Marian congress when he said that liberty is dependent on truth; that truth will make you free. Truth is the mother of liberty. Truth is its light, its actions and its glory. How much truth is hidden when external affairs are discussed? I do not mean in this chamber but wherever they are discussed. Do we hear the truth, or do we hear something which is passed off as the truth? I should like to quote the magazine *Truth,* the magazine of the once great Liberal party of Great Britain. On May 23, 1947, there appeared in that magazine an article with regard to a meeting in Albert Hall, London, held for the purpose of discussing international affairs, and this report is made with respect to the Archbishop of Canterbury:

> His Grace referred to Europe as having once been known as Christendom, but he expressed no hope that Christendom would be revived. Instead, he went out of his way to stress that the campaign for a limited Europe was being waged by people of all creeds and of none. He spoke, too, of the heritage which Europe had derived from Greece, Rome and Palestine, but so carefully were his sentences chosen that the Palestinian contribution was worded without one reference to Christ. No American President during the past quarter of a century has dared to refer to the United States as a Christian nation, the reason being that a small but formidable minority of American citizens resent the title. Things have come to a pretty pass, however, when the Archbishop of Canterbury feels obliged to pick his way with similar caution when aproaching the problem of Europe's future.

The last speaker referred to powers and small powers, and he said there were no middle powers. I wonder where he would put that small but formidable minority who resent the title of Christian nation. Would he say that was a minor or a major power? It seems to me they are able to control all the powers.

It is strange that so far no mention has been made of the visit of the external affairs committee to Lake Success. We were invited there as the official guests of the united nations organization for the express purpose of hearing the discussions on Palestine. I was one of those who went and I was greatly interested in listening to the debates of the delegates. I mention this because I believe that the Palestine question is at the present time perhaps the greatest threat to world peace.

I should like to refer to a statement I made in this house on December 17, 1945, when I spoke on the Arab-Zionist question. I said:

> I have no brief for either side, my sole concern is to establish the truth, for just as truth and freedom are indivisible so mutual faith in the given word is the basis of friendship, individual and international. Once that faith is destroyed or even impaired, trust and friendship turn to suspicion and hatred. But in spite of historic fact, the zionists base their case on racial, cultural and commercial superiority. These claims on behalf of a favoured nation and a chosen people are upheld especially by leftists and internationalists, by the very people who denounce racism and nationalism. They also are the people who claim especially to be

the world's peacemakers, but who, in the face of continued and fatal rioting in Palestine, are going out of their way to embarrass Great Britain in her efforts to maintain peace by encouraging tolerance by both Arab and Jew.

At that time I quoted a letter I received in answer to one of mine from Mr. Herbert Mowat, who was executive director of the Canadian Palestine committee. I will not quote the whole of his letter, but I will quote enough to show that there are people who are not worrying about the future peace of the world so much as they are about furthering their own interests or rather the interest of those whom they serve, because in this letter he makes it clear where he believes Canada stands in regard to the Palestine question. He says:

If the Arabs fight a united nations decision on Palestine it is apparent that they have forfeited their place of good standing in this world organization. Our committee represents the united nations point of view and technique in respect to Palestine. If the Arabs fight what the world agrees should be done about Palestine they fly in the face of world law and order and, so far as the united nations organization is concerned, they are outlaws and as such are subject to military measures to be taken by the security council of the united nations, a body which Canada is bound to support in whatever action it takes according to the unanimous adoption of the united nations charter which took place in our Canadian House of Commons and Canadian Senate not long ago. Whatever responsibility rests on Canada through membership in the united nations organization accruing from the situation in Palestine our committee believes should be accepted.

According to that, we are committed to take part in a war before this Palestine question is settled. But since I made that speech and since Mr. Mowat wrote that letter the very thing has happened about which I warned the members at that time. And I confirmed it when I was in New York attending the united nations organization discussions on Palestine. I discussed this question with leading Arabs and other delegates who are vitally interested in the matter. What is happening? As a result of the pressure put upon the united nations by this small minority of political zionists who seem to have political control, not only in the United States, but in Great Britain and in Canada, the Arab people are being driven to become more sympathetic to the soviet overtures, and behind the scenes the soviet agents are working all through the Moslem world from the East Indies clear across to Morocco on the Atlantic ocean.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): They have not had much success.

Mr. JAQUES: I do not know.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): I know.

Mr. JAQUES: I would say that the position in India is due largely, or at any rate in part, to propaganda which has its origin in Moscow.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): They have been put out of all the parties in India.

Mr. JAQUES: They may have been put out of the parties; but, as hon. members know very well, the communist party man is no danger anyway. It is the fellow traveller who is the danger, and he is inside every party in all countries. As I was saying, that is the position with regard to Palestine at the present time, and that is what we face. When I was in New York I made inquiries; and, as far as I could understand, whatever is decided by this Palestine commission of the united nations organization, neither Great Britain nor the Arabs nor even the zionists are bound to accept it. I believe Great Britain made that clear. The Arabs say they will accept it, of course, if they consider it favourable; if not, they fight. That is what I learned in New York when I was at the UNO conference.

Not only is that mainly the danger in Palestine and the near east; the same danger threatens the relations between the British people and the people of the United States, owing to the zionist anti-British propaganda which is most violent and virulent in the United States. I have been a witness to that on several occasions. There is also, of course, a similar propaganda being used in Great Britain to turn the friendly feeling of the British people against the people of the United States. The whole purpose is to separate the English-speaking peoples in order that they can be that much more easily dealt with. As I said when I started, I believe that the peace of the world, politically at least—and I am leaving out any moral and religious consideration—depends, more than on anything else upon the continued and increased friendship between all the English-speaking peoples; that is, between the peoples of the British commonwealth of nations and those of the United States. Those friendly relations are being threatened by a deliberate propaganda which is aimed at the separation of the two great English-speaking peoples.

I might quote from a petition which was sent last fall from the public affairs forum of Los Angeles to President Truman. When I was in Los Angeles last winter I met the chairman of this public affairs forum and he gave me a copy of this resolution. I will not read it all, but just two or three paragraphs:

Whereas the President of the United States, the state department and members of congress are daily subjected to a barrage of telegrams, resolutions and letters from Jewish-Zionist organizations urging the government of the United

States to interfere in the conflict between zionists on one hand the Arabs and Great Britain on the other, for the purpose of forcing the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, contrary to the wishes of the native inhabitants, and

Whereas such agitation spreads disunity among the American people and weakens the government of the United States in its diplomatic relations with other countries, thus making more difficult the establishment of permanent, honourable peace between our country and other nations, and

Whereas certain well-financed professional Zionist agitators, radio commentators and newspapers who cater to so-called minority groups (whose activities suggest that they have a dual allegiance inconsistent with loyalty to the United States) are now engaged in Russia-first, pro-communist, pro-zionist, and anti-British propaganda thus giving aid and comfort to subversive foreign ideologies and organizations.

Let me say that I have witnessed active displays of that propaganda, and its importance cannot be exaggerated. I believe it is the greatest threat at the present time to any real permanent peace. I say again that anything which threatens or injures British-United States relations, threatens world peace. Everywhere in the United States among people who take an interest in international affairs, I was told that responsible opinion is that the deterioration of Europe's condition since the war is largely due to the so-called Morgenthau plan.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, may I say that it seems to me that the greatest threat to world peace is this idea of one world and one-world government. How can there be one world and a one-world government shared by two ideologies which are absolutely opposed to each other? They are as far apart as the north and south poles. I have said in this house and elsewhere many times over during the past several years—since the war ended anyway—that if there is one certain way of bringing about another war, it is the drive for one world and a one-world government, because there are, in fact, two worlds at the present time. There is the world and the way of life that we know; then there is the soviet, the totalitarian, the communist or the Marxian socialist way, I do not care what you call it. Those are the two worlds. If there is to be one world, then I say that one of those worlds will have to be eliminated; and in that process it is possible that both worlds will be destroyed.

Mr. L. PHILIPPE PICARD (Bellechasse): The statement made this afternoon by the minister was on such a high plane that much of the discussion which follows on his estimates is bound to appear trivial. The minister is to be congratulated on having expressed in such appropriate words Canada's aim in the world today. The committee will agree with him in all that he has said.

I had intended to review what has happened since I spoke on this subject last year. However, in view of the advanced stage of our proceedings I shall touch upon only two points at the present time. On one of those points I would associate myself with what has been said by other hon. members by way of regret that a subject of this importance should come before the committee at such a late hour in the session. The situation in the world at large is such as to have warranted more time being devoted to a discussion of this subject. Yet I believe I would not be fair if I were not to admit, or if I failed to recognize the fact that much has been done in the last three years to improve the situation.

The committee on external affairs, first under the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) who was the former Secretary of State for External Affairs, and now under the present minister (Mr. St. Laurent) is to be commended for the work it is doing. Both the Prime Minister and the present minister of the department are to be commended in this regard because, through the evidence given by officials in the department, hon. members have been able to gain a much better knowledge of the inner workings of the department, and a better knowledge of the problems of those officials who must advise the government on these questions.

I think much can be said, too, of the good work done by the chairman of that committee, the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette), since he has taken charge of it. The next step would seem to be for the government to accept the suggestion which has come from all sides of the house, namely, in the next year and years to follow, to bring down the estimates for the Department of External Affairs earlier in the session.

My chief object in rising at this time is to emphasize anew the importance of giving adequate remuneration to those in our diplomatic service. At times we are bound to be criticized for expenditures made. But here is one place where I believe we are not as generous as we should be. It would be to the advantage of the house and the country if we understood better the necessity for appropriating larger sums for our external service.

Perhaps on this occasion I might be permitted to repeat what I said on March 21, 1946, when a similar debate was in progress before the house. On that occasion I said:

I saw the evolution of our diplomatic service during the years I was in contact with its members when on many occasions I accompanied the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe to imperial or international conferences. I think we have as good a staff of men as or in some cases even better than, the big powers. We should make life in the service more comfortable and free from worry and criticism. We should pay them more generously from the rank of third secretrary up to that of ambassador. I hold no brief to speak for the personnel of the Department of External Affairs, but I think it is only fair to say the good I think of them especially when they have been doing such a good job.

And later in the same speech I said:

We have in external affairs a body of men who are highly trained, who are hard working, but who are strangely unpaid. This is not said in criticism of the minister or his deputy minister, but I do want to offer a word of advice to the press and to the house that better service will be rendered to the country if the government is encouraged to lift the standard of pay of our diplomats. During the early stages of their careers when these men have to spend many years in acquiring knowledge they are greatly underpaid when compared with the returns that could be obtained in business. A young man in business may have some value, but certainly he has not the cultural achievements possessed by our officials in external affairs.

I know the minister, personally, is sympathetic to the staff which serves him; but I believe I can show, if I may take a moment or so, that the salaries paid, particularly in the lower positions, are quite low. A third secretary, according to the estimates, appears to begin at $2,500 and goes up to $2,840. In this year's estimates we have some as low as $2,520 and others as high as $2,820. In order to reach that point, these men must have had college training. They must be college graduates, and they have had to attend universities and spend a long time to acquire the proper training which the duties in these important positions demand. This is a most important department of government.

I suggest that consideration should be given to a review of the present situation. The examinations which I know these men had to pass a few years ago—and I believe they are equally as difficult today—are quite exacting. These young men must know more than the average man would need to know who would receive three times the salary. When they enter the service they are young, and may not mature immediately. Even so, I believe they are deserving of higher salaries.

Then, the allowances are shown in a lump sum. Although I asked for details, my request was received too late to be of service in this debate. I would point out, however, that, although they may appear satisfactory, certainly in certain cases they are not too high. I have been in many of our embassies abroad, and I know that young men with families in those positions find it difficult to follow those who are in the foreign services of other countries. It may be that many of the older countries attract wealthier men to their foreign service, while in Canada we take young men who have passed the required examinations and have shown that they have the necessary qualifications but may not have private means. Therefore they find themselves at a disadvantage when they must deal with diplomats of other countries who are better paid or who have private means.

I believe that is a point which should be given careful consideration. If we expect to attract the high calibre of men it has been our good fortune to attract up to this time, we cannot expect that they will always have private means, and we should consider improving their position either by giving them better allowances or higher salaries, and especially those who are stationed in Ottawa.

I have mentioned third secretaries because their salaries are the lowest; but I do not think a man would reach the position of first secretary much before the age of forty, or somewhere around that. We find that first secretaries are receiving salaries as low as $4,500, and ranging up to $4,900; and these men have been in the service for at least fifteen years.

I believe we would be ill-advised to criticize expenditures in our diplomatic service. We are wise to make sure that there is no waste of money; on the other hand, we should be generous in our appropriations for our representatives abroad. In those countries we have very few people from Canada and Canadians at large are judged from those few. We should be giving them fair salaries and allowances so that they would be able to maintain their rank and give the impression that Canada is really a rich country, a country of the future, and that it pays well those in its service who are deserving.

Mr. GRAYDON: How does the Brazilian post stand at the present time? I understand that some change is in contemplation, and I was wondering whether it is likely to take place soon. I understand the Hon. Jean Desy is now in Switzerland, and I had in mind whether it was the intention that he should go back to Rio de Janeiro or whether he was being selected for some other post.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Jean Desy is at present on leave from his post in Brazil, a leave to which the regulations entitle him. However, he consented to represent Canada at the refugee conference in Geneva. He was taking his leave in Europe and complied

readily with our suggestion that he represent us at that conference. No change has yet been made with respect to his post in Brazil.

The hon. member has said that a change is contemplated. There is in contemplation the establishment of a mission in Italy as soon as the peace treaty with Italy is ratified; or perhaps it might be established even earlier. That is a matter which is under consideration. Mr. Desy is one of those under consideration for the Italian post. If he is appointed to that post, some other representative will have to be chosen and recommended to His Majesty for Brazil.

Mr. GRAYDON: Wherever Mr. Desy goes, I am sure that most of us feel that he will do a most excellent job on behalf of Canada. Has the minister any further information to give other than that which was tendered a few weeks ago with respect to the exchange of senior diplomatic representation between Canada and Russia?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No, there have been no developments there. When the former ambassador to Russia took his leave of Mr. Molotov he was informed that the question of appointing a senior representative of the soviet republics in Canada was under consideration, but there have been no developments since that time.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Kearney was appointed high commissioner to India some time ago, and a point that rises in my mind is whether Mr. Kearney has been delegated to Pakistan, Hindustan and so on.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Kearney was delegated to India. So far, we have not been officially notified that there has been any change in the status of the nation to which he was delegated.

Mr. GRAYDON: I intended that my next question would be as to what would happen after the official designation comes through, but I fancy there is little use in my asking it. Experience tells me that the minister will say that they will cross that bridge when they come to it; only he will use language much more perfect and delicate and say that that is a matter of government policy which will be announced in due course.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I think the hon. member's words are sufficiently polished and delicate to express my views.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am not sure whether my next question would come under the minister's department or not. It has to do with reparations in connection with the S. S. *Athenia* upon which a number of Canadians were passengers and which was sunk in the early days of the war. I understand that some progress has been made with respect to reparations to those who lost property as well as in cases where lives were lost. I should like to know if the minister can say when Canadians may expect payment of their reparation claims.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I am afraid I would not venture to forecast any date. A conference of those countries entitled to reparations from the western zones of occupation of Germany under the terms of the Potsdam agreement was held in Paris during November and December, 1945. This conference agreed to an allocation of all German assets available for reparations on a percentage basis between the countries participating in the conference and also agreed to the setting up of an inter-allied reparation agency charged with the distribution of these assets between the claimant countries.

It was also decided at the conference to establish two categories of external assets; namely, category A and category B; the latter category to include industrial and other capital equipment, merchant shipping, and inland water transport. Category A includes all other forms of German assets available for reparations, such as (a) German assets within each country's jurisdiction, (b) German assets in neutral countries, (c) future deliveries from current German production, and (d) reciprocal deliveries from the eastern zones of occupation of Germany.

I think the hon. member will feel as I do that the prospect of delivery from current German production or of reciprocal deliveries from the eastern zones of occupation in Germany have not yet proved to be very good, and there are not very sanguine hopes at the present moment that they will improve.

The conference did not determine what total amount of reparations should be paid by Germany or the period over which payments should be made. I would imagine that the restoration of conditions in Europe would be looked upon as having prior claim on current production over reparations. The Canadian ambassador in Paris signed the reparations agreement on behalf of Canada on January 30, 1946. The agreement has been published in treaty series, 1945, No. 23, and was tabled in the house on March 15, 1946.

The first session of the assembly of the inter-allied reparation agency, set up under

the reparation agreement, took place at Brussels from February 28 to March 7, 1946. Since then, the assembly has met eight times. The first Canadian delegate to the inter-allied reparation agency was the Hon. W. F. A. Turgeon, at that time our ambassador to Belgium. When the Hon. Mr. Turgeon left Brussels in September, 1946, to become Canadian high commissioner to Eire, Colonel G. W. McPherson took over his position at the agency.

During the initial meeting of the assembly, several standing committees were organized, on which Canada has representation on the following: the committee of German external assets; the merchant shipping committee; and the committee on industrial property.

During the past year and up to the present time, no German reparations of importance have been allocated to Canada by the inter-allied reparation agency, except the three merchant vessels: *Huascaran, Tiefland*—now called *Empire Gatehouse*—and *Weserwehr*—now called *Empire Gangway*. Of these, the first two are already under Montreal registry and the other will also be registered there upon its arrival from England in the near future.

I have no information I can give the hon. member about the claims of persons who suffered through the disaster to the *Athenia*.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am wondering if the minister will not find, on further investigation, that the claims of the *Athenia* victims were underwritten by the United Kingdom. It seems to me that that information came to me during the past year and that is one of the reasons I asked my question. I will not ask the minister to elaborate on his answer now, but perhaps some time before the session closes he will give what information he has on that point. I think he will find that the *Athenia* victims are in a different position with respect to their claims from any other reparations claimants.

The next matter to which I should like to refer is the Canadian information service. I have looked in vain for details covering this branch of external affairs. If they are in some other place I should like the minister to indicate just what the position is. Will he state whether there is to be a new chairman appointed and what the future policy of the department will be with respect to this branch which has been taken over from another department?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: On February 5 the duties of the Canadian information service relative to the distribution abroad of information concerning Canada were transferred to the Department of External Affairs by order in council issued under the Transfer of Duties Act. The estimates had been prepared and the headings were the same as the headings in external affairs. The amounts were added together and they constitute the estimates now before the committee. On each item I shall be able to give the amount which concerns what was formerly external affairs and the amount which concerns what was formerly the Canadian information service. When the service was absorbed into external affairs, its permanent employees became part of the permanent employees of the department and the temporaries became part of the temporary employees of the department. Travelling expenses, printing and so forth were the same, so that no distinction was made in printing the estimates, which were formerly presented separately. For instance, permanent salaries, all concern the former external affairs service; temporary assistance, the estimate is $680,943, and of that amount $534,499 was for former external affairs service, and $146,444 for the temporary employees.

Mr. GRAYDON: What is the number of that item?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: That is in the details on page 106 of the estimates with respect to the item for departmental administration.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Are the duties which were being discharged after the absorption exactly the same as the duties before?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The domestic work was practically eliminated just as quickly as that could be arranged. The department is now carrying on information service only for its foreign affairs. With respect to the replacement of the head of information service, he will be replaced by an official of the Department of External Affairs.

Mr. GRAYDON: A new appointee?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No, one who was already in the service of external affairs. That is the present intention. Mr. Andrews, as the hon. member knows, is going to become assistant to the president of the university of British Columbia, but at our request he has continued and is cooperating with us in preparing the transition to some other person in the department as head of the service.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am not yet quite sure as to the exact position of information service now in this department. Has it been

completely absorbed and has it lost its identity so far as a branch of the external affairs department is concerned?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It is the information division of the Department of External Affairs. There are six or seven divisions under the under-secretary of state for external affairs, each one having a head responsible to the under-secretary.

Mr. GRAYDON: If that is the case, can we have a break-down of the expenditures which are contemplated in these estimates for that one division? Perhaps that will answer the question.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The item for departmental administration is $1,534,144; services performed by those employed in Canada, $477,144; estimate for the services to be performed outside Canada, $169,406.

Mr. GRAYDON: What does the minister mean by those employed in Canada?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: A certain number work here. Then we have a certain number of representatives in Washington, New York, London, one in Mexico, Canberra and Paris. Those are the places where there were representatives of that branch, but they have now been integrated into external affairs, and wherever they are they are a part of the staff of the mission established there.

Mr. GRAYDON: Have all domestic characteristics of this branch been abandoned entirely, and is it now dealing entirely with external affairs?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes, that is so. We have eliminated the service performed or asserted to have been performed for the Canadian public and have confined it exclusively to servicing our offices abroad.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): My understanding was that at one time the service provided information not merely for our own officials abroad but for use in foreign countries. Was that true and is it still true, or is it now purely a service for our own officials abroad?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: That is still true. They are still a part of our missions abroad supplying information with respect to Canadian affairs to inquirers and to the press. There is an inquiry service; also the preparation and distribution of reference materials abroad; the production and distribution of publications; the provision and distribution of photographs, posters and other graphic materials abroad; the procurement and distribution of books for reference libraries abroad; arranging facilities for journalists visiting Canada and for Canadian speakers abroad; the handling of arrangements for cultural projects; the preparation and distribution of circular dispatches; the coordination of information activities abroad; the arranging of departmental press conferences; the preparation and distribution of departmental press releases; the handling of Canadian press releases at international conferences; the operation of area desks, that is, desks in charge of responsible persons for various areas in the world. They carry on the duties of information officers.

Mr. GRAYDON: Have we an information service for the Department of External Affairs and another overlapping information service for the Department of Trade and Commerce? I am not criticizing the minister especially, but I look with some considerable suspicion on this taking over of Canadian information service. I think you have adopted a kind of delicate child, if the minister does not mind my saying so, and you may have some trouble in bringing it up. Here you have hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money being spent on this information service. Has the minister read over the various jobs that this information service did? I must confess I think the public is pretty well fed up on all this canned information. You would be surprised how little the public bothers with canned stuff in the way of news today. A lot of people said that there was a paper war in certain respects. You are moving into a paper peace now. We should not do that. I should like the minister to give assurance to the committee that in between sessions he himself will go into this question of the Canadian information service and go into it with a fine tooth comb because it deserves a real combing out. I would be surprised if we are not to duplicate a lot of news services that are already available. This vote is up half a million dollars now. If the figures I heard are correct it is an outlandish and scandalous business. If it were to go on in this way I am pretty sure that we shall not get good value for our money. Government policy will have to be reviewed carefully. We have the Department of Trade and Commerce making a move all over the world trying to get our goods sold. If we are to get back the money that we spend that is all right, but I am not at all sure that this is not just a big unprofitable balloon that the government has up in the air. It had better deflate it before the public get wise to what is going on, because, once they do, this distribution of paper all over the world will arouse them. We are paying very heavily

for it. I do not want to be unreasonable about the matter. Most hon. members will take a similar view to mine. In all fairness to his department and to his government, the minister ought to go into the matter very carefully before he commits himself to any big expense in the formulation of other estimates.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I should like to reply at once to the hon. member for Peel. When I first came here, for the first two or three sessions I listened to vehement speeches from the hon. gentleman who preceded my hon. friend as acting leader of the opposition. The tone of his speeches was that the government was not doing its duty to the public of Canada because it did not have a press relations service in the United States. For the first two or three sessions that was repeatedly drummed into us, that we were doing a pretty good job in our war effort, but that we were not publicizing it and that we did not have good press relations in the United States. Later, there was set up an organization under an experienced gentleman who had previously been dealing with the publishers in the United States in his capacity as representative of the manufacturers of paper. Within a relatively short time there was a change in the attitude of public opinion in the United States, or at least there were very much more favourable things being said and printed about Canadians and the Canadian war effort than had been said before. Hon. gentlemen opposite quickly became suspicious of the activities of that war information service, and I think it was at the last session or the one before that they were quite vehement in their denunciation of the fact that we were using taxpayers' money for government propaganda.

Mr. GRAYDON: In the domestic field; you should not have done it.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: In order to make sure that was not done, it was suggested that this department be brought under the control and supervision of the Department of External Affairs, and that it had no right to do anything that those responsible for the conduct of our external affairs did not feel it was necessary to do to disseminate proper information about Canadian affairs. That integration was made, and instructions were given that there was to be no domestic propaganda, and there has not been any domestic propaganda.

When the hon. member for Peel suggests that I take what time I may have between sessions to make a personal investigation of the situation I tell him that I will not do that. I have in the Department of External Affairs officials in whom I have sufficient confidence to take their word in their report to me that the instructions which have been given are being carried out. Whenever the House of Commons decides that that is not sufficient, that it has to have a minister of the crown who will do it personally, I will not be that minister of the crown.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Did the Prime Minister say that he expected the house to rise on the twelfth? If so, did he take into consideration the political propaganda of the opposition?

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Chairman, I rose a couple of hours ago to ask a simple question. Evidently your eye was cast somewhere else, and that was all right; I have no objection to that. But since that time, after listening to quite a few speeches I rather felt a speech was growing on me, and my thoughts since that time have now become rather elaborated. However I am not going to punish the committee any more tonight with a further speech. I have confidence in the leader of this group, together with the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Jaques) who represented us on the external affairs committee.

I am interested in international affairs, and if it were not so late in the session I would have spoken at some length. May I make just one observation before asking my question? It is with respect to one or two things that the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) said. I always enjoy his speeches.

An hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. HANSELL: Because I always enjoy a little comedy. Sometimes he speaks words of real wisdom. However, tonight I think a good deal of what he said was a little bit of puffing and blowing. I think the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent) answered him very appropriately. In his proposal the hon. member attempted to evaluate some of the world's diplomats. If I recall rightly he said that Mr. Churchill when he was with Mr. Stalin and Mr. Roosevelt had failed miserably as a diplomat. That depends very largely on what information we may have on which to base our opinions. We are all subject to propaganda; we are all subject to what comes to us in the press and over the radio. Propaganda is very powerful. The propaganda machine can make a man overnight, and it can break him overnight. If we were to appraise the value of these men on the basis of that which is true, if we were

able to gain access to the truth, I am certain we would find that Mr. Churchill ranked with the highest of diplomats.

The hon. member referred to these three great men in conference at Teheran. Personally I believe that Mr. Churchill went to that conference with plans for the reconciliation and reconstruction of Europe, plans which evidently met their Waterloo. Why they did so we are not able to say, because we are not in possession of all the facts.

I wish to quote, from the New York *Sun* of May 8, 1945, part of an article written by a well known columnist, Mr. George Sokolsky, who had the following to say with reference to that conference:

> One of these men (the Big Three) is a British aristocrat, conservative, imperialistic, proud, the most heroic political figure of the war. But he heads an empire that has long been used to the limit. Its principal resource now is the treasury and industry of the United States. His mind is robust, but his purse is bare. At a bargain he sits with empty hands and high hopes.

If that observation is right, then I think some responsibility rested upon the shoulders of Mr. Roosevelt at that time, and my personal view is that Mr. Roosevelt was a much overrated world figure.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): I do not think so.

Mr. HANSELL: When history is rewritten a century or two from now, perhaps that will be found to have been the truth.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Both were good men.

Mr. HANSELL: I am not saying they were not both good men, but if this observation by this columnist is true it proves one thing. It proves that those world powers which hold the purse strings of the world control the destinies of the nations. Let that be put down as, in my opinion, one fundamental principle.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I will ask my question. It is not along the line I have been talking. It is a simple question. Perhaps I could have telephoned the minister, but it might as well be on the record. I had an inquiry from a university graduate who is interested in going into the diplomatic service. Would the minister tell us what the procedure would be for that young man? He has a Master of Science degree in education and is going on from there for some other degree. What procedure will be necessary? Will any preliminary training be required by the department? Perhaps the minister would amplify that for me.

[Mr. Hansell.]

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I understand that a competition is to be announced at an early day by the civil service commission for entry into the service of external affairs, and if the gentleman in question would write to the commission I am sure they would inform him as soon as the competition was announced and send him forms to apply as one of the competing candidates. If, on the other hand, he wishes further information and will write to the department, giving information about himself, the personnel officer of the department will reply and tell him what further qualifications, if any, are required, and will facilitate to the greatest degree possible his participation in the civil service competition.

Mr. GRAYDON: I understand that most of the positions which are open in the department are being filled by university graduates. If that is the case I should like to plead the cause of those who have graduated from agricultural colleges across Canada. From a question I asked last year in the external affairs committee, I do not think a single man from an agricultural college was admitted to the department. In our relations with other countries the people whom we sent abroad are the only show-windows by which those nations can judge the Canadian people, and it would seem a shame if graduates of agricultural colleges could not have their quota so that they might be sent to other countries, in view of the fact that Canada occupies so important a position in agricultural matters.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I am informed that graduates of agricultural colleges are not in any way debarred, but they tend to go to the Department of Agriculture or to trade and commerce. There is being established a system of interchange between trade and commerce and external affairs, and there is a desire in both departments to make them complementary to each other and to make the personnel in each of the two available for promotions that become open in either. I think that is a move which not only will be helpful to the morale of the personnel in the two departments but will give the two departments a broader field from which to select the best persons for any post which is to be filled.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Now that the air is cooler, I want to come back to the question of the information service. The minister seemed to become so interested in one aspect of the question asked by the hon. member for Peel that he forgot to answer the question. We are in earnest about it. We know that when a going concern of this kind

gets into action it is hard to prevent it from going on and even increasing and we want to know whether there is danger of overlapping or of parallel action. From what the minister read to us of the activities now being conducted within the Department of External Affairs, that long list which was read seemed to include a number of items which the layman would think were within the scope, let us say, of the Department of Trade and Commerce. Will the minister say whether in some important country where we have quite an organization for the Department of Trade and Commerce and an organization also for the Department of External Affairs there are actually two publicity organizations, or whether, in such a case, it is all done by one. We do not suggest that there is carelessness or impropriety, but we do suggest that there is real danger of overlapping, and it is our duty to find out about it.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: My information is that it is all done by one. There is close cooperation between the two departments to make mutually available all facilities that either provides. It was found that there had been, in the growth that was a natural consequence of the way in which the Canadian information service had been established, things that could be eliminated, and they are being eliminated. It is, as I believe the hon. member will concede, the sincere desire of external affairs to avoid anything that could become the object of partisan controversy. The Secretary of State and the under secretary have given instructions that we avoid responsibility for anything that could become the object of partisan controversy. That is being attended to just as closely as possible. I can give the hon. member the assurance that these items are lower than they were last year. Last year the estimates were more than was expended. There will not be anything done which we feel can be avoided. We are doing much less in that field than other countries. The figures in that respect were put on the record in the committee on external affairs. We shall probably do some things which were not done by the Canadian information service, but we expect to do only that which we feel will be providing full value for what is expended.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): In the list of ministers and ambassadors which I received I do not find the name of General Odlum. Is he still in the public service?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: General Odlum is still on leave, and there is no public announcement I can make at the present time. I should be glad to tell the hon. members just what the situation is, and I hope that it will not be many days before I am in a position to make a public announcement. The hon. member realizes that we have to get agreements of foreign countries when we make an appointment and to get the approval of His Majesty to appointments in a foreign service; and no announcements are ever made until those agreements and approvals have been secured. I hope that I shall be able to announce at an early day the appointment of General Odlum to a foreign post.

Item agreed to.

43. Representation abroad—including salaries of high commissioners, ambassadors, ministers plenipotentiary, consuls, secretaries and staff, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act or any of its amendments, $3,178,256.

Mr. GRAYDON: Can the minister give some indication as to what the general policy is with respect to the balancing of non-professional diplomats and professional diplomats, if I may classify them in those categories, in so far as appointment to senior diplomatic posts across the world is concerned?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Whenever a senior post was to be filled, if there was available in the department an officer who was considered to be qualified to fill it, he was appointed to the post. Whenever there was not in the department someone who appeared to be ready to take on the post, we looked outside for a representative.

Mr. GRAYDON: Some reference was made by the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario to the former ambassador to China, General Odlum. At the bottom of page 190 and the major part of page 191 of the minutes and proceedings of evidence of the standing committee on external affairs, certain questions were asked with respect to the new arrangements made for the new ambassador to China who has had extensive baggage go over with him, the baggage including four houses, a truck, a substantial amount of foodstuffs and some coal. One of the witnesses said that the baggage had taken about $30,000 to transport it from here to China. That would indicate a sort of adventure into what, I should think, might be called trailer diplomacy. In any event, whatever it may be called, I asked some questions of the witness who was on the stand at that time, and I think it was Mr. Matthews. He indicated he could get me the actual details of the shipment. I know the minister will not have those with him now; but before the session is ended, in order that

we may have the information complete, will he provide that information? I think I myself am partly remiss in not having followed up the question in the committee on external affairs at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I think I have most of the information here. Mr. Matthews noted the question and prepared a note for me in order that I might deal with it. First of all, with respect to coal: In July, 1946, General Odlum advised the department that the price of poor coal in Nanking was $150, United States, per ton and suggested that we consider shipping coal for heating the residences and offices in China. As the situation regarding fuel in Nanking had not improved, it was decided to ship coal in the vessel which was taking the prefabricated houses to Nanking. Two hundred and four tons were purchased at a price of $10.90 a ton and were shipped to Nanking at a freight cost of $28 per ton. In this manner, the embassy was provided with a good quality of coal for $37.90 a ton, whilst poor quality coal had been purchased the year before at $150 a ton.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is the minister doing the same thing in France where it is $80 a ton?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: We have not yet done the same in France. I was not informed that coal cost the equivalent of $80 a ton.

When a Canadian legation was first opened in Chungking, no premises were available for lease since the movement of the Chinese government and of all foreign missions to Chungking, had more than doubled its ordinary population. It was, therefore, necessary to construct a building which served as a residence for the minister, for all Canadian members of his staff and also as offices premises. The total cost of this building was approximately $135,000. The building was modest in size and extremely simple in its design and furnishings. The large cost resulted entirely from the fact that the official rate of exchange for Chinese national currency at the time of construction multiplied costs by at least five times what they would have been for a similiar building in Canada. When the capital was moved to Nanking the problem of suitable premises became acute.

In June of 1946, General Odlum, who was then ambassador, advised us that, after a long search, a small house which would be just adequate for the first secretary was available at a rental of $600, United States, per month, on a two-year lease, all to be paid in advance. He advised us this was the lowest rent for which any property was available. As it was necessary to provide accommodation for the ambassador, the counsellor, the first secretary, the Canadian members of the stenographic and clerical staff, the military attache and for offices, the department decided to explore the possibility of sending to China prefabricated houses. In the meantime accommodation had to be leased. It was decided that eventually we would have to adopt the practice of other missions in China and to provide all residence and office accommodation in a single compound. So that any buildings erected now would be of continuing use, land for this compound has been purchased.

Mr. MacNICOL: That is at Nanking?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes, at Nanking. I have the costs here.

Mr. GRAYDON: I was really rising to ask the details of the shipment across. Perhaps the minister might add that in that Chungking case, with the cost $135,000, I think the house when sold brought only $12,000.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I do not know.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is on the record.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The freight charges on these prefabricated houses was $20,280.65.

Mr. GRAYDON: Can the minister give the details I asked for in my question regarding the freight shipment over, in addition to the houses? The minister gave the information with respect to coal, but in addition to that there was a truck, if my information is correct, and a quantity of foodstuffs. Has the minister those details?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No. I have a note with respect to the coal on which the freight was $28 a ton, and the charge on the prefabricated houses amounted to $20,280.65. But it was felt, in view of our experience with the cost of building with materials supplied at Chungking, that anything we could send over from Canada would cost much less than if we attempted to secure it in China.

Mr. KNOWLES: I have three questions to ask. First, are there any developments in connection with filling the senior diplomatic post at Moscow, and also are there any developments in connection with the Soviet Union filling their senior post here?

Mr. GRAYDON: I asked that question.

Mr. KNOWLES: Second, I have a question relating to the purchase of the new residence in Washington. Has that been completed? Third, could the minister indicate the number of countries in which we maintain both diplomatic missions and trade commissioners' offices?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: My hon. friend will find the reply to the first question in *Hansard,* where it was answered for the hon. member for Peel. The purchase of the residential property at Washington has been completed, but the ambassador cannot obtain occupation until November. It is the property that was described before the committee on external affairs.

With respect to the third question, I would ask if it would be satisfactory to have a statement prepared. I believe the hon. member would like to know in what places we have both external affairs representatives and representatives of trade and commerce. That being so, I shall have a return prepared. It can be tabled if the hon. member wishes.

Item agreed to.

52. Portion of expenditure of the imperial economic committee, $14,500.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Would the minister explain this item?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The imperial economic committee was reorganized in 1933 on the recommendation of the Skelton committee and took over the marketing intelligence notes, the commodity series and world surveys on production and trade formerly issued by the empire marketing board. In addition, it prepares reports to governments on special subjects. Throughout the war, subscriptions were reduced in view of the limited amount of work that could be done. The committee is now planning resumption of the work and subscriptions are to be resumed. At first they are to continue on the reduced basis until work can be extended.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): That is a committee based in London?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes, a committee composed of representatives of the United Kingdom government and other members of the commonwealth. The expenses are shared by the members of the commonwealth, and the services are available to all of them.

Item agreed to.

55. Provisional international civil aviation organization, $125,000.

Mr. KNOWLES: I take it that there is a change of one word in the name of this organization. It is no longer provisional. May I ask the nature of the expenditure? Is it a portion of the expenditure, or a grant. What is the reason for the increase?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The hon. member knows that the convention on international civil aviation was drawn up in Chicago in December, 1944, and made provision for the establishment of this organization upon ratification by twenty-six of the signatory states. The twenty-sixth ratification was received this year and the international civil aviation organization came into existence on April 4, 1947. Thirty-eight ratifications have been received. This amount is our proportion of the budget of the organization.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Marine service—

425. River St. Lawrence ship channel; contract dredging in the St. Lawrence river and Montreal harbour, including cost of administration—capital, $1,022,150.

Mr. MacNICOL: Perhaps on this item I may be out of order in what I wish to say, although I do not think I am. I am going to speak about the Richelieu river, which is part of the St. Lawrence canal system.

When I was last in Sorel, in September, 1946, I had the joy and pleasure of spending a few hours with the late Hon. Mr. Cardin, for whom I always had a warm feeling, one which I knew he reciprocated. At that time I was in Sorel making a survey in connection with the Richelieu river.

On this occasion I am going to ask the minister, as I have on one or two earlier occasions, to interest himself in the problem of completing the canalization of the Richelieu river. In my judgment it is nothing short of an outrage against navigation on the Richelieu river for conditions which have remained there for so long to remain longer.

It will not take long to tell about it. The minister has been there, and he knows that a steamer of perhaps 2,000 tons, the ordinary lake steamer operated by the Canada Steamship Lines, can ascend the Richelieu river as far as St. Ours. At St. Ours the river is dammed, although it is a poor dam, and is just a barrier across the river. Ships can go no farther without going through St. Ours lock. That lock, I believe, is about 339 feet long by 45 feet wide, and has a 12-foot draught. The amazing picture is that, once they have passed through St. Ours, reaching the Chambly basin, they cannot proceed up the canal any farther. The Chambly canal from the Chambly basin up to St. Johns has about nine small locks approximately 120 feet long by 23 feet wide, with a draught of six feet six inches.

That creates a vicious bottle-neck in transportion on the Richelieu river from Montreal to New York. I am convinced that if the Richelieu river were properly equipped with

draught and locks equal to St. Ours, as it should have been long ago, there would be large increases in transportation and commerce which would benefit Sorel, St. Johns and Montreal. After you pass St. Johns going south, there is a 12 foot draught through lake Champlain and through the Champlain canal right down to Albany. After you pass Albany there is a much deeper draught to New York.

I am going to ask the minister to interest himself, as did the former minister who represented that constituency for many years, in this matter. I supported the late minister years ago when he diffidently, almost timidly asked for a vote to build the Fryer's dam north of St. Johns in order to raise the water level at that point to twelve feet, so that ships could come down from lake Champlain as far as the dam. I am going to ask the minister to interest his engineers in this. I am sure the plans are already in the department. This transportation route should be completed and it is an outrage that it was not completed long ago. The Richelieu river constituted one of our first transportation routes and it is the most neglected of all our routes, at least in the east.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The hon. gentleman is quite right about that being a bottleneck on the Richelieu. I will not attempt to say that I am as familiar as he is with the situation, but in the last few months I have interested myself in the project because of delegations and representations I have received. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is aware that a joint report was made some years back—I do not remember the date which stipulated that until the St. Lawrence waterway had been finally developed to a 35-foot depth all the way, it would not be advisable to undertake the deepening of the Richelieu. I may not be using the exact words of the report, but that is their gist. Because of that finding, the engineers of the department have taken the stand that it would be preferable to await the completion of the other project, and I am sure my hon. friend is as familiar as I am as to when the time of completion will be.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am going to ask the minister not to take the word of his engineers. The words they use may not be their own, and I am afraid they are the result of some campaign in opposition to Richelieu river transportation.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is the report.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am opposed to the report.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

Mr. CHEVRIER: I hope I made myself clear. That is the report of a joint board of Canadian and United States engineers.

Mr. MacNICOL: I have all the reports and I oppose the report as strongly as I can. It is nothing but nonsense to have a 12-foot draft to St. Ours and from then on have only a six foot six inch draft, and then, after passing St. Johns, to have a 12-foot draft right down to Albany. Anyone who opposes the completion of that canal is not working in the best interests of Canada.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The joint board did not oppose it.

Mr. MacNICOL: If I were the minister I would see that they changed their opinion and got on with the completion of the canal, so that ships could come up from Albany right to the river St. Lawrence where there is a 30-foot draft. The St. Lawrence canal has in my judgment nothing to do with this. This is part of the over-all picture with which I am familiar. Part of that picture is a 12-foot draft right up to Sorel from Albany. I am going to ask the minister again to pay no attention —I do not mean this unkindly—to his engineers if they oppose completion; let him tell the engineers what to do.

I am sure if he does that I will do my best from this side of the house to support the completion of the canal with a 12-foot draft to Sorel. I am convinced that this would mean increased transportation business all along the river. This river has been neglected for too many years. The draft in some of the locks is too shallow; the locks themselves are only twenty-three feet wide, and some of them will not take a boat more than 120 feet long. That is quite a small boat. The only boats that can use this canal are the small oil boats. This draft should be the same as that in the St. Ours lock, and that would mean increased traffic right from Albany to Quebec. Shipments from Three Rivers and elsewhere could be made in good-sized steamers rather than in the small driblets as at the present time. This would mean a great deal, not only for Quebec, but for the whole of Canada.

I know the minister is interested in our canals and you will not find such bottlenecks anywhere else as those that exist in the Canadian canal system. I will not take the time to name all the locks, but the Lachine is the first one out of Montreal, then the Soulanges, then Cornwall, and then the Williamsburg group and the Galops locks.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. MacNICOL: I will be through in one minute. The canal system in Canada is important, and it is all very well to say "carried." There is a lot of stuff that is of no moment at all, but the canalization of the Richelieu river is a matter of great importance. It has been delayed long enough. The depths and the width and the draught of the canal locks are not uniform. A shipper sending a boat up to the great lakes must inquire about each lock and then judge what sized ship he can send up. I believe the smallest lock on the St. Lawrence is at Cornwall. I have great respect for the young minister, and I mean young in experience.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacNICOL: That is right because he has been in the cabinet for only a few years. I have been a long time at this business of transportation and I know these canals very well. As I say, I have a lot of respect for the young minister, and one of his ambitions should be to make the locks in the canal system uniform throughout. They are not today. I think I have said enough. I promised the late Hon. Mr. Cardin that I would again this session promote what I knew was nearest to his heart, the completion of the Richelieu canal system.

Item agreed to.

Railway service—
428. Hudson Bay railway—construction and improvements—capital, $10,500.

Mr. WRIGHT: I should like to ask a question in regard to stevedoring at the port of Churchill. My information is that shippers who wish to ship through that port this year some four and a half million feet of lumber had considerable difficulty in getting a stevedoring company to move the lumber from the railway cars on to shipboard. Has the minister any information on that?

Mr. CHEVRIER: The last information I have is very encouraging. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was in the house when I stated, in answer to a question by the hon. member for Saskatoon City, that, so far as mixed cargoes of lumber and grain were concerned, there was no difficulty at all. The national harbours board felt they could raise a sufficient number of stevedores. There was some difficulty as regards whole cargoes of lumber; but I am informed, although not officially, that there will be a sufficient labour force in the area to move the lumber that so far has offered itself for movement.

Mr. WRIGHT: My information is that the grain people had objected to the lumber being loaded on grain boats and that this shipment of about four and a half million feet would have to secure a boat which carried only lumber. The boat has been obtained, provided that the necessary stevedoring can be done.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Stevedoring is not the responsibility of the national harbours board but the responsibility of the shippers. I am informed, however, that there will be a sufficient labour force to move the lumber cargo which is offering.

Mr. BRYCE: Have the cattle sheds been removed at Churchill?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes. That was the answer given in a return brought down in the house.

Mr. BRYCE: Why were they removed?

Mr. CHEVRIER: They were taken down to make room for the United States army when it was in there, and they have not been replaced.

Mr. BRYCE: Will they be replaced so that cattle can be shipped out of Churchill?

Mr. CHEVRIER: If there is a demand for them they will be.

Mr. BURTON: Can the minister give us the latest information as to the possibility of the maximum amount of grain and other products being shipped over the Churchill route?

Mr. CHEVRIER: The amount of grain that can be stored in the elevator at Churchill is two and a half million bushels. There has been a great deal of talk about shipping as many as sixteen or seventeen million bushels. The facilities are there to ship that much. The movement of the grain is the responsibility of the Canadian wheat board. I am informed by them that they expect to ship more than they did last season, but what amount I am not in a position to say.

Mr. BURTON: The road will have the necessary facilities?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes, the facilities are there to ship far more than two and a half million bushels.

Mr. WRIGHT: Information was given to me last year with regard to freight rates from points adjacent to Hudson Bay Junction to the port of Churchill on pulpwood as compared with the rates for a similar distance on pulpwood shipped from somewhere in the neighbourhood of Fort Frances. The figures I was given indicated—I am speaking from memory—that it cost approximately twice as

much to ship pulpwood from the neighbourhood of Hudson Bay Junction to Churchill as it cost to ship a similar distance to Fort Frances. Has the minister any information on that? I was given to understand that was one of the reasons why it was difficult to use the port of Churchill for the export of poplar logs for making matches. There were inquiries from interests in Great Britain as to the export of poplar logs for that purpose, but they found that because of the high freight rate to Churchill as compared with shipments east they could not use the port of Churchill successfully. If there is that difference—and I have reason to believe there is—I think the minister should look into the matter and see just what the reason for it is.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The hon. member knows, of course, that the classification of freight rates is perhaps the most complicated thing there is, and I would not attempt to answer his question offhand. I know there are no export and import rates in existence on the Hudson Bay railway, but I shall be glad to inquire into the case he has mentioned and send him a note on it.

Item agreed to.

Railway service—

430. Prince Edward Island car ferry and terminals—construction and improvement of terminal facilities—capital (estimated cost $5,964,000) (revote, $1,815,000), $4,000,000.

Mr. McLURE: What proportion of this $4,000,000 for the Prince Edward Island car ferry and terminals will be for the car ferry?

Mr. CHEVRIER: None of this vote is for the car ferry. It is all for the terminals at Tormentine and Borden.

Mr. McLURE: That is what I thought it might be, but it says "car ferry". Are the terminals at Tormentine completed? The terminals on the Borden side are only just started. Have contracts been let for them?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Contracts have been let in both cases.

Mr. McLURE: The contract for the Borden side has been let to two different contractors, I understand.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is right.

Mr. McLURE: Would the minister state the amount of each of these contracts?

Mr. CHEVRIER: One is let to Canadian Dredge and Dock Company and the other to Foundation Maritime Limited. The contracts are: the former, $747,512, and the latter, $1,409,571.

[Mr. Wright.]

Mr. McLURE: Does the minister consider that a sufficient amount for the terminals at Borden, or will a further sum have to be voted to complete them?

Mr. CHEVRIER: According to the engineers who made the survey and prepared the estimate of costs, this vote will take care of the contract, but there will perhaps be required a small additional amount.

Mr. McLURE: Will it be practicable for the new car ferry to load and unload at Borden while the work on the terminals is going on?

Mr. CHEVRIER: It will be extremely difficult. The contract has been given to repair the terminals, and the ship must dock at these terminals. I understand that arrangements are being made to dock the ship in the usual way, but it is going to hold up the work.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED ENTERPRISES

National harbours board—

478. Advances to national harbours board, subject to the provisions of section 29 of the National Harbours Board Act, to meet expenditures applicable to the calendar year 1947 on any or all of the following accounts:

Reconstruction and capital expenditures—		
Saint John	$125,000	
Quebec	149,000	
Generally—unforeseen and miscellaneous	200,000	
	$474,000	
Less amount to be expended from replacement funds	222,500	
		$251,500.

Mr. GREEN: Will the minister explain to the committee whether there are any plans for modernizing the national ports of Canada? I believe there has been practically no work of that kind done for seven or eight years, perhaps longer than that. There is great concern in some of the ports about modernization programmes being undertaken.

Mr. CHEVRIER: There are under consideration and continually under review plans for the betterment of the national harbours board facilities in this country. Since 1935, the national harbours board has spent in various provinces of Canada not less than $17,500,000 of capital money for the extension, improvement and establishment of new facilities.

Mr. GREEN: In what years was that spent?

Mr. CHEVRIER: From 1935 down to date.

Mr. GREEN: There has been nothing spent since 1939.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes, there has. I have not the figures before me but I could get them fairly quickly.

Mr. GREEN: I should like to know that.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It runs from a quarter to half a million dollars a year since 1939. It was half a million dollars in the last three or four years and a million dollars from the beginning of the war to that time.

Mr. GREEN: Over all the war years?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: That is spread over all the different national ports.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Spread over the different national ports. In this year's estimates there are votes for projects which will run into well over $7 million.

Mr. GREEN: What amounts by way of capital improvements are under contemplation for the current year?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I cannot give that offhand. For instance, there is for Saint John an item of $125,000 for building a wharf, which will mean an additional expenditure. There is an item in Vancouver for some $153,000. That is a preliminary expenditure.

Mr. GREEN: What for?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I can give that when we come to the item. We are dealing with another item now. We are dealing with item 478. There is an item dealing with Vancouver a little later on. I will give the details when we get to it, if desired.

Mr. GREEN: We are very much concerned in Vancouver about the fact that there is no local control over the harbour. As the minister knows, a recommendation was made by Sir Alexander Gibb in his national port survey of 1931 and 1932 for a form of local control. We are far removed from Ottawa and are not satisfied to have all the control centered here in the national harbours board.

Mr. CHEVRIER: But it is not.

Mr. GREEN: We think there should be some definite form of local control. At least there should be a committee on which the representatives of the various groups in the city who were interested in the harbour could sit; for example, labour, shipping interests, business, merchants and various other interests of the city. We have had that up time and again in the house, and the minister was asked to make a change of that kind when he was in Vancouver in January. At that time apparently he would not do anything about it. What is the picture at the present time?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I will tell the hon. gentleman, in the first place, that his statement that there is no local control is not quite correct. There is local control through the port manager. That is the idea of the whole set-up of the national harbours board. There is a centralized administration here in Ottawa which does business through its local port managers in each of the seven ports of Canada. That is local control. That port manager is in touch with the local situation. He knows what the shipping interests want; he knows what labour wants; he knows what the board of trade and the other various organizations are interested in.

With reference to the other matter that my hon. friend speaks of, it is true that Sir Alexander Gibb recommended advisory councils in these ports.

Mr. HOWE: In 1933.

Mr. CHEVRIER: In 1933. But there are a lot of things that are recommended in reports which the government does not see fit to adopt. I am not saying that the government will never consent to advisory councils in the harbour boards of this country, but thus far it has not seen fit to do that. I have visited Vancouver and Halifax. I know that what my hon. friend says is the feeling in some quarters but not in all. I have had representations right in the city of Vancouver saying, leave the thing as it is now. Before the position is changed, I want to be quite sure that we are not going to move toward a worse position than a better one. I can tell my hon. friend that the door is not closed and I am always open to conviction.

Mr. GREEN: Of course that is really just repeating the statement the minister made last year. It is quite obvious that the intention of the government is that there shall be no local board. Certainly that position is not satisfactory to the great majority of the people who are using the port of Vancouver. I should like to know what survey the minister has made of the situation and whether he has any reasons other than those that he has given this evening for refusing to set up a board, because they are very slim ones.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not know that I need give any other reasons. I am not under any obligation to tell the hon. gentleman what the reasons are for the decision of the government. I do not think he will expect me to do that. But I can tell him the main thing that the port of Vancouver and, I think,

most of the harbours are interested in is the development of business and traffic, and that important thing is right in the hands of the port manager.

Mr. GREEN: The minister has outlined no plan tonight for modernizing these great Canadian ports. These ports cannot stand still; they must be kept up to date.

Mr. CHEVRIER: They are not standing still.

Mr. GREEN: They must have new facilities all the time. The minister indicates no change at all tonight, no attempt to bring them up to date. We feel that if there were local people having some say in the planning of the port we would be far more likely to have the port kept up to date. Can the minister make any announcement about any plans for improving these ports?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have already told the hon. gentleman that in this very year we have votes for projects costing over $7 million toward improving the facilities at these ports.

Mr. GREEN: Has a general plan been drawn up by the national harbours board toward which you are working?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Can the minister give us any idea what that plan is?

Mr. CHEVRIER: There are plans, but the hon. gentleman knows the plans that the harbours board work upon must be approved. They must be approved by the committee on reconstruction. They must have the approval of the engineers, and until they have, the national harbours board is not in a position to make them public. Should the board make an over-all plan public, a five-year or a ten-year plan, the way things are developing in the country today, they might have to change the plan after two years. I know of a situation in Montreal where a plan was announced for five years in connection with the building of a certain wharf, and because of a change in navigational plans the wharf had to be entirely changed. It is, therefore, not safe to announce a five-year or a ten-year or a twenty-year plan and lead the people to believe that we will do these works and then, for some good reason, have to alter them. I think that is dangerous. Therefore, rather than do that, what the board has been following is to have a plan for each particular harbour announced in the estimates. In these estimates there are certain works for Saint John, Halifax and Vancouver.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

Mr. REID: I would ask the minister to consider the question of refinancing the debt of the New Westminster harbour commissioners. If one had time to place the whole picture of our harbour boards before the country I think it would be found to be a startling one, but I would point out that New Westminster is the only harbour board that paid interest charges in full up to 1939 when the war broke out. New Westminster is the only city and port in the entire country that has spent huge sums of money in the development of the port. Some years ago a bond issue was put out amounting to over $500,000 in connection with our port. Looking at the figures for some of the other ports, I find Halifax with an interest debt of over $3 million; Saint John, over $7 million of matured unpaid debt; Chicoutimi, $2,500,000; Quebec, $29,500,000 of matured interest unpaid, and Vancouver, over $5 million of matured interest unpaid. When I look at all these figures and consider the fact that in all cases there has been a refinancing this year, and then come to the port which I have the honour to represent and find that, as I have said, it is the only port in Canada which has paid its debt and, notwithstanding that, has not received the same consideration, I think I am justified in asking the minister to give it that consideration. Some of the principal becomes due this coming year. I would ask him to consider the question of refinancing in the case of New Westminster.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am familiar with the problem to which the hon. gentleman refers, and I have studied it. Unfortunately, however, we have not been able to do much to assist him, although I feel strongly for him. It is a matter about which I hope something can be done, and I assure him again that I will look into it and see if we cannot find some solution.

Mr. REID: Thank you.

Mr. HAZEN: All credit is due the municipality of New Westminster for what it has done in the respect indicated by the hon. member, but I must point out that he made a statement which is not correct when he said that New Westminster was the only municipality that had invested money in the development of its port. That statement is inaccurate, because the port of Saint John a good many years ago invested money—

Mr. REID: I am glad to hear it.

Mr. HAZEN:—in the building of wharves and the development of its port.

Mr. MacNICOL: About Toronto harbour—

Mr. REID: I have not it here.

Mr. MacNICOL: We have a new minister. He will make a good one by and by. About Toronto harbour, what draught of ships can now enter both the east and west entrances and sail through the bay, and what dockage depth have they?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I cannot give that information now but I will get it. This is a national harbours board item.

Mr. MacNICOL: There are not many harbours that can beat Toronto as a national harbour.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Quite so. I will get the information.

Mr. JAQUES: May I ask the minister a question with reference to the railway service between the cities of Calgary and Edmonton?

Mr. CHEVRIER: That item will come later on.

Item agreed to.

Deficits—transport—

479. Amount required to provide for the payment during the fiscal year 1947-48 to the Canadian National Railway Company (hereinafter called the national company) upon applications approved by the Minister of Transport, made from time to time by the national company to the Minister of Finance and to be applied by the national company in payment of the deficit (certified by the auditors of the national company) in the operation of the Prince Edward Island car ferry and terminals arising in the calendar year 1947, $707,000.

Mr. McLURE: I see that this item indicates, just as the item last year indicated, a deficit in respect of this service. When there are deficits in connection with canals that fact is not indicated, but when there is a deficit in connection with the car ferry service the fact is stated. Why should the word "deficit" appear here at all? The item should simply indicate that it is for the operation of the ferry service. If you designate it as a deficit in one case, why not in the other? Last year I was looking for a breakdown of this amount of $700,000 odd and I suppose we should get it. I am not going to ask for it tonight because it would be a huge question. May I say this, however. When the new boat is put on, I hope that the freight rates on trucks on the car ferry will be treated in such a way that the whole system of nine miles will be taken into account as if it were part of a national highway. I understand from press reports that the new ferry rates will go into operation as soon as the new boat is put on.

Mr. CHEVRIER: July 1.

Mr. McLURE: I suppose they are in force now on the old boats. I should like to know what these rates are. The only information I saw was that they would be favourable, but no specific statement was made with reference to the trucks or the loads they carry.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The Canadian National authorities announced two or three days ago that the rates for trucks would be the same as on the Wood Islands, Cariboo ferry, and that commodities on trucks would be exempt, provided that they were products of the farm or fisheries.

Mr. McLURE: I might mention one point in that connection which we were arguing last year. In my opinion, the Canadian National Railways should not make these rates. I submit that the Minister of Transport should set these rates in conjunction with the government of Prince Edward Island. They are the two parties to the contract, to whom we look for its fulfilment. If the Canadian National Railways take their direction from the Minister of Transport, should he authorize them, declaring that this must be treated as a highway, then the matter is settled.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The minister takes the attitude that he has no authority to fix rates. That is for the board of transport commissioners. That is the attitude I took in answer to a similar question by the hon. gentleman last year and it must be the answer this year. I am afraid I have to take the same attitude this year.

Mr. McLURE: I think that was pretty well threshed out before. We know that the terms of confederation in 1873 come first. The board of transport commissioners have no authority in that whatsoever. They have no right to set the rates. Why do they not set the rate from Charlottetown to St. Johns, Newfoundland? Because they have no authority.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not want to get into an argument with my hon. friend on that. But if the board of transport commissioners have no right to set rates, why does my hon. friend accept the rates set by them?

An hon. MEMBER: They have to.

Mr. McLURE: We have to accept them and take what we get.

Mr. CHEVRIER: They have fixed the rates.

Mr. McLURE: Last year when the board went down to Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, to hold their sittings on freight rates,

they themselves acknowledged that they did not have any authority.

Mr. CHEVRIER: No, they did not say that. They said they doubted whether they had; but they proceeded to fix them.

Mr. McLURE: Well—

Mr. CHEVRIER: And they have again fixed them.

Mr. McLURE: But their chief legal man, Mr. Dysart, definitely made the statement, as he is reported, that they had no authority. Why should we accept it from them now, unless it is what we really want?

Item agreed to.

Deficits—
National harbours board—

480. To provide for payment to national harbours board, of the amount hereinafter set forth, to be applied in payment of the deficit (exclusive of interest on dominion government advances and depreciation on capital structures) arising in the calendar year 1947, in the operation of the Churchill harbour, $83,641.

Mr. MacNICOL: How is this deficit made up?

Mr. CHEVRIER: It is an operation deficit.

Mr. MacNICOL: Operating what?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Operating revenue for the year 1947 is $80,000, and the maintenance and expenses amount to $163,641. The operating deficit is, therefore, $83,641.

Mr. MacNICOL: That does not include any repairs to either docks or roundhouses?

Mr. CHEVRIER: All current repairs.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: That does not take into account any of the dredging?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No.

Mr. JAQUES: Will the minister tell me when we reach the item I am interested in?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes; I will tell the hon. gentleman when we reach the item he wishes to discuss.

Item agreed to.

Deficits—National harbours board—

482. Advances to national harbours board, subject to the provisions of section 29 of the National Harbours Board Act, to meet expenditures applicable to the calendar year 1947 on any or all of the following accounts:

Reconstruction and capital expenditures—		
Montreal	$419,500	
Vancouver	153,800	
	$573,300	
Less amount to be expended from replacement funds	41,800	
		$531,500

[Mr. McLure.]

Mr. GREEN: That includes two payments, one for the port of Montreal and one for the port of Vancouver. Has any arrangement been made within the last few weeks with regard to the Second Narrows bridge in Vancouver? A newspaper report on June 16 said in the headnote, "May cut bridge charge; government makes offer," and read in part as follows:

Second Narrows bridge will probably be returned debt-free and in good condition to its original bondholders, Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company by the end of 1951.

This is expected following an announcement made in Ottawa today by Hon. Lionel Chevrier, Minister of Transport.

Can the minister explain the facts with regard to that report?

Mr. CHEVRIER: What happened was that there was a refinancing of the debt. The matter was studied over a period of years. I have the facts here. It is a fairly involved matter which I should not like to go into, but representations had been made by a number of people, by the various public bodies there, and by members from this side of the house.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): The hon. member for Vancouver North.

Mr. CHEVRIER: By the hon. member for Vancouver North and by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni—

Mr. KNOWLES: He is an Independent.

Mr. CHEVRIER: —in addition to those I have mentioned. They asked that there be a refunding of the moneys, or at least that there be a reduction in the interest from five per cent to 2¾ per cent. This money, which in amount was in the neighbourhood of one million and some thousand dollars, had been advanced by the predecessors of the national harbours board in order to provide for the building of the Second Narrows bridge. The board paid off the money lent from the banks by its predecessors. It was paying a lower rate of interest than it was charging up to these people. It consented to reduce the rate from five per cent to 2¾ per cent upon certain terms and conditions. By that reduction it will hasten the return of the bridge to the owners. With the amount of tolls which are being collected today, I think in five years the bridge will be turned over to its original owners with full payment of the amount owing. I am just reminded of this which is important. There was a conditional offer. There were one or two conditions, the terms of which I have not before me. If those terms are met, then the offer stands. If they are not met, of course it may be necessary to withdraw the offer.

Mr. GREEN: Then, in effect, it is a conditional offer subject to these special conditions being met?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am sorry, but I cannot hear the hon. member.

Mr. GREEN: It is a conditional offer?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes. It is not conditional in so far as the reduction of interest is concerned; that is, the reduction of rate.

Mr. GREEN: What is conditional?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): The city and district of North Vancouver are grateful for this offer and are going to accept it, so that the hon. member can put his mind at ease.

Mr. GREEN: A strong request has been made that cargo rates in the port of Vancouver be done away with. I believe that our port is the only one in which cargo rates are charged. What is the present position with regard to that?

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is true. There are cargo rates in Vancouver; but there are no dockage charges such as there are in other ports. It is true that representations have been made asking that these be removed. The average charge is small and, when compared with the rates in the Pacific coast ports of Seattle, Tacoma and San Francisco, the rates in the port of Vancouver are much lower.

Mr. GREEN: We consider it unfair that we should have to pay cargo rates when none of the other national ports are charging them. I do not think it is fair to maintain them because they may have them in Seattle and Portland.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The totality of the charges in Vancouver is less than in Pacific Coast ports and no higher than in eastern ports.

Mr. GREEN: That is not the submission made by the Vancouver people. Will the minister have any special investigation made into that question of cargo rates?

Mr. CHEVRIER: The charges have not been touched since the national harbours board took over. Local boards and local bodies fixed those rates, and we have not increased them in any way, notwithstanding the fact that all other things have gone up and applications have been made for increases in many transportation services.

Mr. GREEN: This is just another good example of why there should be some local control of the Vancouver harbour. This business of control from three thousand miles away simply is not good enough.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It was local control that put the rates on.

Mr. GREEN: That was a condition many years ago before the national harbours board was set up. Under present conditions, we feel that these rates should be taken off; and we shall not be satisfied until there is some sort of local control set up in this regard.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): The hon. member for Vancouver South mentioned the Second Narrows bridge. The city and district of North Vancouver, who are the bondholders concerned, are most grateful to the minister for the reduction of the interest rate from five per cent to two and three quarters per cent after seven years of negotiation, and have gladly accepted the condition that all revenues be applied to the reduction of the loan so that they will return the bridge to the owners in four years.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Monday, July 7, 1947

The house met at two o'clock.

CAPITAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

FIRST INTERIM REPORT—INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AREAS—RIDEAU CANAL BRIDGE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I desire to table the first interim report of the national capital planning committee, together with related documents and reports, with the exception of appendix 4 to the first interim report.

The present report of the national capital planning committee is an interim report dealing with two particular projects involved in the general planning of the capital. The first recommendation in the report deals with the acquisition of certain areas on the outskirts of the cities of Ottawa and Hull for industrial development purposes. The second recommendation deals with the construction of a new bridge across the Rideau canal, at a point about midway between Rideau and Laurier streets, in order to provide a new thoroughfare to relieve the present congestion of traffic in the area of confederation square.

So far as the first recommendation is concerned the proposal is to have certain areas

acquired by the government in order that they may be made available for industrial uses. A tentative recommendation with regard to the precise areas involved has been submitted on appendix 4 to the report. However, it is felt that on these details further study is desirable and, for this reason, copies of appendix 4 are not being tabled at this time. The appendix, or such modification of it as is finally decided on, will be tabled at a later date.

The broad purpose in recommending the acquisition of industrial sites is to enable land to be used for industry in locations where there would be no conflict with the general plans for the capital. These locations would be so selected as to make possible the ultimate removal of many of the railway lines which at present intersect the capital in such a way as to mar its appearance and to add to the hazards and congestion of traffic. The proposal is that initially the cost of acquiring the areas should be borne by the government. However, it is recommended that the property should be sold, over a period of time, to industrial users wishing to locate in the capital area, in such a way that the project would become largely or completely self-liquidating.

So far as the second recommendation, with regard to the bridge, is concerned, I believe hon. members who have had experience with the traffic congestion in confederation square and in front of the station will agree that something must be done at an early day to improve conditions. The proposal for the bridge appears to be a possible solution, and an item will be included in the supplementary estimates for $100,000 to enable preliminary engineering surveys and estimates of cost to be made.

I wish to emphasize that both projects which I have mentioned are at present simply recommendations of the national capital planning committee, carrying with them the approval of the federal district commission. Before any final decisions are taken with regard to them they will be given most careful consideration by the government and discussed in such manner as may be necessary with the municipal authorities involved.

Mr. BOUCHER: Does the government contemplate taking any further action on this report this session?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have mentioned that there will be a vote in the supplementary estimates which will refer to what I have just said. It is intended to permit of further action forthwith.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

PRIVATE BILLS

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 105

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK moved:

That for the remainder of the session standing order 105, respecting the posting of private bills, be suspended.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 414, to incorporate The Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Labrador.—Mr. Dorion.

Bill No. 416, to incorporate the Yellowknife Telephone Company.—Mr. Robinson (Simcoe East).

Bill No. 418, for the relief of Maud Mary Rose Denton.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 419, for the relief of Judith Bychowsky Sanders.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 420, for the relief of Marie Irene Joly Martineau.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 421, for the relief of Sam Pronman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 422, for the relief of Eva Greenblatt Thow.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 423, for the relief of Edith Norma Issac Davidson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 424, for the relief of Ida Lottie Stubina Pollack.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 425, for the relief of Minnie Black Herman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 426, for the relief of Clifford Gilbert Adams.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 427, for the relief of Dallas Sara Barnes Millington.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 428, for the relief of Madeleine Agnes Joly de Lotbiniere Doucet.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 429, for the relief of Adeline Charlotte Simone Desjardins Teakle.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 430, for the relief of Margaret Blane Bowen Adair.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 431, for the relief of Mary Hrab Navrotzki.—Mr. Maybank.

TRUST COMPANIES ACT

VARIOUS AMENDMENTS

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance) moved the first reading of Bill No. 417 (from the Senate) to amend the Trust Companies Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

*CONVERSION OF SHIP FOR TRANSPORT OF IMMIGRANTS

Mr. THATCHER:

1. Is the government at present converting or overhauling a ship, to make it suitable for carrying immigrants?
2. If so, when will the conversion be completed?
3. By what company is the work being done, and at approximately what cost?
4. Upon completion, how many passengers will the ship carry?

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to answer this question in its present form, but perhaps I can give the information my hon. friend desires. The question refers to the ship *Huascaran,* which was delivered to Canada by Germany as part of the reparations. The ship was reported to be available at a German harbour in a damaged condition. The government had no convenient means of taking charge of the ship in a German harbour; therefore it was turned over to War Assets Corporation and tenders were called for, with reserve bid by the government in the amount shown by the reparations commission. The ship was purchased by a Canadian firm, was repaired in Germany and then moved to Britain for further repairs, and has now been delivered in Canada. The ship has been surveyed and is found capable of carrying 600 immigrants. The survey was made at the request of the present owners, who propose to convert the ship at their own expense for carrying immigrants. The Department of Mines and Resources will cooperate to the extent of furnishing the immigrants, provided that the ship will accept immigrants at such points as are nominated by the department.

*POLYMER PLANT AT SARNIA

Mr. WINKLER:

1. What was the cost to the government of the Polymer plant for producing rubber at Sarnia?
2. When did it begin producing rubber?
3. What would be the amount of depreciation of capital allowed for taxation purposes had the corporation been a privately owned plant constructed for and working for war contracts?

Mr. HOWE:

1. $49,931,163.92 to March 31, 1947.

2. September 29, 1943.

3. This is a hypothetical question amounting to: if it paid taxes how much taxes would it pay? Hypothetical questions are barred under the rules, as the hon. member will see if he consults Beauchesne, third edition, page 119, paragraph 295. I may say, however, that up to March 31 last the earnings of the Polymer Corporation, if applied to reduction of capital, would have reduced capital expenditure by something in excess of $19,000,000.

MURIATE OF POTASH USED AS FERTILIZER

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia):

How much muriate of potash has been used for fertilizer in Canada in each of the years 1939 to 1946, inclusive?

Mr. MacKINNON:

Sales of muriate of potash for direct use as fertilizer

Year ended June 30	(tons)
1939	8,643
1940	7,808
1941	7,425
1942	5,419
1943	5,376
1944	4,924
1945	5,223
1946	3,794

Muriate of potash used in the manufacture of mixed fertilizers

Calendar year	(tons)
1939	40,320
1940	43,902
1941	42,815
1942	41,648
1943	51,500
1944	52,863
1945	69,730

AMMONIUM PHOSPHATE AND SUPERPHOSPHATES —CONSUMPTION IN CANADA

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia):

How much ammonium phosphate and/or superphosphates has been used in Canada for each of the years 1939 to 1946, inclusive?

Mr. MacKINNON:

Sales of ammonium phosphate for direct use as fertilizer

Year ended June 30	(tons)
1939	8,977
1940	12,444
1941	10,084
1942	11,478
1943	11,984
1944	16,910
1945	32,182
1946	33,298

Ammonium phosphate used in manufacture of mixed fertilizers

Calendar year	(tons)
1939	3,575
1940	4,071
1941	3,122
1942	3,358
1943	3,890
1944	1,946
1945	3,938

Sales of superphosphate for direct use as fertilizer

Year ended June 30	(tons)
1939	53,721
1940	44,999
1941	39,824
1942	38,630
1943	40,319
1944	38,268
1945	33,710
1946	30,811

Superphosphate used in manufacture of mixed fertilizers

Calendar year	(tons)
1939	174,849
1940	175,045
1941	143,420
1942	178,221
1943	214,340
1944	234,172
1945	220,423

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

WAR ASSETS—EMPLOYMENT OF AGENTS

Mr. SHAW:

1. Has War Assets Corporation at any time employed agents to assist in disposing of surplus crown assets within Canada?

2. If so (a) what are the names of all such agents; (b) what was the total amount of sales made or arranged by each agent; (c) what commission and/or other compensation has been paid to each such agent to date?

Mr. McILRAITH: Return tabled.

CHALK RIVER, ONT., FOREST RESEARCH STATION—SUPERINTENDENT

Mr. GREEN:

1. How many applications were received for the position of superintendent, Forest Research Station, at Chalk River, Ontario? (Competition No. 46-3458.)

2. How many of the applicants were veterans?

3. Who was awarded the position?

4. Is he a veteran?

[Mr. MacKinnon.]

5. Previous to this appointment was this man permanently employed with the dominion forest service?

6. If not a veteran, what special qualifications did this man have to give him preference over veterans who applied for this position?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Return tabled.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INQUIRY AS TO HOLDING OF SECRET SESSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I would ask a question of the government. Is there a secret meeting of the house to be held tomorrow, and on what matters? Because when Sir Robert Borden had a secret he used to tell it to his cabinet.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): There is no secret meeting of the house.

FURS

EXCISE AND SALES TAXES—PETITION FROM BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. CHESTER S. McLURE (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Did he receive a resolution or petition from the Canadian National Silver Fox Breeders Association asking for the removal of the excise tax on ranch furs and the sales tax on articles manufactured or trimmed with ranch raised furs?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): I do not recall. I may have received such representations. I received a great many of a similar kind. I will make inquiries.

DOMINION COAL BOARD

ADMINISTRATION OF SUBVENTIONS OR SUBSIDIES—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENT

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction and Supply) moved the second reading of and concurrence in an amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 340, to establish the dominion coal board.

Mr. GREEN: Will the minister explain the amendment?

Mr. HOWE: It is to correct a small drafting error. The word "and" is substituted for "or".

Motion agreed to; amendment read the second time and concurred in.

NATIONAL PARKS

ADJUSTMENT OF BOUNDARIES, ADDITIONS, ETC.

The house resumed from Thursday, July 3, consideration of the motion of Mr. Howe for the second reading of Bill No. 365, respecting certain national parks and to amend the National Parks Act.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): This seems to be a sort of omnibus bill covering quite a number of parks. With some of the recommendations contained in the bill I can find no fault. Some of them are excellent, but there is one vicious recommendation, namely, the part which refers to the Prince Albert park. A measure having to do with this park was withdrawn in this house some six years ago.

I see no objection whatever, in fact I am quite in accord with the recommendation to increase the size of the Fort Beausejour park. If I understand the bill properly, the land consists of twenty acres, and is being donated by Doctor J. C. Webster who is the chairman of the national parks board. If I might digress for a moment—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman. May I ask the hon. members to moderate their voices? It is almost impossible to follow the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. MacNICOL: I was about to say that the house and the country should pay marked respect to Doctor Webster for his great generosity in donating some twenty acres of land, as I understand it, to the country. If it can be done in any way that will be accepted, the house should pay that mark of respect to Doctor Webster. Fort Beausejour is a fine park and one that is visited by many tourists. The parcel of land which Doctor Webster has donated contains the site of General Moncton's lines of attack in the siege of 1775. That part of the bill I can very strongly support.

I see no objection to the part pertaining to Riding Mountain. It looks to me like an exchange of one square mile of land inside Riding Mountain park in Manitoba for a square mile of land on the borders of Riding Mountain park. I have been in Riding Mountain park on several occasions. In Riding Mountain park Manitoba has a magnificent area, but I should like to see it enlarged. I am sure that the people of Manitoba are delighted to have such a splendid park in their province, and I see no reason why the part of the bill having to do with this park should not be supported.

As I understand it the bill does not indicate that any payment is to be made for this exchange. When the minister closes the debate I should like him to explain whether the exchange in Riding Mountain park is an exchange of 640 acres in the park for 640 acres outside. If so, whoever is responsible for the exchange should be complimented.

Elk Island park, which I have visited, is some distance east of Edmonton where we have many buffalo which belong to this country. That part of the bill I can support, because it increases the grazing area for the buffalo and the other animals in Elk Island park. I do not know why the government wishes to reduce Waterton Lakes park. I cannot understand it. If there is some legitimate reason for it I would not particularly oppose it, but that area of Alberta needs all the watershed of Waterton that it can get. The reduction will not be very large, some sixteen square miles, I believe, but we own it, and in my judgment, any reduction of the area adjacent to Waterton Lake will be bad for this country. It should not be supported. It is such a small matter that I am not going to carry on the debate too long. I should like the minister to look into that. I realize that the minister who is piloting the bill is perhaps not familiar with all these areas. I want to be as sympathetic to him as I can; I want to help him rather than to obstruct him. Waterton is a beautiful lake. I doubt whether there is a more beautiful lake in North America. These sixteen square miles adjacent to it have been used for the feeding of wild animals. We are now told that these animals are getting numerous. If we take this feeding area of sixteen square miles away from that area we shall be reducing the feeding area roundabout for the animals. If we do not have to do it, and if the public does not gain anything by doing it, if I were the minister I would oppose any recommendation to reduce the area around Waterton Lake.

Another recommendation of the bill has to do with the Nemiskam park and Buffalo park areas. I am not familiar with either one of those, therefore I cannot comment on them. Apparently these two parks are to be wiped out. Not having seen them I am not going to say anything about either one of these changes. If there is no reason why they should be kept, perhaps there is no reason why I should oppose their not being kept.

The next recommendation is one which I strongly oppose. I refer to the reduction in area of the Prince Albert park. The one province in Canada that has very little park area is Saskatchewan. I know of only two other Saskatchewan parks, one near the

Cypress hills and the other around Watrous. The third is Prince Albert park. I do not know whether I have been to Prince Albert park. I drove northwest of Prince Albert for perhaps forty or fifty miles at the time I was making a survey of the watershed of the Sturgeon river. I was interested in that because during the Northwest rebellion the Hudson bay boats wintered at the mouth of the Sturgeon river. Years before that the Hudson bay boats traversing the Saskatchewan river wintered at the junction of the Sturgeon and Saskatchewan rivers. I like to see areas in which I am interested. I was interested in the history associated with the Sturgeon river. The Sturgeon river forms about one-third to one-half of the west boundary of the Prince Albert park.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I wish the hon. member woud face this way. I cannot hear a word he says.

Mr. MacNICOL: I had started to say that one reason I became interested in the Prince Albert park is that about one-third of the west boundary of the park is formed by the Sturgeon river. It is an historical river in that part of Saskatchewan. In the early days the Hudson bay boats wintered at the mouth of the Sturgeon river because of the water roads at the mouth of the river. During the rebellion of 1885 it played a small part in that rebellion.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The hon. member is now discussing Prince Albert.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes: I believe the south boundary of Prince Albert park is about forty miles north of Prince Albert. I do not claim to know anything about the inside of the park, never having travelled through it. I travelled through much of the area east of it. I presume the area is much the same as the park itself. It is about fifty-four miles down the west boundary and about thirty miles across the top boundary; there is a large part of the park projecting about eighteen miles east of the third meridian, and that projection ranges about twenty-four miles north. It is that part, that eighteen by twenty-four miles, that the bill proposes taking off Prince Albert park.

It has been said, although I do not know whether the minister himself has expressed the same opinion, that that particular area is of little importance or value. Whoever says so, I would say that he is not at all familiar with the river watersheds in that locality. He cannot be if he feels like that. That particular 350 square miles comprise in the area which it is proposed to take out is, in my judgment, a mighty important part of the watershed of the Montreal river which drains into Lac la Ronge and then into the Churchill river. A few nights ago we passed a bill granting $6,300,000 for the preservation of the watersheds on the east slopes of the Rocky mountains in connection with the Saskatchewan river. This strikes me as being the reversal of that policy, because we are going to throw away—that is all we are doing—an important part of the watershed of the Montreal river in that area.

Mr. HOWE: I would point out that it is not proposed to alienate all the property in question from the crown. Part of it is being changed from a national park to an Indian reserve, on the theory that the Indians can make better use of it than the park commission.

Mr. MacNICOL: I said I wanted to be easy on the minister because I know that he does not know much about the area. He does not administer that department, and unless he travels through the area he cannot be familiar with it. If he had travelled through it I do not think he would make that statement. This 350 miles, comprising between 75 and 150 lakes, is a very important part of that area. Two or three of these lakes are quite extensive. Part of the Montreal lake, which is a fairly large body of water, is also included.

It has been said that it is largely a muskeg area, but I must tell the minister that, next to a lake there is no part of the watershed that is as valuable to the river as muskeg. The other day the statement was made that the area was of little value because it was muskeg. Muskeg is of great importance to the watershed of any river, and I suggest that every possible effort should be made to preserve the watersheds of our rivers instead of throwing them open, I was going to say, to destruction. In fact, I think that term expresses it correctly, because as soon as this 350 square miles is taken out of the national park it will be denuded of forest. I believe there are a million and a half feet of timber on this 350 square miles, and that forest will be denuded if that territory is taken out ruthlessly.

I am not opposed to the taking out of timber that should be removed. The Ontario government is doing it in Algonquin park, but it is doing it under the instructions of engineers who mark the trees that should be taken out. I would not oppose trees being cut in that park by the government. The statement has been made that there are a million and a half board measure feet there. What I am opposed to, however, since I have taken a

great interest in the conservation of our natural resources all my life, is the ruthless destruction of any of the watersheds of any part of them. When this park was created in 1927 or 1928, those who undertook the work deserved every credit. I suggest, however, that if they had looked ahead they would have carried the line of the park right up the Churchill river and so created in Saskatchewan the largest national park in Canada. That is one province that should have a large park and there is little park area in southern Saskatchewan. There are only the two small ones I referred to earlier. This is a natural national park area and the part it is proposed now to take out should be retained.

I wish the minister could visualize as I do the effects of the proposal now before us. He would draw his pencil through that part of the bill without any hesitation. So far as the rest of it is concerned, it may not involve any great amount of trouble, but certainly that part of the bill is one that I shall oppose as strongly as possible and when we get into committee I intend to move a motion to throw it out. I shall do this because of the great value to Canada of all the head waters of the Churchill river. Up to the present little has been done on the Churchill river. As the minister knows, it flows into Hudson bay at Churchill. There is a large volume of water which, six miles west of Churchill, provides a fairly substantial power site. I have heard various figures mentioned—one million, two million or three million.

Every part of that watershed should be preserved for power purposes. I know that is only a small part of it, but many a mickle makes a muckle, and if this area that I speak of is destroyed, many other parts of that watershed will suffer likewise, and in due time we shall find ourselves faced with exactly the same situation as we have had to face on the Saskatchewan, being under the necessity of voting millions of dollars for restoration. There is no reason why we should have to do any such thing, because the country owns that area now.

This area does not play an important part inside the park itself, but it does possess the attribute of being muskeg, which preserves the moss, as muskeg does, for the feeding of wild animals; and, as the minister knows, that part of Prince Albert park is a breeding ground for wild animals in all that area. Moreover, east of this area, outside Prince Albert park, is one of the best hunting grounds in Canada, and certainly in the province of Saskatchewan. But the breeding grounds would be destroyed if the trees were cut down.

As I view it, it would be a retrograde step to take that 350 miles out of the Prince Albert park and I must protest as strongly as I can against the introduction of what I would call a vicious proposal, a proposal that was pretty well thrown out of the house six years ago. As a matter of fact, the bill was withdrawn at that time. I suggest that it should have been thrown out; it should have been kicked out, and I would like to see this particular part of the measure now before us kicked out at this time. In my opinion it is a vicious proposal to bring it in together with several good things we do not wish to oppose.

Why was not this Prince Albert park part of the bill brought in by itself? Some members may not wish to oppose it in view of the fact that it contains other features that they would like to support. However, as I say, when we are in committee we can move to delete this particular part.

I have travelled the area adjacent to it and I look upon all these areas as very valuable from the standpoint of the watersheds of our rivers. In this particular case, when you consider the Montreal river, the headwaters of one of the branches of the Churchill river, and appraise their importance to the country, I submit that it would be a retrograde step to take this territory out of the park area with the possibility of the timber being ruthlessly taken off and the muskeg being destroyed.

Someone will say that the purpose of the bill is to help the Indians. I am all for that, and if I thought the Indian would get any part of it I would say, yes, let the Indian have a part of it. But he will not get it. There are a good many halfbreeds in that country; indeed there are more halfbreeds than there are Indians. These halfbreeds as well as the Indians and the whites would have their rights there, because once you surrender title to it and it goes back to the province they can do what they like with it. In my opinion that would be very bad business.

The Prime Minister has a special interest in that park and I should think he would like to see it preserved. It was opened in 1927 when he began to represent that part of the country, and the people, out of respect for his great support in creating the park, presented him with an ideal cottage on the shores of Lake Waskesiu. I have heard it said that when you stand on the verandah of that cottage and look over the lake the scene is one of the most picturesque the eye can behold. If this part of the park is taken out it will seriously affect that locality.

If you take away two other small areas on the south side of the park, as is proposed—and it consists, I believe, of thirty acres more

or less—and open it up to settlement, are you not going to invite a fire hazard into the park itself? I think we should make every effort to preserve that park. Saskatchewan needs it more than does any other part of Canada, but we all need it. What do we get out of any reduction of the park? We are told that we get a reduction of the cost of perhaps one or two fire rangers. But what is that? When this house cuts things down so small that it is going to throw away good park land for the sake of saving the salaries of one or two fire-rangers, it is getting down pretty small indeed. If we were so careful as that in the expenditure of all our moneys we should have today a surplus of hundreds of millions of dollars instead of what we have.

I would urge the minister not to let anyone convince him that the surrender of this additional thirty odd acres more or less, on the south side of the park, will be of benefit to Canada. It will not be of benefit to Canada. We do not have to surrender it and we get nothing out of it in any event. The same thing applies to the big eastern area. I want to plead with the minister as strongly as I can. He has heard me say many times that I have a warm feeling for him. He has done a big job. I have said that before. That is not flattery. I say to him: Do not let somebody come in here and tell you—and they must know you are not familiar with that area—to jam this bill through. Do not let anybody do that. The minister has done too many good things to be mixed up with a business like this; and I do not mean that he is mixed up in it in any way other than that the country is surrendering land which should be retained for park purposes, muskeg and trees, and for the preservation of the watersheds of the Montreal river. As one who has travelled to the headwaters of most rivers and surveyed their origin, I am intensely interested in their preservation. As far as the Montreal river is concerned, that 350 miles is almost priceless to its preservation. I know it starts in Waskesiu lake in the main park itself. I know it gets some of its water from Kingsmere lake, called after our Prime Minister. But a large source of it comes out of that 350 square miles which contain some 75 to 150 lakes. This is my last word. I know one thing. If the minister just sees the picture as I see it—and I have seen a lot of it—he will have the same opinion as I have, namely, that the watersheds of these rivers are priceless and should not be ruthlessly thrown away. We own them now and we should retain them.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, when I first entered the House of Commons in 1922 I brought to the attention of parliament the great value a national and provincial parks system could have to the people of this country, from the point of view of preserving the regions named, of the beautification of the country, of health and recreation, and the providing of educational facilities and outdoor sport for all classes of our people. The bill before the house today is a limited one. Its purpose is to adjust the boundaries of four national parks under the general statute and also to close two others. The purpose of the bill is all right as far as it goes, but I desire to call attention to one fact. Part of the bill provides for certain social services, for health, recreation, and so on, which the people outside of the national parks system are given by the provinces. I would call the attention of the minister to one or two things about this policy. The principle of the bill is very largely what I wish to speak about. I remember years ago, when I first entered the House of Commons, I called attention to the deplorable condition of the battlefields and parks in the Niagara district. The house at Queenston Heights which was formerly the printing establishment of the Prime Minister's grandfather, William Lyon Mackenzie, was dilapidated, and the battlefields of the war of 1812 practically in ruins. My calling the attention of the government to that led to a debate in the house and later to a large expenditure by the Niagara Falls park commission and the rebuilding of the forts, parks and driveways.

How does it come about that this particular bill should be left to the hundred and sixth sitting day of the House of Commons? It deals with the important matter of the national parks system and the natural resources of this country, which are unsurpassed by those of any other country in the world. We should have had this up in the early days of the session. It comes up like external affairs estimates, in the dying days of the session. I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I want to say to the government that I am very much dissatisfied. I admit that little or nothing could be done during the war about this national parks system; the war was paramount. But now that the war is over—and it has been over for two years—there has been plenty of time to get on with the work and the programme and have surveys made in all the provinces. I remember taking this matter up, and set out in the explanatory notes, with regard to the two parks named. I have no objection to the policy or the principle of the bill, but I want to call attention to one thing. The province of

Ontario, from which the present minister comes, is a forgotten province. I remember ever since I have been a member of the House of Commons that has been so. We see only five or six members from Ontario here today who are interested in a big matter like this. We have great natural resources in our province, in new Ontario, in the Rideau canal built by the British government in 1844, the Trent canal connecting Muskoka and Temagami, lake Ontario and lake Simcoe, up to Severn bridge and beyond that, connecting with Georgian bay. We have a magnificent system of inland lakes and rivers in Northern Ontario and in the Peterborough district—Georgian bay, Parry Sound, the Nipissing district and right to the head of the lakes which the minister officially represents.

The general principle of the bill deals with the whole policy of a national parks system for the whole country. The act has now been amended three or four times; I think the last time was about 1941. As a result of the criticism I made in the house I was glad to see that the maritimes obtained some national parks in 1941. I have a list of the parks here. I will not refer to them, but they are set out on page 33 of the "Canada Year Book" and in the minister's annual report. The development of our national parks system was held up by the war—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the general principle of the bill. If he wants to discuss the general policy of the department, or part of it, he should do it when the estimates are before the house.

Mr. CHURCH: You are quite right, Mr. Speaker. In my opening remarks I said I was going to discuss the principle of the bill. The principle of the bill is all that may be discussed at this stage.

As I have said already, nothing has been done about the parks since the war, but I believe an interprovincial conference has been held within the past year or two with a view to coordinating the national and provincial parks. Surveys have been made but aside from this bill nothing has yet been done. We in Ontario get no help at all, except in the Niagara district, from the province, and I call the attention of the minister to the lack of national parks in our province.

As to this particular bill may I say that I believe we have a great opportunity to make the whole of Canada like Switzerland, not only a huntsman's paradise but a thing of beauty and a joy forever. We have summer sports and winter sports, wild life, fishing and everything that could be desired—a huntsman's and fisherman's paradise. No other country in the world has such great natural resources; and instead of having these matters brought up in parliament in the last days of the session I hope they will be taken up at the coming interprovincial conference so that we shall get real value for the money expended on our park system. We are fifty years behind the times in catering to the tourist trade and developing our great natural resources.

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I spoke on a bill similar to this in 1941, in relation to the Alberta national park; and I oppose the transfer of these lands from the dominion to the provincial governments at the present time. When the minister spoke on July 3 he said the land in question was not of much use anyway, that the land we were turning back or giving away was all muskeg. The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) pointed out, however, that the muskeg was the water supply for the various lakes. From what I have heard and what I have been told by Alberta members I believe the dominion government is extremely foolish in turning back this land to the province of Saskatchewan. The bill states that some of this land will be turned into farms, which means it will gradually be encroached upon until there will not be a stick of timber left standing in the whole district. Even the timber in the portion the government intends to retain will be affected by the remainder of the land being denuded of trees, as will be the case, with the resulting loss of moisture. On June 24 of this year, in the other place, the minister who tried to pilot this bill through this house in 1941 said:

> I recall being in the park in 1937, at the height of the drought in Saskatchewan, when everything was parched. I saw a farmer, his wife and three children drive into the park in an old model T Ford car with some provisions. They found a suitable place and pitched a tent to sleep in at night; and I thought what a wonderful thing it was that these people from the parched prairie country could come in and see evergreen trees and water and animals; and that, even if the park conferred no other benefits, what a boon it was to the children. This vacation feature is one of the great advantages of our park systems all across Canada.

In the estimates this year is an item of $650,000 for the tourist bureau. That money is to be used to attract tourists to Canada. If this bill goes through it will mean that on the one hand the government is paying out money to draw tourists to Canada while on the other hand it is getting rid of the attractions for the tourists. The minister knows that when they begin to cut trees eventually the pine, hemlock and spruce all disappear, because they

cannot live without water. He also knows that if this land is turned over to the government of Saskatchewan, or any other government, who will allow settlers and Indians to go in there, eventually their holdings will be expanded into the present park so that before too long we shall have another bill before parliament asking that another 373 square miles or more be removed from our parks. Just think what that means. The 373 square miles mentioned here would be equal to a piece of land a mile wide reaching from here to Kitchener, Ontario, which is a good deal of land. I plead with the minister to amend this bill by deleting that provision. Let this park remain as it is. It is foolish for this government to spend money to attract tourists to Canada and at the same time destroy the attractions that bring them here.

Mr. D. KING HAZEN (St. John-Albert): I am not familiar with the Prince Albert national park, but the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) made a statement opposing any reduction in its area, which I think deserves some reply. When we have once established a park I think it is a great mistake to cut down its area, unless there are very good reasons for doing so. However, I do not rise this afternoon to discuss that matter because, as I say, I am not personally familiar with the park. My purpose in rising is to join with the hon. member for Davenport in expressing appreciation to Doctor J. C. Webster and Mrs. Webster of Shediac, New Brunswick, for their very generous gift to the Dominion of Canada of over twenty acres of land, which will form an important addition to our historic parks. Doctor Webster, who was born in New Brunswick, for many years was a prominent physician in the city of Chicago, where he had an international reputation. When he retired from practice he returned to his native province, and since that time both he and Mrs. Webster have devoted a good part of their time and some of their wealth to its welfare. This gift he and Mrs. Webster are now making to the dominion is just one of many gifts they have made for the benefit of the people of this country.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): I should like to add my word to the discussion of this bill, because I understand a certain portion of Waterton Lakes national park is to be cut out, with the net result that the area of that park will be reduced. I am not altogether satisfied with the reasons that have been given for taking out that portion of the park set out in the bill. Evidently it is not a large portion; nevertheless there must be some reason for cutting it out. When the minister replies I should like him to give that reason, and the arguments in support of it. As a general principle I think we must take the attitude that we do not want our national parks reduced in size. If anything we want them to be extended or additional national parks acquired.

We have to preserve wild animal life in the mountainous regions. Most of the wild animals of Canada need plenty of grazing lands. Perhaps I could give an illustration. Banff national park is one of the finest virgin national parks in the world. There are a great many bear, mountain sheep, elk, antelope, moose, buffalo and other wild animals in that park, but I understand their number is gradually diminishing. They should be preserved. Banff is a great tourist attraction because the mountain scenery is simply magnificent. If tourists go to Banff hoping to see the wild animals of Canada they find that it is almost like looking for a needle in a haystack. They are there somewhere, but the park is quite large. Going into Banff you notice a sign with an arrow or hand pointing to the animal paddocks, but when the tourists go there expecting to see wild animals all they find are a few small mangy buffalo. The grass all over the paddock is worn and I am sure that tourists must get a wrong impression of the wild life in Canada. I do not believe that any other animals but buffalo are fenced off in the park.

If a tourist in Banff wants to see the bears he must wait until night and go down to the old stinking dump ground where they come in for their evening meal. There is no reason why a considerable portion of the park could not be set aside for bears.

In the southern part of Alberta, particularly around the Waterton lakes, there is wonderful mountainous country, although the scenery may not be quite as magnificent as at Banff, lake Louise or the Columbia ice fields. However, the southern part of Alberta is perhaps more prolific in forest growth and grazing pasture, and I believe plenty of room should be given to these animals. I know the department has spent considerable sums in Waterton lakes park. They have built a number of cottages and more and more people are coming to the park every year to spend their vacations. It is on the direct highway to the United States, and more and more tourists are coming from the United States to the park.

As a matter of broad principle the government should retain these parks and if pos-

sible make them larger instead of reducing their size. More money should be spent to make them real tourist attractions. On these broad principles I am afraid that I shall have to oppose the bill. I noticed from the discussion in the other place in respect to Prince Albert park that it was argued that the part to be taken out is of no use. I do not know whether that would refer also to the Waterton lakes park, but if it is of no use, what are you going to do with it? Someone will say: Give it back to the Indians. That is a nice argument—when it is of no use, give it back to the Indians. Or you may say: Give it back to the province. There is some reason for this government giving anything to the provinces.

If it is costing too much to maintain that portion of the park because of bog lands and the maintenance of highways, then is the government going to saddle the province with that expense? That does not make common sense and I do not think it is fair. As I say, on broad principles we shall have to oppose this bill unless the minister in charge can give a better reason for reducing the areas of these parks.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, in a general way I should like to associate myself with the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) who has just taken his seat. One defect in this bill is that the ordinary member is not in position to know about the whole situation. I hope the minister when he makes his statement will clarify a number of matters which seem obscure to me. Waterton lakes national park is in my constituency. All that the hon. member for Macleod has said and a good deal more is true. I can understand how it might be wise to consider removing a certain portion of that park so that settlers could pasture their stock and so that timbering operations might be carried on, but I should like to know if there has been a demand for this from the settlers who live in that part of the park. Will the minister tell us whether Alberta has asked that this portion be taken out of the park, and whether the settlers nearby have asked for the same thing? Is it deemed advisable, in the light of these two circumstances, that a change be made in the boundaries of Waterton Lakes national park?

I should like to ask two or three questions with regard to Prince Albert national park. This park is not in my constituency, but coming as I do from the west I am interested in it. Why does the government wish to dispose of an area from this park? The argument seems to be, first, that it costs too much to maintain, and second, that it is not suitable for park development. What constitutes suitability for park development? How is it that the area which it is proposed to remove from the park does not qualify as suitable for park development?

There seems to be considerable uncertainty as to whether this area is to be added to an Indian reserve. I am not very much impressed by the argument that it is to be added to a reserve. I find in the explanatory note that approximately 373 square miles are to be removed from the park. If I read what is stated aright, only ten of the 373 square miles are supposed to be handed to the Indians to be joined to the Little Indian River reserve. If that is the actual state of affairs, it looks to me as though this argument about adding lands to the Indian reserves is unimpressive.

It is said that the cost of patrolling this parcel of land which it is proposed to remove from the Prince Albert park has been excessive in respect of looking after forest fires and the game. Will the minister tell us when he makes his statement what has been the actual cost of maintaining Prince Albert park during each of the last twenty years—he should have the figures—and what portion of that cost may be properly applied to the area which it is proposed to remove from the park? It seems to me that only by such figures can we form an estimate of the validity of the arguments in respect of the upkeep cost.

This whole bill and everything that has been said about this project up to the present time fills me with a considerable amount of suspicion. I had a good deal of suspicion in 1941 when the measure was brought into the house and I certainly have not had any of my suspicions allayed by reading what the Hon. Mr. Crerar had to say on this subject on June 24. It looks to me as though he was not very well informed about the matter and therefore not a very satisfactory witness.

I should like to read to the minister some of the statements that were made in the other place regarding this transfer of property, and ask him to explain away the statements that are made. I find that the Hon. W. M. Aseltine made the following statement as reported in the Senate *Hansard* of June 24:

> An explanation given in committee was to the effect that there were some 400 Indians in the Montreal lake area, and that it was advisable that they should be given the right to trap in the area of some 350 square miles which it is now proposed to withdraw from the park.

Is it the intention to allow the Indians to trap over the whole 350 square miles? If

that is the case I can see that there might be considerable value in making the transfer if the Indians could use all that land. But later on the hon. senator says:

. . . whether or not they would be the only ones allowed to trap in the area in question I learned that half-breeds and white settlers were also given permission.

If that happens, the poor Indians are not going to have very much chance at the game in this area. Further on he says:

It was added to the park originally for the purpose of preserving wild life, including muskrats, mink and all kinds of fur-bearing animals, particularly the beaver, and big game, such as elk, moose, and deer. It is known for a certainty that the animals we were hunting on the eastern boundary of the park were bred in that park and had spread throughout the surrounding country. This is particularly true of Candle lake, the home of the last surviving band of elk running at large in western Canada. That territory is their home ground, and if it is taken out of the park and thrown open to the public it will only be a year or two before all those animals are shot and killed.

If what the hon. senator says is correct, and the fact that he is from Rosetown, Saskatchewan, and states that he has been over the area concerned and has hunted over land contiguous to that area seems to make his words worthy of consideration, would the minister explain that matter to us also when he speaks? The hon. senator went on:

The honourable senator has no idea how many hunters there are since the end of the war. During the war years all the young men were away but now they are back and are taking out hunting licences. They are allowed to go into this area. Even if the limit were one deer or one bull moose, it would only be a year or two before all these animals would be shot off.

I find myself strongly impressed by that statement because it is in conformity with what I have seen happen in parts of Alberta. Further on the hon. senator said:

This land was set aside, not only as a park but as a place in which to preserve for posterity the wild life of that part of Saskatchewan.

If that is the case, certainly the reason for preserving the wild life of Saskatchewan must be just as strong today as it was when this land was set aside, and if the wild life of the dominion is to be preserved the dominion government ought to assume as much responsibility therefore as any province. The hon. senator went on:

The timber will be cut down . . . I do not think the area proposed to be taken away is good for anything but park purposes.

That is widely at variance with the statement of Senator Crerar, who asserts definitely that it is not good for park purposes. How can any member be blamed for being completely confused over this matter when men supposed to know the most about the situation disagree so widely? When we have the hon. Senator Crerar, who was in this house as minister of mines and resources when the bill was introduced in 1941, and the hon. Senator Aseltine from Saskatchewan, who, by reason of his intimate experience with the park and the area in question, ought to know just as much about it as any other man, differing so widely, it seems to me that that is a situation which requires careful explanation on the part of the minister when he makes his reply.

The hon. Senator Kinley makes this statement in the Senate on June 24:

He stated that these Indians were not allowed to hunt in the park area, and that if this section was taken out of the park it would provide a source of livelihood for them. We hear a lot these days about the Indians, and what Canada took from them, and I think if they will live up in the north country, under such conditions as must prevail there, they should have the rights to any available hunting. We could very well turn the land over to the Indians.

The important aspect of that statement is that undoubtedly Senator Kinley was influenced to support the measure by the consideration that the whole of the area would be turned over to the Indians, when by the very statement in the bill itself opposite page 2, only ten square miles of this 373 square miles to be taken out of the park are to be turned over to the Indians. Surely there is something seriously wrong there. Senator Kinley went on to say, on the same page:

I said that if any land was available to the Indians we ought to let them have it.

With that I completely agree, and we should be sure before we take the land out of the park that it will be turned over to the Indians. In the same discussion Senator Crerar said:

As a matter of fact, the greater part of the area is muskeg. A little bit is developed and might be salvaged by some small operations, but it is not suitable for park purposes.

What is the explanation why muskeg is not suitable for park purposes? I fail to see why it would not be. Certainly it is excellent land for the raising of wild animals and it is attractive from the tourist standpoint. There are muskeg areas over which corduroy roads have been built which constitute some of the most interesting scenery to be found in Alberta, and I take it that muskeg in other parts of Canada would be equally interesting. Senator Crerar went on to say:

The Indians will not have the sole right of trapping, but they will be assured of their fair share, and thereby a substantial means of livelihood will be provided for the band of Indians at Montreal lake.

There again is uncertainty about this whole thing. It is said by some people that the Indians are not able to go in and hunt there today. As this area is part of a national park owned by the dominion I should like to know why the Indians should not be given access to hunting in that area. I cannot see why they should not be. Why should it be necessary to take this land out of the park in order to give the Indians a chance to hunt in the area? I shall say no more at this time, but when he makes his speech I would like to hear the minister's explanation of these conundrums.

Mr. D. S. HARKNESS (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the idea which has been put forward by several hon. members that our policy should be to increase rather than decrease the area of our national parks. The decrease which is provided for in this bill personally I should be loath to vote for until we have had a much better explanation than we have had so far as to why it is necessary. That is particularly true of the Prince Albert national park and the Waterton Lakes park. I should like a better explanation than the one given in the explanatory notes as to the abolition of the Nemiskam park which was originally set aside to provide a refuge for antelope. It is stated here that it is no longer necessary to have a refuge for animals because they have increased materially during the last ten or twenty years. That is correct, but there is no guarantee that they will not be practically wiped out again, particularly with the increase in population in the southern part of Alberta and Saskatchewan owing to the development of irrigation schemes. Personally I think there is every possibility of these parks being required for the protection of animals again in the not too distant future. I do not want to hold up the business of the house and therefore will not press the matter now, but when we reach the committee stage we should have a better explanation of the sections than has so far been given.

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Acting Minister of Mines and Resources): As hon. members know, I am the acting minister of the department, and in that capacity can only convey the information which is given to me by the officers of the department. The officers of the department believe it is important that these amendments be made to the National Parks Act.

In the case of the Waterton national park it is pointed out that the sixteen square miles to be removed from within the present park boundary and transferred back to the province lie in another watershed from that of the remainder of the park. The area of the Waterton Lakes park is considerable. The sixteen square miles is only a minor section of the park.

The maintenance of national parks by the federal government is a considerable obligation. There are certain standards to be maintained. We have standards of protection and of development, and we have certain standards of improvements. As I understand the situation from the officers of the department, the purpose of the bill is to reduce the parks to an area which can be kept up to the standard set by the government for these national parks.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Before the minister leaves the Waterton park will he answer this question, if the information has been given to him: Has there been a request on the part of Alberta—

Mr. HOWE: I am told there has been.

Mr. BLACKMORE: And a request by the settlers?

Mr. HOWE: Through the province. I am assured that the province and the federal government are in complete agreement that the boundaries of the park should be altered as proposed in this bill.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That would carry a great deal of weight with me.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the hon. member that he wait until we are in committee to put his questions.

Mr. HOWE: The remarks I have just made apply only to the Prince Albert national park. The 350 square miles that are to be either returned to the province or added to a nearby Indian reserve consist of acres that cannot be kept up to the standard required in national parks.

Reference has been made to this being a suitable hunting ground for Indians. Hon. members will appreciate the fact that the government cannot allow hunting in its national parks and still preserve the game in these parks. If an area is to be hunted over it must be outside the park boundaries. Conversely, if the area is to be kept within the national parks it cannot be hunted over. It so happens that a fur conservation plan is in operation, in partnership between the dominion and the Saskatchewan government, in a nearby area. The purpose of the fur conservation plan is to provide a means of livelihood for a band of Indians on a nearby reservation, and for certain other settlers in the area. It

is felt by both the province and the officers of the federal department, and by the government, that the well-being of the area will be better served by turning back the 350 square miles to the fur conservation plan, where it will be administered by the province under terms laid down by the federal government for a period of ten years, during which time its fur-bearing potentialities will be increased to the maximum possible. Ten square miles of the area is being transferred to the Indian reserve, and the remainder is being turned back to the province to be included in the fur conservation plan.

My purpose in rising, however, is to discuss section 9 of the bill. Section 9 is entirely new. At the present time the permanent residents in the parks do not receive the advantages of social services provided for other residents in the province in which the park is situated.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the minister, but it is against the rules to discuss a section of the bill on second reading. I suggest that he wait until we are in committee.

Mr. HOWE: It is not my purpose to discuss the section. This is a procedural point arising out of the fact that in the other place they decided that it was not competent to deal with one subsection, since it involved levying a tax. Therefore I find it my duty to ask for the unanimous consent of the house to introduce a resolution after second reading of this bill. After second reading I will move that the house go into committee on a resolution which will restore to the bill one subsection which was deleted in the other place.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. MacNICOL: On division.

Motion agreed to on division and bill read the second time.

Mr. HOWE moved:

That the house go into committee of the whole this day to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, that the following provision be inserted as paragraph (p) of subsection one of section nine of Bill No. 365 (letter M-9 of the senate), intituled: "An act respecting certain national parks and to amend The National Parks Act," now before the house:

(p) levying taxes upon the residents of a park in order to defray the cost of health and welfare services supplied to such residents by a province pursuant to an agreement made under paragraph (o) of this subsection or supplied to such residents by the government of Canada.

[Mr. Howe.]

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Mr. MacNICOL: Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, may I ask this question. Does the minister assume that the house concurs in the recommendation to add to section 9 something that will mean taxation on the residents of the park?

Mr. HOWE: No. The purpose is to bring the section before the house for discussion and thus restore it to the bill. It by no means means an acceptance of the provision.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee on the resolution, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. HOWE: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the house now go into committee on the bill.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—Additions to national parks.

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not know what the proper procedure is, but I should think there ought to be some motion, or at any rate a letter addressed to Doctor J. C. Webster, C.M.G., acknowledging the splendid gift he is making to the country in connection with this important park. If his wife is associated with him in the gift, I suggest that her name be coupled with any such acknowledgment.

Mr. HOWE: That has already been attended to by the minister of the appropriate department. The formal opening of the park was held and I believe that all honours have been bestowed upon Doctor Webster appropriate to the occasion. I cannot think of anything else, short of a vote of parliament, that would be appropriate.

Mr. MacNICOL: It is fitting that the minister should have mentioned the fact in the discussion of the bill.

Mr. HANSELL: The minister assured us on the second reading that as far as Waterton park is concerned the province has agreed to this change. I would like to have an elaboration of that statement. How were the negotiations carried on with the province? Has the minister any correspondence in that regard? Perhaps I might add to the question. Is this parcel of land of approximately sixteen

square miles simply to be passed over to the government of Alberta? Will they now be in possession of the land? When it is passed over to them will it be crown land in the right of the province to do with as they desire? I would like to know in what way the negotiations were conducted and whether there is any documentary evidence.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend is not discussing section 2 at the moment.

Mr. MacNICOL: That would come under section 5.

Mr. HANSELL: Then I will wait until we reach that section.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Land withdrawn from Prince Albert national park.

Mr. MacNICOL: I would like to move an amendment to have this clause struck out but I am informed that I cannot do so. I would ask the minister, however, to take steps to withdraw it, and if he does not care to do that then we shall have to ask for the yeas and nays. Before doing that, however, I wish to say a few words to the minister. As I said at the beginning, I have a warm feeling for him and it is easy to see that he was not familiar with the areas he described in connection with Prince Albert park. I know he would like to set it right.

Reference was made to the muskeg area being the breeding grounds. That muskeg part, which is for the most part the 350 square mile area that is taken out of the park, is undoubtedly the breeding ground. There is no shooting there. No one can shoot in a national park and for that reason it is all protected breeding ground, so far as any government can protect breeding grounds. It is to all intents and purposes a protected breeding ground but the moment it is taken out of the national park area it ceases to be. The minister said that the province could see to this aspect of the matter. I do not know. Perhaps they would; on the other hand, they might not. The province will run its own show. Everyone with any knowledge of hunting in that area knows that it is the animals that are bred in that part of Prince Albert national park that move east, and every year there are hundreds of hunters who go out to that district to the east because they know that the animals are bred in that protected area.

The minister said something to the effect that if it were taken outside of the park it would become a potential area. That is what it is now. It is a real breeding area, as a matter of fact. It is not simply potential, because it is in the park where shooting is not allowed.

Someone spoke about muskegs and it was said that muskegs will never be good agricultural land. It was not intended for that purpose at all. Something was also said about its reverting to the Indians, and I think the minister is under a misapprehension there. There might go to the Indians a small area of 10 square miles out of the 350 square miles in the eastern part of the park. Perhaps ten or eleven miles, I believe the description is, might be given to the Indians in Montreal river and Montreal lake area. But they now have the whole area north of that and to the east of it in which to trap and hunt. I still say that should remain in the park, no matter what anyone advises the minister. As someone over here said, instead of taking that area out of the park, we should increase it by another 350 miles right up to Lac la Ronge if we can. We cannot have it too large in that country.

Mr. HOWE: I should like to make my position quite clear. At the present time the 340 miles at present under discussion is in the park.

Mr. MacNICOL: In that particular area.

Mr. HOWE: Yes. Animals can breed there; they cannot be shot.

Mr. MacNICOL: That is where they breed.

Mr. HOWE: In other words, it is just wild land in which animals can breed. Both the provincial and federal government would like to include this land in a joint plan of fur conservation for which they have both provided funds. By arrangements between the two governments a certain area already has been set apart to be developed for fur conservation. It is a long term agreement, I think for twenty-five years. Each government has undertaken to spend a certain sum of money over that period in developing the area for the breeding of fur bearing animals. The purpose is to divert all of this area into the fur conservation plan, under this dominion-provincial agreement and to develop it as a fur conservation area rather than to maintain it as a federal park. As I say, all the officials of the federal government believe that constitutes a proper use. The province itself wishes to have the land transferred for the purposes of the other agreement, and I see no reason why parliament should not implement the wishes of those responsible for the development of the area.

Mr. MacNICOL: A moment ago the minister said ten years.

Mr. HOWE: I am corrected now by my officials. The period is twenty-five years.

Mr. FRASER: The minister changes all the time.

Mr. MacNICOL: The minister said ten acres. What the Indians are to get, if they get anything, will be near Montreal lake and will be approximately eleven square miles. I am sorry for the minister in his present position; I have the highest regard for our officials, but I lose my regard when I find officials in the parks department wanting to get rid of this large area of park land.

An hon. MEMBER: We are not getting rid of it.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes, you are getting rid of it. Do not take any stock in this idea that there is to be any cooperation with the provincial government. The provincial government has all the land outside of that and can start a park whenever it likes, the same as we have in Ontario. There is nothing in that. It has been going on too long. Six years ago a determined effort was made to detach this area from Prince Albert park. I am going to oppose this to the limit of my power. If the minister is not prepared to withdraw this provision, I shall ask the chairman to call for the yeas and nays on section 3.

Mr. JAENICKE: The explanatory note to section 3 says that the department has been in communication with the government of Saskatchewan, which government has agreed to accept the return of the lands. If there is an agreement I should like to know it. If it is just a matter of correspondence, perhaps the minister could read to us the letter of the Saskatchewan government agreeing to the cancellation of this 350 square miles and turning it back to the province. If there was an agreement, as the minister intimated, with regard to the conservation of game and fur, what is the date of it? What is the date of the recent correspondence with the government pertaining to the return to the province of this 350 square miles? Does the agreement with regard to fur conservation cover the whole 350 square miles or only part of it?

Mr. HOWE: The hon. member asked the present status of the fur conservation plan. It has been in operation now for some two years. I am told that it is working satisfactorily. I am told that it is the wish of the province, and of the minister responsible, Hon. Mr. Phelps, that this additional land be added to the fur conservation plan.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

Mr. JAENICKE: The whole of the 350 square miles?

Mr. HOWE: Three hundred and forty square miles go into the plan and ten square miles go into the Indian reservation itself. All 340 square miles go into the fur conservation plan.

Mr. MacNICOL: Has the provincial government agreed to maintain that road from Waskesiu to Montreal lake?

Mr. HOWE: I am told they are already maintaining that road. The road was built by the federal government and by agreement is being maintained by the provincial government.

Mr. FRASER: What agreement is there as to cutting timber on that piece of land which is being turned over?

Mr. HOWE: The land comes under the management of the province. In future if any arrangements are to be made for cutting, they will be made by the province. It is my understanding, however, that as long as the land is used for fur conservation it will not be cut over.

Mr. FRASER: There is no agreement to that effect, though?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. FRASER: There definitely should be an agreement to that effect.

Mr. JAENICKE: Has the minister the letter from Saskatchewan agreeing to this proposition?

Mr. HOWE: I am sorry, but the officials cannot find it in the folio that was given to me. I am assured that there is such a letter.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is the federal authority agreeing to pay over any money to the province?

Mr. HOWE: No. We were contributors to the fur conservation plan, but no money is involved in this present transfer of land.

Mr. HAZEN: By this section, land is being taken out of the park for the purpose of the development of a fur conservation plan. It seems to me that it would have facilitated matters greatly if the explanatory note had so stated. Now for the first time we learn that there is to be a fur conservation plan and that some agreement has been entered into between the provincial government and the dominion. Had we known this before, it might have facilitated to a considerable extent the passing of this bill. The explanatory note on page 3 says, "Some of the lands have a

distinct value for development and settlement." How much of this 340 square miles have a distinct value for development and settlement? Are they to be developed for agricultural or mineral purposes, or what?

Mr. HOWE: The area mentioned as having possibilities for settlement refers to 26 square miles which jut out from the southern boundary of the park, as distinct from the 350 square miles we are discussing. It is an excrescence on the map, you might say, at the southwest corner, and it is believed that it would be more appropriate to return that land to the province than to maintain it as part of the park.

Section agreed to on division.

Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5—Land withdrawn from Waterton Lakes park.

Mr. HANSELL: I wonder if the minister would care to answer the question I asked some time ago.

Mr. HOWE: The cost of maintaining Prince Albert park over the last twenty years, including capital expenditures, is $2,502,696.43; a very accurate reply.

Mr. HANSELL: But that is not the question I asked.

Mr. HOWE: Well, it is nice to know, anyway.

Mr. HANSELL: I am not concerned with how much it has cost to run the park. I wish it had cost twice that much, because then we would have had a park twice as good. The minister assured the hon. member for Lethbridge that the province of Alberta was agreeable to this change in the boundaries of the Waterton park, and I asked how the negotiations were carried on and whether there was any documentary evidence. Were they carried on by mail? Has the minister the letter with him so that from the record he can assure us that the provincial government is agreeable to this change? Following that question, instead of taking my seat I want to ask another one. Is this parcel of sixteen square miles in Waterton park to be handed over to the Alberta government for that government to use as they wish? Are any strings attached to it? What sort of agreement is there between this government and the government of Alberta? Those are the questions I put to the minister on section 2 in error; I should have waited until section 5.

Mr. HOWE: I am told that negotiations for the return of this property have been conducted verbally between Hon. Mr. Tanner of Alberta and the Minister of Mines and Resources; and I am told also that there is a file of correspondence on the subject confirming the final decision. Unfortunately that correspondence is not at hand at the moment, but it can be produced if the hon. member wishes. As to whether the land is to be delivered to the province without strings, I would remind the hon. member that the Alberta Natural Resources Act provides that any land not required for park purposes automatically reverts to the province, and this land will so revert without strings of any kind.

Mr. MacNICOL: A few moments ago the minister said this sixteen square miles was in some other watershed than that of the Waterton river and lake. What watershed is it in?

Mr. HOWE: The area in question drains into Lee creek, which in turn drains into some area off this map, whereas the balance of the park drains into the Belly river and into the Waterton river.

Mr. MacNICOL: The two rivers in that area are the Belly river and the Waterton river; the latter drains into Waterton lake.

Mr. HOWE: But this area does not drain into either the Waterton river or the Belly river. As I say, it drains into Lee creek, which in turn drains into the middle fork of Lee creek, which in turn according to the hon. member for Lethbridge drains into the St. Mary river, which is the river now being dammed for irrigation purposes.

Mr. HARKNESS: It seems to me we are going to get all this water behind a dam some place in spite of anything we may do. However, I must say I do not agree with this statement in the explanatory note.

"This land is not suitable nor required for park development." If this is the most easterly portion of the park I do not see that it would be a bit less suitable than the rest of the land in this national park. As a matter of fact I should think that when the number of people in southern Alberta materially increases and the park has a great many more visitors than is the case at present, that land might very well be required for riding and grazing purposes, for people who may be in the business of maintaining horses within the park. The simple statement that the land is not suitable or required for park purposes I think is denied by the statement following, which is:

It is of value specially as grazing and timber land for the benefit of the settlers in the vicinity.

I have no doubt it would be of benefit to some of the settlers in the vicinity, but I should think it would be of much greater benefit to the people of Canada as part of one of our national playgrounds than to turn it over to two or three people in the vicinity. As a matter of fact I have been wondering whether one of the reasons behind this move to get rid of these sixteen square miles is the fact that one or two people in that vicinity are extraordinarily anxious to add this area to their present grazing lands. I can also quite understand that the province would not put up any complaint about receiving that land, and in fact might be quite anxious to get it, because when the province gets it the provincial revenues can be increased, either by leasing it as timber and grazing land or by selling it. Naturally the province would not look a gift horse in the mouth. The fact that the province has agreed to take it is not an argument for eliminating it from the park. As a matter of fact it might be an argument in the opposite direction. Before this section carries I think the minister should give us much better reasons than have been given so far, or that failing this the section should be deleted. Personally I think it should be deleted and the land retained as part of the park, because the Waterton park is not very large as it is. As parks go in the Rocky mountain region it is quite a small park, and I am really very much opposed to having it whittled down any further, particularly since no good reasons for doing so have been advanced.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I think probably it will be found that an addition to the park can be made at the northern end, where there is a good deal of land which is not of particular value for grazing. As I recall it the area which it is proposed to remove from the park is valuable for grazing purposes and I think that was the reason why the Alberta minister of mines and resources agreed to take back this portion. There was no desire on the part of the province or anyone else to cut down the area of magnificent Waterton park, it was simply that the sixteen square miles would be a little more valuable if it were on the north end of the park where there are trees and mountains.

Mr. MacNICOL: Do we need the consent of the United States before taking any land out of the Waterton Lakes national park? I remember supporting a bill some years ago called the Waterton lakes boundaries bill, in connection with which both countries were associated in setting apart land on both sides of the boundary for park purposes. Have we authority to extract any of the land from the park which was created by a bill passed here in conjunction with one passed at Washington?

Mr. HOWE: I am advised by the officers that Canada has complete jurisdiction over the area.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I am familiar with this park and I know it will be found that it is only a little bit on the southeast corner of the park that is being taken away. There will remain plenty of park alongside the international boundary.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Parks abolished.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is the area now in Nemiskam park to be covered by the St. Mary irrigation project, and has that anything to do with this park being abolished?

Mr. HOWE: The park is near Foremost, Alberta. I am told that this park was originally set aside for the propagation of antelope, but these have increased to the point where the province is actually permitting the hunting of them.

By agreement with the province it has been decided to allow this area to revert to the province under the natural resources act.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is this area in the southwest corner of Alberta, or is it east of the St. Mary river?

Mr. HARKNESS: It is half way between Lethbridge and Medicine Hat. As the minister probably knows, the land in this area is quite dry. If it is not to be irrigated as a result of the project now going forward I think it would be much better to keep it as a park. If they do not want to use it for antelope at the moment, it could be rented out for grazing. I think that would be better than to turn it back to the province to be put to general use. Some of it would be broken up and a good deal of the land would be blown away. This is in the part of the province which comes under the P.F.R.A. and I think it would be better for the dominion to keep it as a park so that it would be available in the future if it is needed for the protection and preservation of antelope. If it is not needed for that purpose it at least would not be broken up and blown away.

Section agreed to.

Sections 7 and 8 agreed to.

On section 9—Health and welfare services.

Mr. ABBOTT: I move:

That the following provision be inserted as paragraph (p) of subsection one of section nine: "(p) levying taxes upon the residents of a park in order to defray the cost of health and welfare services supplied to such residents by a province pursuant to an agreement made under paragraph (o) of this section or supplied to such residents by the government of Canada."

Mr. KNOWLES: Upon the adoption of this amendment will these various services come into effect immediately, or is this just permissive legislation?

Mr. HOWE: This is permissive legislation. The purpose is to allow citizens residing on federal park land to obtain the social services of the province within which the park is situated in return for paying appropriate taxes.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is it the purpose of the government to see that these citizens get these social services?

Mr. HOWE: Negotiations are going on at the present time.

Mr. HARKNESS: Who is going to levy this taxation? Will it be levied by the Department of Mines and Resources, parks branch, and will it vary from park to park? Will the council, or whatever it is called, at places like Banff have anything to say in regard to the amount of taxation? Is it to be a straight imposition or are the people concerned to have anything to say with regard to the amount they are to be taxed?

Mr. HOWE: The parks branch, Department of Mines and Resources, will levy the taxes, and I am sure that the imposition will not be made until representations by the residents of the parks have been heard.

Mr. HARKNESS: Will the views put forward by the citizens groups—these correspond to municipal councils—in the parks be taken more or less as a guide? In the past one of the complaints by the people living in these national parks was that their representatives received very little attention from the department when making complaints on their behalf. I should like to be assured that they will receive proper consideration from the department.

Mr. HOWE: I can assure my hon. friend that the representations of the association to which he refers will be considered. He will hardly expect me to say that their representations will be accepted, as we both know that people do not like to be taxed.

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): I am not sure that the question I want to ask comes under the particular item we are discussing. For some time there has been dissatisfaction over conditions in our national parks, particularly in the Kootenay park and the Yoho national park. Many persons are operating tourist camps on the banks of fine creeks, and they are anxious to get permission to use the water to generate enough electricity for their own camps. In the past this permission has always been denied. We are spending a lot of money in beautifying our parks and inducing tourists to come here to enjoy them; yet when visitors stop at some of the camps in these parks the only light they have at night is a smelly coal oil lamp belonging to the antediluvian days. There is ample water running by these camps year in and year out which could be harnessed to supply electric light and make things more comfortable for the tourists who come into the park.

Mr. HOWE: The Department of Justice has ruled that streams in the national parks can be developed for park purposes only. I am told that it would require an amendment to the National Parks Act to permit the development suggested by my hon. friend. Personally I would be inclined to favour an amendment that would permit that sort of development, but the matter is not before the house at this time.

Mr. HARKNESS: What is meant by "the abatement and prevention of nuisances"?

Mr. HOWE: That is only a repetition of what is in the act already. It applies to the taxation clause. It is in section 7 of the act and is being reenacted in section 9 of the bill.

Mr. HARKNESS: What is the reason for it?

Mr. HOWE: It is for the prevention and abatement of nuisances.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Schedules agreed to.

Bill reported.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION

AMENDMENT OF ACT WITH RESPECT TO AGE OF RETIREMENT, ETC.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 415, to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is the minister going to make a statement?

Mr. ABBOTT: I made an extended explanation running to about half an hour when the resolution was before the house, and there is nothing I can add at this time.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, there are a few words I should like to say about the measure that is before us, and I rise to do so now because this is the only opportunity I shall have to bring to the attention of the house and of the government certain matters relating to pension and superannuation rights.

The bill before us calling for improvements in the Civil Service Superannuation Act has already received considerable acclaim. There may be some details concerning which improvement is desirable, but in the main the principle of the bill is highly commendable. The point I wish to bring to the attention of the government is that the considerations which they have found it desirable to implement in the case of civil servants are considerations which sooner or later must be implemented for all the people of Canada. This bill provides, for example, for mobility of employment without the loss of pension rights. In other words persons who have been working in other lines of employment with which pension rights were associated can now move into the civil service under certain conditions without losing the pension rights they had built up previously. It is also now possible for civil servants under certain conditions to leave the civil service to go into some other line of work and not lose their pension rights.

We also have in this bill a provision for definite recognition of the period spent in military service overseas so far as civil service pension rights are concerned. We have, too, a recognition that those who have been classed as temporary civil servants should be given consideration with respect to pension rights.

It is good to note the extent to which the principle of providing for security in old age is being recognized by the government with respect to the civil service and also to an ever larger extent by industry. We must not, however, lose sight of the fact that these various pension plans have to be paid for. That is true of any pension scheme, including old age pensions, which some of us advocate very strongly. The point I wish to make is this, that we are getting into a situation in this country where large numbers of people, rightly, are earning pension benefits portions of which have to be paid by persons who do not enjoy pension rights. When employees of an industry are earning a pension they pay for part of it themselves and part of it is paid for by the public who buy the product of that industry, and that public includes many people who do not have the opportunity to provide pension benefits for themselves. And so with civil service superannuation: in part it is paid for by the civil servants themselves out of their own remuneration; in part it is paid for out of the consolidated revenue fund, which means that the taxpayers of Canada are helping to make it possible.

I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that I am in favour of all these pension plans, and I am pleased with the extent to which they are growing. But the fact is that they still leave out in the cold a great many other Canadians who do not have the opportunity to provide their own old age security and yet they have to help pay for the security of others. All of this means that the time has come in this country for parliament, and I say that because it seems to me that it ought to be a major plank in the platform of every party, to force whatever government is in power to move in the direction of a universal superannuation plan.

Some industries, for example the Canadian National Railways, already have in effect a plan whereby they give to their employees a certain gratuitous pension, a certain amount as a matter of right apart entirely from the employee's contributions; and then on top of that the employees receive a pension based on their contributions. I feel that the time is long overdue when not only the civil service but Canadians generally should have the benefit of some such plan. We should have an old age pension plan which provides the basic minimum, but we must have in addition to it for all Canadians some such plan—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member knows that according to the rules, on second reading the discussion should be confined to the principle of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLES: I know that rule, and that is the reason I am making these remarks on second reading. It seems to me that this is the only place I can make them. I submit to Your Honour that the principle of this bill revolves around the extension of certain principles. These principles relate to making it possible for workers to move from private industry into the civil service or from the civil service into private industry without the loss of pension rights. The whole principle of this bill is to make more secure the old age of Canadian citizens both in and out of the civil service. It is not confined just to those who spend their lifetime as civil servants. The point I am trying to make is that the time has come when the government should bring before parliament a measure to provide

such over-all security for all the people. I am not talking about old age pensions as such; that is another matter. I submit that in addition we should have a universal superannuation plan which should be, as this is, on a contributory basis. As a matter of fact it should go farther than that; it should cover all of the things that happen to people over which they have no control. I urge upon the government and upon this house the realization that there is perhaps no more desirable social objective toward which any party or any parliament or any government should strive.

We have come to the realization in our day and age that one of the things that our people need most is security; one of the things the lack of which causes so much hardship, suffering, frustration and loss of efficiency is insecurity. One of the shortest ways to offset all these evil things and to bring security into the lives of our Canadian people is to give them the assurance that we are giving by this act to this group of people who having done their turn, having done their share of work in this country, will have at a reasonable retirement age, such as is now suggested in this bill, sixty-five or sixty, ample security.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I think I have already given too much latitude to the hon. member. We are dealing with the second reading of a bill to amend the Civil Service Act, and the hon. member's remarks should be confined to the principle of the bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—Definitions.

Mr. BOUCHER: Under this section I notice that the civil servant is to a large extent dependent upon designation by the treasury board. I believe that we should have gone a little farther and put into statutory form the various classifications of civil servants, because we can see gradually encroaching upon the civil service many persons who are not in the ordinary sense of the word servants of the government, but who are given equal status to career civil servants or permanent employees of various departments of government. For that reason I think it would be better for the civil service of Canada generally and for the civil servants themselves if the designation of a civil servant were put in statutory form and not subject to the ratification of the treasury board.

I can see situations developing by which persons who might be called secondary or third-class civil servants, members of committees, members of commissions, members of crown companies, who are not in the same classification as the person who lends to the nation his talents and his abilities as a career or permanent civil servant, will encroach upon the civil service. They may be employed by the officers of a company, or by the heads of committees, on a temporary basis—not hired or fired, strictly speaking, by the government of Canada, but employed and discharged and given rights of salaries, superannuation and remuneration, leave of absence and so on, entirely apart from that set out in the Civil Service Act. I see a move on foot to bring these people into the same status as those who have given their talents, their ability and their education as a career within the civil service of Canada.

Generally speaking we Canadians are proud of the work our civil servants have done for Canada over the years. Their efficiency, their devotion to duty, their loyalty to the service is well known. We are not enhancing that prestige or increasing the efficiency of the career civil servants by adding to their category those who are not in the same status. In other words I believe that nobody should be given the classification of a civil servant unless he is employed under the Civil Service Act, with the rights, privileges, benefits and obligations common to the other ranks. It seems to me that we are going to see three, four or more different classes of civil servants under different terms of employment, with different rights and privileges; the treasury board—which is not known to the public to any great extent, and which varies from time to time, from government to government and from minister to minister—giving different rights, privileges and determinations as to their status. I do not think it is to the interest of Canada as a whole or to the civil service generally that this condition of affairs should prevail. I am disappointed that when the amendment to the Civil Service Act and to the Civil Service Superannuation Act was brought in, that line of demarcation was not put in statutory form instead of being left to the treasury board as at present.

In the employment of the government of Canada we have many people who have been temporary. I believe that by an amendment to the Civil Service Act they are to be made permanent. We do not know in what department, in what board, on what commission or with what crown company these employees are to be found who are to be accepted by the treasury board. Much advantage could be gained and much satisfaction given to the civil service generally if the civil servant were put into the class by statute rather than by—I was going to say the whim or fancy of

individuals, but I do not like to use these words in a disparaging sense. It depends a good deal upon the representations made to the treasury board and the time at which these representations are made whether they are put in the classification.

Many of the civil servants appointed under the Civil Service Superannuation Act are making contributions to the fund equal to the amount paid by the government. They are now to see other classes come into the fund and draw benefits under conditions different from those under which they draw their benefits when they retire. It is not fair to the career civil servants. I would urge the government when dealing with the Civil Service Superannuation Act and the Civil Service Act to bear in mind that when persons are contributing to a superannuation fund, the fund should be earmarked as held in trust for the contributors and not dispersed in a manner which will be unfair to the career group.

Generally speaking the people of Canada appreciate the amendments to the Civil Service Superannuation Act which are embodied in this bill. I am sure that there are many improvements in it which the civil servants and the people of Canada welcome. My learned friend the member for Winnipeg North Centre—

Mr. KNOWLES: "Honourable", please.

Mr. BOUCHER: I beg his pardon, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I am glad to note he denies the "learned" part of it.

Mr. KNOWLES: For reasons this house well understands. I am not a lawyer.

Mr. BOUCHER: And you know yourself better than anyone else. I was going to say that the people of Canada do help to pay for the superannuation for our civil servants, but they are amply repaid for their contribution by the devotion of the civil service to duty as well as by the service which is rendered. I think the government as an employer of thousands of people should lead the way in providing for superannuation benefits. I do not think that in setting up these superannuation benefits it should continue the policy it has followed in the past of saying to civil servants "We have hired you for so many years. You have contributed to the fund, but if you leave the service you will not get the advantage of the security which you have been helping to build up". In my opinion this bill makes the fund much more flexible and more advantageous to the civil servants.

In providing superannuation for the civil service, we must not merely consider the inducement held out to capable persons to join the service; we must consider the encouragement which is being given to the man who is doing a good job to remain in the service, and security to him when he reaches the age of retirement forms a part of that encouragement.

These three points have, I believe, been thoroughly considered in this bill, and I commend these portions of it. I think, however, we could go quite a bit farther than we have in the directions I have indicated.

Mr. REID: I suppose it is well understood that members from the city of Ottawa or members who live close to Ottawa generally take an active interest in any bill of this kind, but to those of us who are not so close to the capital the picture presented is not quite the same. It is not the same as the picture painted by those who either live in Ottawa or live close to Ottawa and who depend upon the great vote of the civil service. I am not one of those who are against superannuation, but I am one of those who believe that our philosophy of life is all wrong. When you tell a person that he must retire at the age of sixty-five I think you are going directly against human nature itself.

Let me say to those who are advocating compulsory retirement at the age of sixty-five as a means of affording employment that they would do well to look up the figures, because if I were going to advocate anything from that point of view I would retire every one at the age of fifty. That is what I would do if my object were to give employment and a pension.

I say to hon. members who intend to vote for this bill that they had better also seriously consider their own position when they reach the age of sixty-five, because what is good for this group of citizens should apply to members of the House of Commons. I am not advocating it. I do not advocate it. I am one of those who think the best life for any man or woman, provided that he or she is in health and strength, the best life is one in which they can carry on as long as possible and is the life that will enable them perhaps to do their best work. Let us see what we are doing. We are making provision for this great class of citizens in the belief that we are doing it from a humanitarian point of view, whereas we are actually sounding the death-knell of the majority of these citizens. If you look at the figures in regard to those who are compulsorily retired at sixty-five years of age you will generally find that, once they quit, their length of life is, on the average, about five years.

These people may have worked thirty-five or forty years; they have, during that time, had their sociability in their comings and goings among their fellow men; but one fine day the superintendent comes and says "Jack, it is too bad; next week you will have to retire". Then others go around the office and collect some money, and on Wednesday or Thursday or some suitable day the individual is presented with an umbrella or a fountain pen. Perhaps he has been looking forward to this day, saying to himself "Well, now I will enjoy life". But does he enjoy life to the full when he has nothing to do? If you live on the coast you may find them later sitting on benches along the shore with nothing to do. In this condition it is not long until the individual feels that he is the forgotten man.

I say to hon. members that we had better take more seriously what we are doing. The old country, I see, is now going to encourage its aged citizens to do some work, and so should we. Our philosophy of life is entirely wrong. However, I can understand members living in or near Ottawa extolling this bill. Bear in mind that I am in favour of superannuation, but I am not in favour of compulsorily retiring everyone at the age of sixty-five. Therefore, I would vote against this bill and not have it said of me at the age of sixty-five that as a member of parliament I should retire.

Is the usefulness of a man or woman gone because he or she has reached the age of sixty-five? What about Churchill? If we continue along this line we may soon find the man of thirty-five or forty pointing his finger at every one who has reached or is near the age of sixty-five and saying, "It is high time you quit that job and allowed someone else to step in." We are beginning to think people are old and finished at sixty-five. I am not saying that those who are ill, those who may have been wounded in the last war and who may wish to retire, should not be allowed to do so. Provision might well be made for them to retire on a decent superannuation. But when you compel every man or woman of sixty-five and say to him or her, "We have no more use for you; you must retire", then I warn those who contemplate the glory of this that they had better cultivate some hobby or other because when they are sixty-five and find themselves with nothing to do in life, they will not enjoy it as they may now think. The good Lord never intended it that way.

With things developing in this way, it is a wonder you can find any man or woman willing to work on a farm. They might very well say, "Why should we put in long hours on a farm and receive no holidays or superannuation? Instead, we will go to the city or maybe get some government job."

Let me now take a minute or two to refer to a class of public servants about whom I have heard no word from any member of the House of Commons. There is a class of public servants around this building without whose work no member of parliament could get along. I know I may not be popular in what I am about to say, and I may receive a lot of black looks. We could perhaps get along without the masseur or the barber and some attendants, but not a member of parliament can do without a stenographer. The correspondence which every member gets must be attended to.

But these indispensable people are not in the bill? Someone will say they are only temporary and they can find another job. Let me refer to another group of public servants. I do not want anyone to think that what I am going to say applies to all who work in the public service, because we have many public servants, here and elsewhere, who are working long hours and giving the best of their ability to their duties. But generally speaking, the civil servants in the government work six and a half hours a day, and then we turn round and say to the trade union men who advocate shorter hours that it cannot be done. I find some around Ottawa almost cursing the House of Commons because we are sitting. They say, "If you fellows were not talking so much we would get off at four o'clock." My heart bleeds for some of them working six and a half hours a day because I know that if we were out of here they would be working a full five and a half hours. They are entitled also to three weeks' holidays with pay, eleven statutory holidays and eighteen days sick leave. But that is not all. They are entitled to six days of special leave if someone dies in the family or if there is sickness; and some of them have the neat system of piling up days until they have accumulated 800 days of sick leave with pay.

They are getting all this with superannuation as well, for which the country pays half. As I say, they are in a special class, and yet we have a group of stenographers and secretaries around this building who have to seek jobs and have none of those advantages. I am not apologizing to anyone for saying a word on their behalf. In fact I would advocate a royal commission to look into all positions around this building.

It is not always popular for a member of parliament to get up and speak in this way. That opinion has been expressed after the experience of a former member of parliament. Well, I will take a chance on that happening to me, and I want to see who will push me around or who will be rough with me because of what I have just said. I have a duty to perform. Not one member of parliament has risen to his feet today to say one word on behalf of those without whose help they could not get along. I have heard charwomen mentioned, but not stenographers—

Mr. KNOWLES: With regard to the representations the hon. member is making, may I say on a point of order—

Mr. REID: That is not a point of order at all. Sit down.

Mr. KNOWLES: On a point of order.

Mr. REID: That is not a point of order.

Mr. KNOWLES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is saying he has never heard anyone rise in this house and speak on behalf of the stenographers. I submit that I, for one—and I know others have done so also—have risen on behalf of the stenographers. I submit that the hon. member would strengthen his case if he would admit that others have done so. By refusing to do that, he does not help his case.

Mr. REID: I am willing to accept that statement. But that was not a point of order. It was just another little speech.

Mr. KNOWLES: Then it is a point of truth.

Mr. REID: Well, I am truthful, too. I hope the hon. member does not think he is the only one carrying the beacon of truth around with him. At one time he changed his cloth. I have not changed mine. I do not wish to be diverted from what I have to say. I make no apologies to anyone for rising this afternoon and speaking on behalf of that class of people. I should like to see the whole matter looked into. If others on the opposite side have spoken about them, I should like to see them join with me this afternoon on behalf of the stenographers of the House of Commons. The next time they raise the matter, I shall certainly support them, and I hope they will do the same for me.

Mr. KNOWLES: We are right with you.

Mr. REID: Without this class of people to whom I have referred, no member of parliament could carry on his duties. This is my eighteenth year in parliament. I can remember the time when there was a great deal of competition to get a position in the House of Commons. In those days the civil service, of course, did not receive the few benefits which they today receive. But if you look at the civil service today, they are in a much preferred class to what they were in back in the 1930's. These girls who work here will have to look for a position after the session ends. They have no superannuation. They have no sick leave. Their hours are long. As everyone knows, they work from nine in the morning till six in the evening, with an hour and a half off for lunch. Many, if not all of them, work in the evenings. There is hardly one who does not work one or two nights a week. Many work on Sundays to assist members, when required. When these hours they work are taken into consideration, they are not in any way in a class to compare with civil servants of the same grade. I think most of them would rank as grade three stenographers. If they do not, it is up to the member to say whether or not they are capable. But I think most of them would rank as grade three stenographers, and as such I claim they are not being paid sufficient.

I am going to make this suggestion. I do not believe it would cost the country any more money to put them on a permanent basis by the year, and I shall explain why. When the session is over, many of them have to seek employment. Some do not. Some may find a position in the civil service as temporaries, and some do not. The entire staff could be seconded into the various departments after the session is over. Their services would be valuable to many departments. I ask the minister to consider seriously the request and recommendation that I am making this afternoon.

But again I am coming back to what I stated first of all. We had better review whither this nation is going in the matter of compulsory superannuation. I say there should be voluntary superannuation. I repeat to those who are in favour of retiring people in order to give jobs to younger people: let us do it decently and retire them at fifty and give them a decent pension: then everyone will have work. But I say that by retiring people at sixty-five compulsorily you are practically giving the death sentence to at least sixty or seventy per cent of our splendid citizens.

Mr. KNOWLES: I rise, not in any sense to quarrel with the hon. member for New Westminster, but to support him in the matter he

has once again brought to the attention of the minister. I would refer him to *Hansard* of this year, for March 28, 1947—

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. member cannot do that.

Mr. KNOWLES: —where he will find this matter was dealt with. It so happens that I raised it, and was supported by the hon. member for Fraser Valley—

Mr. MACKENZIE: On a point of order, the hon. member cannot do that.

Mr. KNOWLES: —and the hon. member for Vancouver North as well as the hon. member for Kootenay West.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Order. The hon. member cannot quote from a previous debate in the same session.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am not quoting from the debate.

An. hon. MEMBER: He is merely referring to it.

Mr. KNOWLES: We were also able to get His Honour, the Speaker, as a member of the committee, to take part in the discussion. It was a worthwhile discussion except that, as the hon. member for New Westminster might point out, it ended up in the air. I think the hon. member is to be commended for raising it again today, and he need not worry about any black looks so far as the general membership of this house is concerned.

Mr. STIRLING: They were not meant.

Mr. KNOWLES: We are all with him. It seems to me that the time has come when the government should give consideration to including these people in a number of matters, particularly pension rights, and that is what is now before us. Some of these stenographers have been in the service of this House of Commons for a good many years. As a matter of fact, I have in my possession a document which indicates the number of years some of them have served. To find that some of these women have been here for twenty or thirty years and still have no pension rights seems to me to be a rather black mark against parliament. We realize that there are difficulties in working out a pension scheme for people who do not work the year round, but this bill is recognizing the fact that other temporary employees should be given pension rights, and I submit the time has come when we ought to get the usual answer that this is a matter to see His Honour, the Speaker, about; or that it is a matter to see the treasury board about. I submit it is time that the government, which is interesting itself in these other people, should pay some heed to these representations from members of parliament. I am sure the hon. member for New Westminster and I are expressing the thoughts of members in all sections of the house when we say that these people who do so much work for parliament and for the country should receive the recognition of security.

Mr. McILRAITH: It seems to me that we have wandered a little bit off the section and into a contest to see who has spoken the most about a particular phase of an item. I am quite sure that hon. members on all sides of the house are interested in the administration of the public service of the country. I do not know that any useful purpose is being served by trying to prove on what date or by which individual member certain representations were made.

One matter I wished to point out was that the effect of the suggested change mentioned by the hon. member for Carleton would be to exclude about one-quarter of the present number of persons under the superannuation act from the benefits of that act. I am quite sure it was not his intention to exclude that large number.

Mr. BOUCHER: Would the hon. member explain what he means?

Mr. McILRAITH: Yes. The hon. member's suggested definition of the term "persons" to come under the act would exclude, for example, all prevailing rates men in the printing bureau who are hired by the civil service commission and all public works prevailing rates men hired by the civil service commission. It would exclude practically all the ones who were brought under the act by the 1944 amendment. I am quite sure that was not what was intended by the hon. member. However, that would be the effect of it. I am sure that is not his desire.

Mr. BOUCHER: I am afraid the hon. member has entirely misconstrued my intention. My intention was that, instead of having treasury board designate who gets superannuation and who comes under the Civil Service Act, it should be done by statute. That is very far from the hon. member's interpretation of my statement.

Mr. McILRAITH: You went farther, however.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill. I imagine it would pass

without my support, but I am glad to have the opportunity of endorsing it. I am particularly glad because, in addition to looking after some of the better paid civil servants, this bill is doing something for those receiving lower salaries. The other evening in the house I made reference to the fact that our methods seem to be all wrong, because when we can find a job for a person the salary goes with the job, and not according to the usefulness of a person to the community; and I was told I was going against human nature. I should like to point out that if every group is going to use all the pressure it can to further its own advantage, then we are rapidly approaching the time when we shall have to do something to bring about equality on a more rational basis than anything we have as yet tried.

I was interested in the implications of the remarks made by the hon. member for New Westminster. On numerous occasions during my seventeen years in this house, and more particularly during the last few years, I have heard of the terrible things that would happen to the individual when we all came under the control of the state and all were paid by the state. After hearing the speech of the hon. member for New Westminster, I have not the slightest doubt but that there will be more people clamouring to get into the civil service than ever before. I would say to hon. gentlemen to my right that their warnings will not count for much, because, after all, what the ordinary individual is looking for is security and what he fears is insecurity. To the extent that a position represents security, he will take that position. I believe he would rather have a secure position at a lower wage than an insecure position at a higher wage; and in that I think he shows good judgment.

A great many things could be said about this bill. I am wondering if the same people who drew up these amendments to the Civil Service Superannuation Act also drafted the Old Age Pensions Act. If so, how did they come to the conclusion that a person was no longer a useful civil servant after reaching the age of sixty or sixty-five, and also come to the conclusion that in ordinary civil life a person should carry on until the age of seventy? Personally I should like to see a little more logic in our approach to questions of this kind. However I am glad these improvements are made by this bill, since they will constitute a lever by which we may get further improvements for those who do not now have them.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

[Mr. MacInnis.]

On section 3—Service in the forces and pensionable employment prior to appointment.

Mr. KNOWLES: This is the section that makes provision for persons to move out of other pensionable employment into the civil service without losing pension rights previously earned. That seems to appear at two places; it comes in section 5A (1) (a), and also in subsection 4 on page 5 of the bill, and I should like to ask a question particularly in reference to the definition on page 5. The clause reads:

> In this section "pensionable employment" means employment designated by the treasury board as employment in respect of which there was an established superannuation or pension fund or plan for service therein . . .

In other words, if I may borrow the language the hon. member for Carleton was using a moment ago, this seems to leave the matter in the hands of the treasury board. Can the minister give any indication as to what rules or principles are to be followed by the treasury board in deciding that in case A an employee coming from a private firm which had a pension plan is eligible, whereas in case B an employee coming from another firm may not have his former pension rights continued?

Mr. ABBOTT: I discussed this point at some length with the officials of my department. It is difficult to lay down in the statute a definition of what would be an acceptable pension plan. The committee will recall, for instance, that under the Income War Tax Act contributions to pension funds were deductible for income tax purposes if the plan had been approved by the Department of National Revenue. This is a somewhat analogous position here, in that the treasury board in this case must approve the pension plan in the service from which the employee comes. It will be interpreted very broadly and generously, but those who are expert in these matters tell me it really is essential that there should be some body to scrutinize a particular plan and see that it is a genuine pension plan operated on sound actuarial principles.

Mr. MacINNIS: I should like a little more information on that, because I believe this is a very unusual principle. A pension plan in a private company would be on an actuarial basis, and the civil service pension plan is on an actuarial basis.

Mr. ABBOTT: In the first case it may not be.

Mr. MacINNIS: We were discussing that matter in the industrial relations committee this morning, and were told that a certain plan was on an actuarial basis. Will any

funds be transferred from the one pension plan to the other? If no funds are transferred, then how is the fund, under which the employee comes, to be compensated for that part of the service for which no contribution was made to the pension fund?

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend will appreciate that under the terms of this bill a man who comes to the civil service from pensionable employment can count his service in that employment upon the payment of double contributions plus interest. He contributes toward his pension during the period he serves in the other employment, and the assumption is that on leaving that employment he will receive some cash payment, perhaps with interest, in lieu of his pension contributions. What I think we would rather hope is that employers with pension funds of this kind would do as we propose to do under this act; that is, when an employee severs his employment with them, give him a deferred pension annuity payable, say at the age of sixty, for the term of his employment with that private firm. Then he comes to the government service and starts his pensionable service here. At the retirement age he will receive a pension from his first employer and a pension from the government, and the sum of the two will represent his services during the pensionable period. We are hoping that this plan may commend itself to those setting up pension plans in private employment, and that it will encourage this mobility of workers from one pensionable employment to another which will involve no payment by any pension fund and no transfer from one pension fund to another.

Mr. BOUCHER: Following along this suggestion of giving discretion to the treasury board, may I say it is my feeling that during the last number of years the treasury board has to a great extent been usurping the functions of the civil service commission. I believe that some body should decide whether a pension fund is acceptable within the civil service, but I wonder if the minister has given consideration to having the civil service commission decide what pension fund would be applicable? A great number of civil servants are apprehensive over the tendency by the government to take power away from the civil service commission and give it to the treasury board, even to the extent of a suggestion that a director general be appointed. While there may be some reason for having some body accept the responsibility of deciding what pension fund shall be accepted, I do not think the minister has given us a good enough reason that that body should be the treasury board.

Mr. ABBOTT: This is purely a financial matter, and my hon. friend will appreciate that the civil service commission is not equipped or staffed to handle matters of a purely financial nature. It is not responsible for the administration of the Civil Service Superannuation Act. Under the circumstances it seemed to me that the proper body to exercise such control as is necessary should be a financial body; that is, the treasury board.

Mr. KNOWLES: The usual practice in connection with pension funds is to have a committee on which both the employer and the employees are represented. An example of this is the pension funds of the two railroad companies which we have been discussing in the industrial relations committee. I feel that the same principle should be carried forward here and I think the hon. member for Carleton is quite right in pressing this point. Our experience with treasury board leads us to accept with a grain of salt the minister's use of the word "generous".

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend is aware that there is a superannuation committee which reports to the treasury board.

Mr. KNOWLES: The treasury board has the final say as to who are pensionable employees. It seems to me that the minister would have done better if he had gone to national health and welfare, to the annuities branch or to some department or group of people who are interested in pension rights rather than to a body which is interested in keeping down expenditures wherever possible. I confess that there are two sides, but when you leave the final say in the hands of the treasury board I am not satisfied that the other side is adequately represented. To many of us it seems that the commendable principle which is incorporated in this bill has only one logical conclusion, namely, that soon or later we must have a universal superannuation plan to provide for general mobility of employment and security for our Canadian people, regardless of where they spend their life's work.

Mr. ABBOTT: The superannuation fund is under the direction and control of the Minister of Finance, who is the responsible minister. The Minister of Finance is *ex officio* the chairman of the treasury board which, as my hon. friend knows, is a committee of ministers. There is a staff of competent officials in the treasury board. While one of the functions of that board is to see that expenditures are kept down and that no money is wasted, at the same time the Minister of Finance—I am speaking for myself, but I know that I speak

for my other colleagues—and the treasury board are interested in the efficient operation of the public service and seeing that the members of the public service are fairly treated.

The amendments now before the committee were evolved in the Department of Finance by officials of the much maligned treasury board. The deputy minister of finance, as secretary of the treasury board, took an active personal interest in the drafting of these amendments. I am not rising to defend the treasury board as such, but I think the committee can rest assured that this matter will receive sympathetic administration under the aegis of that much maligned body, the treasury board, and under the Minister of Finance, whoever it may be, myself or my successor.

Mr. KNOWLES: What about my second question?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is something to which I would have to give careful thought. This is a superannuation provision for those in the public service, and that is as far as we are going today. If my hon. friend wants my views on a general superannuation plan I shall be glad to give them at perhaps some other time.

Mr. SHAW: It is quite possible that this section provides the information which I desire, but I want to have the matter absolutely clear. A number of veterans of world war I entered the public service after September, 1939, during 1940, 1941 and so on. Those persons were not engaged in pensionable employment, but they are now on a permanent basis and contributing to the superannuation fund. Are they permitted, by paying double or whatever the provision is, to count their two, three or four years of service in world war I?

Mr. ABBOTT: If they so elect.

Mr. BROOKS: I understand that they have to pay four per cent interest.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is correct; that is the standard basis for all who wish to count prior service, whether it is in the armed forces or in what we call pensionable employment.

Mr. BROOKS: If it were service in world war I the interest would be quite an amount?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid my hon. friend is right. Service in world war I would be some distance back. This probably would be of more value to veterans of world war II who are now entering the service.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Allowance to contributor after ten years service.

Mr. KNOWLES: Would the minister state clearly the position as to superannuation of a civil servant in each of three classes: first, one who retires with less than ten years service; second, one who retires with more than ten years service but less than twenty years service and, third, one who retires with more than twenty years service but prior to the normal retirement age?

Mr. ABBOTT: The civil servant with less than ten years service who is retired by reason of age or incapacity is given the option of receiving a gratuity of one month's salary for each year of service or an immediate annuity reduced by one per cent for each year of service less than twenty. The latter is a new provision. In the case of abolition of office, there is the same option, a gratuity of one month's salary for each year of service or a deferred annuity reduced by one per cent for each year of service less than twenty. In the case of inefficiency, he is given the return of contributions without interest or the option of a deferred annuity reduced by one per cent for each year of service less than twenty. In the case of misconduct, there is no change; he receives a return of contributions without interest. When he is retired for other reasons, such as voluntary retirement, completion of a term appointment and so on he is given the option of the return of contributions without interest or a deferred annuity reduced by one per cent for each year of service less than twenty.

In the case of a civil servant with over ten years of service retired for age or incapacity, he is given an immediate annuity. There is no change from the present act. In the case of abolition of office, he is given an immediate annuity reduced by one-third to age sixty-five. There is no change there. In the case of inefficiency, he is given under the present act an immediate annuity reduced by fifty per cent to age sixty-five and 33⅓ per cent thereafter. That is changed to a deferred annuity reduced by one per cent for each year of service less than twenty or withdrawal of contributions without interest, whichever he prefers.

There is no change with respect to dismissal for misconduct. The employee is given the return of contributions without interest.

For other reasons, such as voluntary retirement, completion of a term appointment, he has under this bill, if he has less than ten

years service, the option of a deferred annuity reduced by one per cent for each year of service less than twenty, or the return of contributions without interest. If he has over ten years service he gets his full annuity rights, whatever they may be, reduced by one per cent for every year of service which is less than twenty, and at twenty years he gets his full annuity rights at the appropriate rate, deferred to age sixty years.

Mr. KNOWLES: I thank the minister for that detailed statement which clears up certain ambiguities. But there is one point I should like to get clear. The minister listed various reasons for the termination of employment but did not refer to a civil servant who leaves voluntarily for reasons of his own.

Mr. ABBOTT: I did give that. I said that for various reasons, such as voluntary retirement, or completion of a term appointment, he has the option of a return of contributions without interest or a deferred annuity reduced by one per cent for each year of service less than twenty years.

Mr. KNOWLES: I thought the minister said voluntary retirement on completion of a term of appointment.

Mr. ABBOTT: That was a slip of the tongue.

Section agreed to.

Sections 5 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

On section 8—Retirement age.

Mr. BOUCHER: Subsection 2 says, "Nothing contained in subsection one of this section," and so forth. If that refers to subsection 1 of this new clause 8, I do not know what it means at all. On the other hand, if it refers to the section of the old act it is referring to section 10 and should read, "subsection 2 of section 10" of the old act.

Mr. ABBOTT: The purpose of this subsection is to provide that the reduced retirement ages of sixty-five and sixty shall not apply until two years have elapsed after the coming into force of this subsection.

Mr. BOUCHER: Has the minister checked the wording?—because, as it is, there is confusion. It seems to me that it should read "subsection 2 of the old section 10."

Mr. ABBOTT: I am advised that the reason for the language used here is that this is not necessarily a permanent section in the Civil Service Superannuation Act, but is merely an enabling section to carry us through that two-year period.

Section agreed to.

Sections 9 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. ABBOTT moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I say just one word to the Minister of Finance. Will he be ready at some stage, perhaps on his estimates, to discuss the question of a cost of living bonus for the present superannuated civil servants?

Mr. ABBOTT: I will do my best. I will think it over.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am just warning the minister that that is coming.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PENSION OR SUPERANNUATION BENEFITS TO SENIOR APPOINTEES SERVING OUTSIDE CANADA

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved the second reading of Bill No. 412, to provide superannuation benefits for senior appointees of the Department of External Affairs serving outside Canada.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. KNOWLES: Would the minister indicate how many persons in the service of the department at the present time this bill will cover?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: From the information that has been given me by the officers it will apply to twelve persons, six of whom would not otherwise be entitled to any superannuation allowance, and six of whom would get some increased benefit from the time spent in the service of external affairs.

Mr. GRAYDON: I was going to direct a similar question to the minister, only I was going to make it a little more definite. Since there are not many involved, perhaps the minister would give the committee the names of those who are affected by this bill as we know them at present, together with their present salaries and their other allowances.

whatever they may be. It may be that they have some blanket arrangement about expenses. I should like to know their actual remuneration and their basic salary in each case.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I think the only one to whom the bill will apply immediately, if he were to retire from the service as soon as the act comes into force, is the Hon. Mr. Justice Davis who has, I think, been for a sufficiently long period in the occupancy of a public office. But those who are not entitled to any superannuation benefits under any existing legislation of the parliament of Canada and who are now heads of missions for external affairs are Mr. W. F. Warwick Chipman, who is Canadian ambassador to Argentina and who served as Canadian ambassador to Chile before that; Mr. Victor Doré, who is ambassador to Belgium and minister to Luxemburg.

Mr. GRAYDON: He took Mr. Justice Turgeon's place.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes, he replaced Mr. Justice Turgeon. Mr. K. A. Greene, who has just been appointed high commisisoner to Australia; Hon. T. C. Davis, now Canadian ambassador to China and formerly high commissioner to Australia; Mr. Vaillancourt, Canadian minister to Cuba; Mr. Laureys, minister to Norway and Denmark, and formerly ambassador to Peru, and Mr. J. D. Kearney, at first high commissioner to Ireland, then minister to Norway and Denmark and now high commissioner in India.

The others to whom the bill might apply, in meaning additional superannuation benefits to what they would be entitled to under other acts of the Canadian parliament, are Major-General G. P. Vanier, who is ambassador to France, and Major-General Maurice Pope, who is head of the Canadian military mission in Berlin; but with respect to Major-General Pope it would be only if the governor in council decided that the mission to Berlin was a mission comparable with ambassadorship or the office of consul general. Major-General LaFleche, ambassador to Greece; with respect to Major-General LaFleche, I am not in a position to say just what the effect would be. Major-General LaFleche was a member of the civil service for a number of years before he became a member of parliament and a minister of the crown; but he is not one who was in the civil service immediately before his appointment as an officer of external affairs. That is a matter that I asked to be given precise information upon, and have not as yet received information as to whether or not he would be entitled under the superannuation act to superannuation benefits for the number of years he served in the civil service.

Mr. GRAYDON: If the gap between the time he was in the civil service and took on the job in Greece disqualified him, this bill would enter in.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: This bill would affect him just as if he had never been in the civil service, but only, of course, upon the conditions prescribed in the bill; that is to say, had the period of service that the bill calls for. When we come to the appropriate section it is my intention to ask that an amendment be moved to make sure that no one, no matter what his service may have been, can get more as a consequence of this bill than the maximum that this bill would provide if he had nothing else. Under this bill no one can get more than thirty-five fiftieths or seventy per cent of his salary. If a man was entitled to a superannuation benefit of a certain amount under another act of the parliament of Canada and by application of this bill got another allowance, the additional allowance will have to be cut down so that the two together will not amount to more than if his whole service had been in external affairs.

Mr. MacNICOL: He will not get two rates.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No. He will not be allowed more than if his whole period of public service had been service with external affairs.

Mr. KNOWLES: What about the military pension?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I had not quite finished giving the explanation. That would apply whether it was a military pension, pension as a permanent member of the permanent force of Canada or any other pension. It is drawn in general terms, any pension or annuity for any prior service under any other act of the parliament of Canada.

Mr. MacINNIS: What about disability pension?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Of course this would not cut down a pension that might have been earned before coming into external affairs, but this would not grant anything additional to such a pension, but would leave the total pension what would have been the maximum for service under this act.

Mr. KNOWLES: In other words, if the other pension is already providing an amount greater than this bill would provide—

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It will not be interfered with in any way; but if it provides a

lesser amount than the maximum under this bill, then there is the difference between that amount and the maximum which could be made available provided it is earned under this bill.

Mr. BROOKS: A returned soldier's disability pension would not be interfered with.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Under the terms of the amendment as it has been drawn, it would be any pension in respect of prior service. I understand that disability pensions are not pensions in respect of prior service; that they stand on an entirely different footing. That is what happens in the R.C.M.P. or in any other scheme. They are not pensions in respect of prior service; they are compensation for disability.

Mr. BROOKS: I was thinking of General Vanier's case.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes. The only other persons I had not mentioned were Mr. Justice Turgeon who is entitled to a pension under the Judges Act, but who has never drawn it because he is in the service of external affairs. Under the Judges Act I understand his pension would be $6,666. Since the total pension here would be presumably $7,000, there would only be the margin between the amount of $6,666 and the $7,000 which could be added to his pension under this bill.

Mr. GRAYDON: I have counted only eleven; I think the minister said twelve.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Major-General Odlum is the next one. I understand that Major-General Odlum is not entitled to any pension in respect of prior service for any other service in the civil service of Canada, and from the information I have, the only pension he could get would be what would be earned by his service in external affairs under this bill.

Mr. GRAYDON: Now, the salaries.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The salaries are $10,000.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is it $10,000 each?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes; each of these heads of missions receives a salary of $10,000. Then, along the line of the previous question, Warwick Chipman, for instance, gets $10,000.

Mr. GRAYDON: What has always concerned me is this. These judges are, so to speak, seconded from the bench for the time being into the diplomatic service. Do they not get some special advantage over others, or do they get the same as other people? Actually, under the changes in the Judges Act last year, I should think Mr. Justice Davis would be entitled to more than $10,000. I do not know about Mr. Justice Turgeon. Does he get more than the others, or are they all on an equal basis?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: All on an equal basis. Mr. Justice Turgeon had retired from the bench before the Judges Act was amended.

Mr. GRAYDON: What about allowances?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Allowances are not counted for pension purposes, with just one exception. If a civil servant under the superannuation act is appointed head of a mission in external affairs at a salary that is less than would have been his salary in the civil service, under the superannuation act, the governor in council can, for the purposes of his continuation under the superannuation act, deem as part of his salary enough of his allowance so as not to prejudice him. That was particularly brought to our attention in connection with the case of Mr. Fraser Elliott, who accepted a position in external affairs at a salary of less than his salary in the civil service, and he was informed that I would ask parliament, in dealing with this bill, to make provision whereby enough of his allowance might be deemed salary so that the change in salary would not affect his pension rights, although he would have to pay the contribution on the portion of the allowance that was for that purpose deemed salary. I think that is the whole scope of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): I want to take advantage of clause 1 of the bill to make a reference to those honourable gentlemen who are serving us so well so far away from home. They are great citizens, great Canadians. During the war particularly they put enthusiasm, vigour and understanding into their work and it was my privilege to observe them in action.

I do not like to single out any particular name. I have not had an opportunity during the last two years to make the observations which, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should now like to make. I would mention Major-General Vanier, who, exiled to Algiers at the time I had the privilege of being a guest in his temporary domicile, did everything that he could possibly do on behalf of a Canadian, burdened though he was with war cares.

In other parts "down under" we received similar consideration, and I have no criticism whatsoever to offer with regard to those names that have been mentioned. Most of the persons in question I have had the privilege of meeting, and I pay the highest tribute to them as great Canadians away from home doing a great job on behalf of Canada.

With your permission, sir, I should like to add one further tribute to the families of these gentlemen, to Madame Vanier and Mrs. Davis. These ladies, in their own way, made things pleasant to persons who were strangers to them, yet at the same time Canadians. To their guests they were as Canadians to Canadians. They went out of their way to do things, and I consider it my duty as well as a high privilege to pay tribute to our Canadian ambassadors—call them what you will—and their families away from home for making us feel at home when we ourselves were away from home. In the last two years I have been anxious to make this statement.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I wish to express my sincere appreciation of the words which the hon. member has spoken and which, we all know, are fully deserved by those who are doing their best to serve Canada's interests abroad, and by their families who are assisting them in every way possible and in an efficient manner.

Mr. CHURCH: I wish to get some information about these various excellencies because I have objected for years now to the extension of the ambassador, minister, consul general and high commissioner principle. I have great admiration for the present minister, but I must object to voting money for ambassadors of one sort or another all over the seven seas. They have no knowledge whatever of external affairs. They learn by experience only. Even Solomon in all his glory was never arrayed like one of them; and, to refer still further to that passage in Scripture, "they toil not, neither do they spin." The thing is becoming ridiculous for a small country, and I think we had better get out of it. What have we in this department? We have a large number of these excellencies all over the globe. We have men in China and Japan, and before the war we had Hon. Mr. Bruce and, after it, General Odlum. Now we have Judge Davis, who has been in Australia. He has been all over the world, on all the seas.

What have these people been doing except fostering the separatist tendency all over the empire and dividing Britain's representation? We have public officials called ambassadors; we have high commissioners; we have consuls general and all that kind of thing everywhere; to such an extent has this system been developed that their excellencies are beginning to make a laughing stock of the country, by so many of them being sent to great and small countries all over the world. That is the plain truth, if you ask me. For a country of ten and a half million people we have altogether too many of these useless representatives abroad. There is nothing but duplication and more duplication all along the line. There are officials under this department who do work overlapping that of the trade commissioners, agents and other officials of Canada. I have a splendid book on the Department of Trade and Commerce giving a list of countries, cities and towns where there are trade agents, commercial agents and so on. Some provinces and many businessmen have associations over there also. All this, in my opinion, is unnecessary duplication. If it were necessary I would not say a word, but are all these people necessary? No. What do they do? Nothing that I know of but get the country into trouble making speeches in foreign countries which they have no right to make. A lot of them are in uniforms. One landed in India the other day. He was formerly in southern Ireland. Now he has gone to India, and there were profuse articles about him and his uniform in the public press. And what about the staffs that assist these gentlemen? You have a first secretary, a second secretary, a third secretary and a fourth secretary; there is a secretary to the fourth secretary, and in addition to that this particular gentleman has a military staff with him to accompany him on land, in the air and on the sea, as he moves from one place to another.

Since I have been in the House of Commons, there has been discovered one great basic industry in Canada, located in the city of Ottawa, known as the ambassador cure for unemployment. I call it the ambassador cure for unemployment, for that is the only object I can see in it. Apart from that, they are doing nothing at all. They are of no value to Canada or to the Empire that I can see. We are talking about our status all the time, our autonomy and our sovereignty. Well, the status we had at the time of the last war, the sovereignty we enjoyed then, saw us through that war and another, in which thousands upon thousands of our young men were killed, and thousands upon thousands of others wounded. If that status was good enough for us then, it ought to be good enough for us today and especially for those of us who stayed at home. We should not be wanting to roam the seven seas.

We are fortunate that the position of the United States is far different. As a great ambassador or a great president of France said—I refer to Clemenceau—Britain and the dominions were the hardest countries in the world to make a treaty with. Why? Because they did not speak with one voice

as the United States does. Fortunately in the United States there is one federal authority in control and not forty-eight separate states, each with ambassadors all over the seven seas. I do not mind the hon. member for Carleton supporting the measure as he does, because he is no doubt able to get some employment out of it, as are all the members for Ottawa city and Carleton county; although I do not think he has in his constituency any of these gentlemen who are roaming all over the seven seas.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Withdraw.

Mr. CHURCH: I think this has gone far enough. For example, when you look at the large powers such as Britain and France, and the others, how many ambassadors have they? The other day I saw a return, I think it was in British *Hansard,* which indicated they have only nine ambassadors. We have about twenty, if you ask me. I had a list of them which was in a return to an order of the house, giving their names. One would think we were a first-class power with 100 to 180 million people, having all these people roaming around on Cook's tours, *par excellence* and *de luxe* all over the seven seas learning the embassy business by experience. Everyone wants to be an ambassador. The hon. member for Vancouver South would qualify as an ambassador. He would make a very good one, as would many other hon. members. The hon. member for Temiscouata —he is not here today; he is taking a holiday —may be an ambassador some day. Some not only want to send ambassadors to various countries, but want to extend it to religious denominations. Some want to go to Canterbury cathedral and no doubt represent their denominations. Some want to go to Rome. Some want to go to the Church of Scotland where the hon. gentleman opposite—

Mr. MACKENZIE: I beg the hon. member's pardon; I belong to the Free Church of Scotland, not to the Church of Scotland.

Mr. CHURCH: I should like to say to Edinburgh's most distinguished graduate, that he would make a good ambassador of the Free Church of Scotland. I have seen him doing ambassadorial work on many occasions in the house, and he is a competent ambassador.

With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, for a country with eleven to twelve million people I think we are going much too far with these vast expenditures. No doubt the pension is contributory. A man shall have to serve for five years first. But not one of them stayed five years in Australia; not one stayed more than one year. There have been three of them down there, and now they are off to South America, and all that kind of thing. We are going too far. There is no public opinion to maintain this. In my opinion we are making a great mistake and causing separatism.

Mr. MacINNIS: In what I have to say I do not wish to be considered as unappreciative of the services our representatives abroad are rendering to Canada, but I believe we should have some sense of proportion in these matters. Last week or the week before, we were considering pensions for people who have served this country as citizens, people who have given a lifetime in the service of the country. The conclusion this house came to was that our old age pensioners, man and wife, can live on a pension of $360 a year. I do not see how we can harmonize the provisions of this bill with what we did last week or the week before with regard to old age pensioners. For that reason—and I am speaking for myself and myself only—I intend to oppose this measure.

Daily I receive letters from constituents, indeed from people in all parts of Canada, who have to live on the war veterans allowance; and, mind you, they are not people who have taken a pleasant and easy job at a good salary, but people who risked their lives for Canada. I had two letters today, one from an elderly couple who have to live on $60.83 a month. The man is not able to work. This man risked his life for Canada. Before we pay pensions of the amounts mentioned in this bill to people who have given only a few years' service, I think we should give more consideration to our senior citizens and to those who are now on what we call the burnt-out pension. We are told that we cannot do it, that the country cannot afford it.

Last year in the Judges Act there was provision for a pension for Mr. Justice Davis. It did not go through. Now we find that a completely new bill can be brought into this house for the purpose of providing a pension for one individual; that others come in on it is merely incidental. I just cannot understand people who are fair—if my hon. friend wants to say something, let him get up and say it and stop murmuring while I am talking.

Mr. LENNARD: I just said I did not want the hon. member to be looking at me and preaching to me.

Mr. MacINNIS: I am not looking at the hon. member; and if he did not look at me he would not notice that I was looking at him even if I were. But as I said, I cannot

understand how intelligent people, people who believe in equity and equality, can do this kind of thing. How can we explain it to our constituents when we go back home? How can I meet an elderly gentleman and his wife, people who have given their all in building up Canada and who are now told that they must live on $360 a year, when we have pensions of these amounts for others which we approve? Personally, I do not believe that those covered in this bill are any more entitled to the pension than is a member of parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE: We do not get any, though.

Mr. MacINNIS: They have not sacrificed nearly as much.

Mr. MacNICOL: Not half as much.

Mr. MacINNIS: I doubt if they have given any greater service to the country. I should not like to be personal in this matter, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not mind my saying this, but I believe the Minister of External Affairs himself is just as much entitled to a pension. I may be wrong, but I am of opinion that he undertook his present work as a duty to the country rather than from a desire to engage in politics. I appreciate that and honour him for it. That being the case, he is just as much entitled to a pension as are those who serve our country abroad. If you were to bring it down to that, all members of parliament are entitled to the same consideration. So far as I am concerned, I intend to oppose this and every similar measure until we deal with greater equity with the common, ordinary, citizens of Canada.

Mr. BOUCHER: Will the minister explain to us what he means in section 2 by "such other persons of comparable status"? In the section he has already named the ambassadors, ministers, high commissioners and consuls general.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I shall be very glad to do that on section 2, if section 1 is carried.

Mr. GRAYDON: In his remarks as to the advisability of proceeding with such a measure, the hon. member for Vancouver East raised one question in my mind. Did any of these appointees enter the service with any guarantee or assurance or undertaking or promise, direct or indirect, that they would get the advantage which this measure would seem to provide? I think that is an important point, because, after all, if they came in on the understanding that they would get $10,000 a year I am not sure that there is any need to give them something further, particularly if it applies only to one man. I do not know whether it applies to more than one, but at the moment the minister would seem to be a little concerned as to whether it does apply to more than one. I should like that point clarified.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: At the moment I am not sure that it even applies to one; I am not sure that Mr. Justice Davis has been five years in the service of external affairs. I do not think he has. He was in the Department of National War Services until nearly the end of the war. The other question must be answered in the negative. These gentlemen who were appointed to external affairs during the war accepted the appointments as a matter of public service to be performed for the country. Some of them were not inclined to continue. They were told that for persons brought in from outside the civil service it was intended to ask parliament to vote pensions which would be somewhat similar to those paid members of the judiciary. No bargain was made with anyone. I would not think it would be proper for me as minister of external affairs to make any promise as to what parliament would do about salaries or pensions. I do remember speaking to two or three and telling them it was my intention to ask parliament to enact a measure of this kind. I did not get the impression that had I not told them this they would have insisted upon retiring, but it came up in the course of conversations as to whether or not they would continue in the service. The only person to my recollection who was much concerned about this was Mr. Fraser Elliott, because he already had superannuation benefits and did not think it would be fair to ask him to abandon those benefits to serve in another capacity. I did tell him that I was going to bring this bill before parliament, that I hoped parliament would adopt it, and that if it were adopted I would ask that there be a provision in the bill which would permit him to continue making contributions based upon an amount equal to the salary he would have been receiving had he remained in another branch of the public service. But as far as my recollection goes, and I think it is pretty clear, that is the most that was done.

I did have some conversation about the matter with Mr. Justice Davis. I told him it would be contributory, and that to have the benefit of the years since he was first appointed to the bench there would be arrears of contributions to be paid. I asked to have a calculation made of what that would be, and it amounts to something close to $5,000. I did tell him that he would be required to pay

that amount if he wanted to get the benefit of the years which have elapsed since his appointment to the bench; but it did not go beyond that. It was something spoken of in the discussions we had about appointments to these offices.

I clearly remember that when Mr. Chipman was first appointed it was understood that he was being asked to serve during the period of the war; and the same was true when Mr. John D. Kearney, Mr. Ralston's former partner, was appointed. Then, when the war was over and it was found that they had performed what we looked upon as valuable service they were requested to remain, and were told that I was going to bring a bill before parliament containing provisions of this kind. But no agreement was made with them that their resignations would be accepted if the bill did not go through.

Mr. GRAYDON: These twelve cases stand on a little different ground from what would be the case if they had been appointed under normal civil service arrangements. Reading some history of cases that occurred before I was in public life at all—perhaps things have changed since then—I find that sometimes when governments change some of these men are changed. I should not like to hold out either the hope or the threat that such things would happen if the government were to change again, but just suppose a future government was of a similar mind to past governments, shall I say. What would happen in the case of any of these men who might be removed on the same grounds on which other people have been removed? What would happen to the superannuation in that case; because the bill only calls for retirement or resignation of a public official.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: If that happened there would be no pension payable under this bill unless the one who retired came under the conditions set out in section 3: if he had attained the age of sixty-five and had served for not less than five years, or if he had become physically disabled from continuing to serve. Otherwise it would not apply; and that was frankly stated to these gentlemen. I think they all realize that situation.

Mr. GRAYDON: There is nothing in this bill, as I see it, that would prevent a succeeding government from removing any of these people.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Oh, no; and there is nothing in this legislation that would give them an indemnity if they were removed. That was fully realized by all those with whom I discussed the terms of the proposed bill.

Mr. SHAW: I do not want to delay the passing of section 1. While agreeing that the observations of the hon. member for Vancouver East contain a good deal of merit, personally I cannot feel that opposing this bill would automatically bring justice to these other groups he mentions. I am one of those who believe that anyone performing a service, outside Canada or within Canada, should be adequately compensated for service rendered. However I say that, by virtue of the government bringing in this bill, and by virtue of the party on the other side supporting it, the government is placed under a greater moral obligation to give justice to the other groups referred to by the hon. member for Vancouver East. I shall not oppose the bill, but certainly I shall feel that I have a greater argument to use in fighting for justice to the recipients of war veterans allowances, to our older persons and others within the country.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the committee that the principle of this bill was accepted by the house on second reading and that discussion should now be directly relative to the section. Most of the discussion that has taken place so far would have been more appropriate on second reading. Could we carry section 1 before six o'clock and then proceed with section 2?

Section agreed to on division.

On section 2—Definition.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I have an amendment which I will ask to have moved to add certain words to section 2, and I want to answer the questions put by the hon. member for Carleton.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at seven o'clock.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock it had just passed clause 1 and we are now on clause 2.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Carleton had asked me a question on clause 1 to which I promised an answer when we got to clause 2. It was with respect to the words "and such other person of comparable status serving in another country in the public service of Canada as the governor in council may designate". The hon. gentleman asked me what that might apply to. The words were inserted so that, in the event of its becoming necessary for Canada to have a permanent representative at the seat of the

united nations, that permanent representative might, if the work he was doing there was of similar importance to that performed by an ambassador, be designated as coming under the clause. It was felt that might be necessary because it is not at all improbable that, in the event of Canada having to have a permanent representative at the seat of the united nations, someone now in the service of external affairs as ambassador might be designated to fill that office.

The question also arose as to whether the office at present occupied by General Pope at Berlin should be included. As a matter of fact, until very recently General Pope was a member of the permanent forces, seconded to the Department of External Affairs, and for that period would not, of course, even if he were included, derive any benefit from the bill. The post was not expressly mentioned because it may very well be that it will be only of quite short duration. It was thought that in bringing the bill before parliament there should be the possibility of including such officers of external affairs as might be heading the kind of mission we have had in Berlin or the kind of establishment we might have to have at New York or Lake Success to represent us in the organizations of the united nations. But that will not necessarily be so, and if we put in precise language it might extend to more than would be the intention of having it apply to. That was the reason for putting those words in. It was felt that in a case of that kind consideration should be given to the specific circumstances and that there should not be an attempt to cover it by general language which might include other than those it would be felt necessary or proper to include.

Mr. GRAYDON: Might I ask the minister apropos of his suggestion that, as time goes on, it may become necessary for Canada to have permanent representation at the seat of the united nations, is that an immediate prospect, or does the minister envisage it more particularly if, as and when—and may I emphasize all three words—we become a member of the security council?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: What we had in mind was that if, as when we become a member of the security council, the charter requires, as the hon. member knows, that every member on the security council shall have a permanent representative at the seat of the organization.

Mr. BOUCHER: I appreciate what the minister says, and probably his argument is sound that if we have the head of a military mission in some of the occupied countries he would be performing work similar to that of an ambassador, or if we had a representative at the united nations organizations with some permanency about his appointment the holder of that office would similarly merit superannuation as much as a diplomat. But both these cases are problematical, and the wording of the section is "such other person of comparable status serving in another country in the public service of Canada," and the governor in council is given pretty wide scope there to decide what other offices have comparable status to that of a diplomat. Only a five-year tenure of office is required until they become entitled to some pension. I do not want to speak on the next clause, but generous provision is being made, and it is within the realm of possibility that someone might be able to get this generous treatment that is meted out only to our diplomats. I think, therefore, we would be well advised to wait until the occasion arises, when an amendment could be made to the bill, rather than to leave it in fairly general terms as it is now. Would the minister consider restricting it to the position of ambassador, minister, high commissioner or consul general, and then, if the occasion arose within the next five years, an amendment could be made to the bill.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I think it is pretty closely restricted already. It says: "such other person of comparable status serving in another country in the public service of Canada". The hon. member says that the tenure may be only five years. But that, of course, applies only when, after five years, one has reached the age of sixty-five or has become physically incapacitated. The possibility to which the hon. member for Peel referred is one which might arise within a very short time. There will be selection of new members for the security council at the September meeting, and if it became necessary to have one appointed we would be apt to be drawing on those who are already in the service. It was felt that it would be convenient if there did not have to be any gap, and in the event of that happening it could be provided at once that, on moving an ambassador from an ambassadorship to the post of representative at the united nations, it could be declared by order in council that that would not affect his rights under the superannuation provisions. That was the reason for inserting that provision. I would hope that the hon. member would not insist upon its being removed. If it is removed there is the probability that one would have to come back soon to have a pro-

vision made, and I should not like to come back. I should like to feel that this matter had been disposed of and that there would not be applications to have it extended beyond what is here provided for.

There is one other matter with which I wish to deal. I said that I would ask my colleague to move an amendment that would add, after the section, the words:

. . . and a person shall be deemed to be serving in a public office during such time as he is entitled to receive the salary annexed to such public office.

That is to avoid a possible technical difficulty which may arise in a case such as that of General Odlum who has already served in several posts, but went on leave according to the regulations, and who was replaced as ambassador to China while on leave, without at the same time his posting as ambassador to another country being announced. Under the definition, this applies only to ambassador, minister, high commissioner or consul general to another country. It might be said that while he is on leave, having been replaced in China, he is not ambassador to China, and that, having been officially posted somewhere else, he was not an ambassador in the meantime. These words would be to provide that when one has been made an ambassador and is, under the provisions applicable to his office, entitled to salary even though he may not every day of the period be posted somewhere, the period would not be interrupted.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I move that section 2 of the bill be amended as follows:

Delete the period at the end of section 2 and substitute a comma, and add the following words:

". . . and a person shall be deemed to be serving in a public office during such time as he is entitled to receive the salary annexed to such public office."

Mr. GRAYDON: As the minister will recall, the name of General Odlum was mentioned in the discussion on Friday. After his name had been mentioned, press reports indicated that he said he was receiving an appointment. He left the matter perhaps not quite as vague as the minister did, but he said that he was to be appointed to a place where most of the trouble lay. I was hoping that he was not referring to the united nations or that he was not to be appointed to Lake Success. The minister spoke about the possibility of a permanent representative there. I was wondering whether he had General Odlum in mind for that post, because I should think the general's statement was somewhat inappropriate if that were the post to which he was to be appointed.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I am not at all sure that the words quoted from memory by the hon. gentleman are those that were used by General Odlum. As I remember the dispatch, he said that he was going to be appointed to a place that was the scene of much interest at the present time.

Mr. GRAYDON: "Trouble" was the word that I read.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I am not sure just what language he used, but I am quite sure that he did not have Lake Success in mind when he made those remarks.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am greatly relieved on that point.

Mr. HARKNESS: Did I understand the minister to say that this amendment has been moved particularly to cover General Odlum?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No, but the necessity or the advisability of the amendment was suggested by the fact that General Odlum had been replaced as ambassador to China and therefore, could no longer be regarded as Canadian ambassador to China on leave. That is something which occasionally happens. One of our representatives goes on leave that he has earned, there is the intention to post him somewhere else, and the post he has left while going on leave is filled. We discussed the language of the section, and it was felt by the legal officers of the department and, I think, also by those of the Department of Justice that it would be better to have it stated that one would be looked upon as continuing in the post during the whole time that he was entitled to the salary that the post carried, though in the meantime the post occupied by him might have been filled by somebody else.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 3—Pension to public official.

Mr. HARKNESS: I take a considerable amount of objection to subsection 2 (a) which provides for a pension for a man who has served for five years. It seems to me that the giving of a pension which amounts to 15/50ths or 30 per cent of the average salary of a man who has a salary of $10,000 a year, which is the ordinary salary in these cases, or $3,000 a year, is not justified. Before we pass a bill which will give pensions of that kind to these diplomats serving in senior posts, we should give serious consideration to the matter of providing pensions, at least equal in a percentage way, to the members of the armed services of this country

who served overseas for five years or more. To my way of thinking, the senior officers of the armed services rendered a far greater service to Canada than any of these diplomats did.

In this connection the name of Major General Odlum comes particularly to my mind. Along with some twenty thousand other Canadians I had the misfortune to serve under his command in England.

Mr. CROLL: That is a nasty remark. It does not do credit to my hon. friend.

Mr. HARKNESS: I know it is a nasty remark, but I am making it.

Mr. CROLL: It is a shameful thing to say. I also served under General Odlum.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am making the speech. I know that most of the men who served in the second division and received anything but good treatment from General Odlum will take it very much amiss that he should be put in that position. I use him only as an example. They will take it amiss that he is put in the position of receiving a pension of $3,000 a year when the people who went abroad and served in the armed forces throughout the war for five years or more are not entitled to any pension unless they were wounded. I should like to be completely fair about this bill.

I would be quite willing to pass provisions which would give pension privileges to diplomats who have served a minimum of ten years. If a man has devoted ten years of his life to the service of Canada in a diplomatic post he is probably entitled to a pension and I would raise no objection to that, but I think this business of paying a pension to a man who has served for only five years, or a day more than five years, or whatever it may be, can hardly be justified by any arguments I have heard advanced in connection with the matter.

Personally, I think we should strike out of the bill subsection 2 (a) which provides for pensions to men who have served for between five and ten years. If that particular provision were struck out I think most people in Canada would be prepared to accept the rest of the bill; but, as it stands, I think there will be serious objection to it. In fact I know there will be.

I mentioned General Odlum as one instance. I am sure that nearly every man who served under his command in the second division will take that as a serious reflection on his own service, and I would request the minister to delete that section.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I must say at once I most deeply regret the remarks of the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Harkness), himself a distinguished soldier. I have known General Odlum for thirty years. As a boy he went to the Boer war and fought for his country. In the first great war he covered himself with glory as commander of the eleventh infantry brigade, and in the recent war he was largely responsible for the organizational efforts made to prepare for the invasion of Europe on D day. He is one of the most gentlemanly of men, as Christian a gentleman as ever lived. He is a grand and gallant soldier. He is a splendid fellow. He is a true Canadian through and through, and I resent, with all the resentment that my Highland emotion can command, the hon. member for Calgary East having the supreme effrontery to attack a bigger and greater man.

Mr. HARKNESS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Veterans Affairs is entitled to his opinion and so am I. As I said before, I know something of the effect that General Odlum produced on the unfortunate soldiers of the second division during the time he was in command of it, and I mentioned that only as an example. I am casting no reflection on the service General Odlum performed in the South African war or in the first great war. I know nothing about it except from hearsay. But as far as this particular war was concerned, he certainly produced a great deal of misery for a large number of people of whom I was one; and I stated and restated that a provision of this kind, which gives him a pension of $3,000 a year as a result of being pushed into a diplomatic post from the command of the second Canadian division, is one which a large number of people in this country are not, I believe, prepared readily to stomach. I protest against it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I say one other word, sir? My hon. friend mentioned the question of pensions of others who served in the last great war. I defy him now; I challenge him now on the floor of this house, to show me any country in the whole world that has treated its returned soldiers, in regard to pensions, as well as this Dominion of Canada has done—the ordinary soldier, the plain soldier, the private, the corporal, the lieutenant—and this suggestion that there has been discrimination in regard to senior officers is an unworthy, mean and dirty insinuation.

Mr. HARKNESS: I made no implication in regard to pensions of senior officers or anything of that kind, and the right hon. minister knows it.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that we are discussing—

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman mentioned $3,000.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: —clause 2.

Mr. HARKNESS: Mr. Chairman, if I may finish replying to the right hon. gentleman, I made no reference whatever to pensions of senior or junior officers. I am in favour of them. They earned them in most cases. But this is a different matter altogether. This has nothing whatsoever to do with pensions or gratuities or rehabilitation credits provided for members of the Canadian armed forces, and I do not think—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. HARKNESS: If I may finish—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. HARKNESS: I do not think the right hon. gentleman should have introduced that.

Mr. MACKENZIE: On a point of order, I did not introduce it. My hon. friend mentioned the sum of $3,000, and he also mentioned discrimination as between senior officers and others who were junior in rank.

Mr. HARKNESS: I deny that absolutely. I made no mention of discrimination between officers and others.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I would point out—

Mr. MACKENZIE: You cannot get by with that stuff.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would ask hon. members to confine their remarks to clause 3.

Mr. BOUCHER: I intend to comply implicitly with your ruling, Mr. Chairman, because I am not going to enter into a controversy over what this government did or did not do for returned soldiers generally. According to this section, any man, who being sixty years of age—

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Sixty-five.

Mr. BOUCHER: —is appointed to the diplomatic service and serves therein for five years at a salary of $10,000 per annum and pays six per cent of that salary in the five years, which means a total of $3,000, becomes entitled to a total superannuation benefit of $3,000 per annum. In other words, in this section we are providing for benefits by way of superannuation to any man, from the time he is sixty-five years of age, at $3,000 per annum, even though he has not served Canada in the diplomatic service, or anywhere else within the public service, for more than five years prior to that. My own frank opinion is that we should appoint to the diplomatic service the best men in the country who will be an honour and a credit to Canada, and that these men should have some security when they leave their private vocations to enter that service. I do not believe that any man reaching the age of sixty or thereabouts and desiring to serve for five years, anxious to serve his country well for a short period of five years, would demand a pension for the rest of his life for doing so. I do not think it would be fair to the service generally, to the men in the Department of External Affairs and in the government service at large, who have spent a lifetime in acquiring knowledge, experience and the necessary ability to represent Canada abroad. On retiring on superannuation, they would realize that they could have worked almost their whole lives in their private vocations and could then have spent five years in the public service and obtained superannuation to this extent.

I agree entirely with the hon. member for Calgary East when he says that the minimum length of service for anyone in a diplomatic post, if he is to be entitled to a pension, should be ten years, if not even more. Then he has been away from his country and his vocation and he does want security when he comes back. But a man who has been in business, commercial or professional life for a great many years, acquiring for himself the necessary qualifications for a diplomatic appointment, will not accept a job for five years by any inducement that may be held out in the form of a superannuation of $3,000 a year after that.

Bear in mind that people who have served ten, fifteen or twenty years are contributing six per cent of their salary, a material amount, towards superannuation, whereas the man who has served for only a few short years pays only a small percentage of his annual salary. There is very little of the merit of the contribution element in that aspect of it. I believe there are occasions when the superannuation provision may secure the services of men highly qualified for a diplomatic post, if they need it. But bearing in mind the many people in the Dominion of Canada who have not available to them any superannuation scheme, I do not believe we would be justified in saying that men getting a salary of $10,000 or more and serving for a short time, should get this benefit. I believe our diplomats should be highly paid, but if they are not paid a sufficiently high salary, we should not try to amplify it by giving them superannuation benefits. I understand that there is provision here that if a man,

even if he is not sixty-five, becomes disabled, he can draw his pension. There are a great many other posts in the public life of Canada where disability does not bring entitlement to any pension. When one realizes that many people within Canada served for years in public office at salaries much less than $10,000 a year, and did not receive any superannuation whatsoever, I think it will be found that what we are doing here will be held against us as being a discriminatory preference to a certain few. A minimum of ten years' service abroad should be required before any superannuation is granted.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I am surprised to hear this from the hon. member for Carleton who is, as I am, a lawyer and who may, as I may some day, become a judge. He would then not feel at all scandalized at having applied to himself or to me the provisions of the Judges Act. In that act, with respect to supreme court judges, there is no minimum period prescribed and there is no gradation. If the retirement becomes necessary, the full pension under the Judges Act is awarded immediately, and there have been cases where that has happened, to the knowledge of the hon. member for Carleton and myself. We members of the bar have never felt that any kind of outrage was being perpetrated in those cases.

Here the hon. gentleman speaks of the possibility of a pension being earned by five years' service. The preceding paragraphs provide that no pension can be granted unless one has attained the age of sixty-five or has become physically disabled. When one has attained the age of sixty-five in heading one of these missions, it does not in any way mean that he necessarily retires. One of those who, during the war, served Canada in a most admirable fashion was well over seventy. Our ambassador to Washington served for several years while he was over seventy, and did it in a competent, efficient and beneficial manner for the public affairs of this country. The fact is that there are now in the service among those I mentioned as persons to whom this bill might possibly apply, one who is sixty-seven, one who is sixty-six, one who is seventy and one who is sixty-six; all of them are performing the kind of service which was referred to this afternoon by the hon. member for Davenport, and I think that is something which may be expected to continue. I do not think it is quite true to say that it is unfair to the other men in the service. This applies only to a person appointed from outside the service to head a mission abroad. I think that requires as high a standing in the community as is required in the case of a lawyer who is taken from his profession and put on the bench. The difference between these men and those who come under the superannuation act is that those who come under the superannuation act have had quite long years in service acquiring the experience and qualifications which presumably the man taken from the outside has acquired in other fields of endeavour.

Mr. JACKMAN: He ought to have pension rights where he was.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Perhaps he ought to have pension rights where he was. I heard it suggested that I should have a pension, and that members of parliament should have a pension. Perhaps that is true. But that is not the question which is before the committee at the present time. The fate of this bill will not make any difference as to the time when and if—if ever—the other matter is dealt with, just as the fate of this bill will not make any difference as to what other pensions are paid. This bill should be regarded on its own individual merits. There may be something in what one of the hon. members said this afternoon. He said that he is not objecting to this bill, but intends to hold it as an argument for the purpose of trying to induce this parliament to make better provision for some others. Perhaps it may be all to the good that he should have the additional argument, but I think this bill should be considered on its own merits.

I am sorry that I cannot accept the suggestion made by the hon. member for Calgary East that the first portion of the section be cut out. It is already something which is not as favourable to office holders as the provision for the judges throughout the country. The only reason which occurs to me for there being more surprise about these provisions is that the existence of pensions for members of the judiciary is something which is sanctioned by long years of practice. Those pensions have always been non-contributory, without any other discrimination because of years of service than that which exists with respect to county court judges. It was the provision with respect to county court judges which inspired us in this regard. The county court judge who retires after five years' service gets only half the pension he gets after having served as much as ten years. That was not the basis, but it was the inspiration of the provision which is made here.

Mr. JACKMAN: I cannot help feeling that the provisions of this section with regard to the pension are unwarrantably high. It is not that I am against what I could consider an adequate pension for those serving our country

in the diplomatic field. The salary of $10,000 which is paid a full-fledged ambassador is by no means out of the way for the position he holds; and I should think that in course of time, the way costs are rising, that salary is likely to be increased. Therefore the whole basis of the pension would be enlarged on a percentage calculation. If I felt that most of these men who were appointed to represent our country abroad had to encroach substantially upon their private means during their term of office so that when they retired they did not have their savings intact, there might be something in the scale the minister is suggesting. But certainly a great many of our ambassadors at the present time are not men who are likely to encroach severely upon their private means. May I just point out to the committee what can happen under section 3. Five years is not perhaps an unusual term of office in this field, owing to the fact that many of these appointments will come from one political side or the other, so that five years may be the normal length of service. After five years of service, during which period he will have received $50,000, one of these men can retire on a pension of $3,000 a year for life. Let us say this man is fifty years of age when he retires.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: But he would not get a pension, because it does not apply unless he has reached the age of sixty-five.

Mr. JACKMAN: If he is under sixty-five he gets nothing at all?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Read the bill.

Mr. JACKMAN: If he retires at the age of fifty does he get anything for his past service, even at the age of sixty-five?

Mr. MACKENZIE: He gets fifteen years older.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Not unless he retires through disability.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether, since he drafted this bill, consideration has been given to the bill that was passed by this house this afternoon providing for what was called mobility of employment. That bill makes it possible for the treasury board to determine that a person coming into the civil service has come from a pensionable employment. Surely a judge was in pensionable employment if there is such employment in this country. In other words, in view of the fact that we passed the other bill this afternoon, is this bill necessary at all? It seems to me that it is now possible to cover under the other bill such cases as may have to be covered in this field.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The matter was carefully considered, and it was felt that the provisions of the other bill would not meet these cases, of which there are only a few at the present time and the number of which is not likely to be substantially increased. As the hon. member knows, we have been so fortunate as to recruit quite a large number of brilliant young men in the Department of External Affairs. The hon. member has been in contact with several of them at these international meetings; and I think we are training in the department an efficient staff so that, like other countries, we shall have the personnel required as career men, who will be under the superannuation act.

Mr. KNOWLES: I cannot see that there is any great difference between covering these men under the bill we passed this afternoon and under the bill now before us except the difference in amount. I can see that under this bill the pension would be considerably greater than under the other bill; but, following out the minister's own declaration as to the desirability of building up a career service in this field, I feel that the whole principle of the measure now before us is wrong in that it vitiates that very principle, the building up of a permanent civil service to serve this country.

A suggestion of real merit has already been made by some hon. members to my right. I want to make it clear that I am not attempting to steal their thunder, but it happened that I had already written out a proposed amendment to this section, which I now wish to move. Our attitude toward this whole bill was expressed this afternoon by my colleague the hon. member for Vancouver East. We feel that the bill, as it stands, should be opposed and these people taken care of under the other measure. However, since the government seems determined to go ahead with the bill, it is our duty to improve it if we can. I think hon. members generally will agree that a pension after five years of service, even though that service does not commence until the age of sixty, is cutting it pretty fine. If I may say so to the hon. member for Rosedale it means that a person can go into the diplomatic service at the age of sixty and get a pension of $3,000 a year at the age of sixty-five. Surely that should be struck out. Therefore I move:

That section 3 be amended by deleting subclause (a), being lines 26, 27 and 28 on page 1, and relettering subclauses (b) and (c) as (a) and (b) respectively, also by deleting all the words after the word "office" in subclause (3) in line 14 on page 2.

The reason for the deletion in subsection 3 on page 2 of the bill will be obvious. The first part of it refers to those covered under present subclauses (b) and (c), but if we delete subclause (a) the last half of the sentence in subsection 3 will no longer be necessary.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The deletion of the words in subsection 3 would be the natural consequence of the deletion of subsection (a) of section 2 of this clause. It would mean that this would be a very much inferior scheme to that which was put through this afternoon, because under the other bill there is a pension whatever may be the length of service, if there are grounds for retirement. This would mean that, unless we got someone to agree to serve for a period of not less than ten years, there would be no possibility at all of superannuation, which I think would seriously affect the utility of this bill. The hon. gentleman knows that there is a provision in this bill, as there is in the Judges Act, that an option may be exercised to take for oneself two-thirds of the pension the bill would provide, and to attribute one-third to one's spouse. In the event of the death of a public officer who would have made that option, one-third of the pension would be payable to the public officer's spouse. I think that is a very desirable provision to have in a bill of this kind. There are some of these public offices which are exercised in climates that are not as healthy as our own, and the fact that there is now no provision for the persons appointed to those offices is a serious factor. My submission to the committee is that this section should be accepted, although I did intend to ask one of my colleagues to move that a subsection be added to carry out the statement I made when we were on section 1, that provision would be made that no one could, by getting two pensions, have more than the maximum of one. The subsection which I intend to suggest adding reads:

(4) Notwithstanding subsection one, the pension authorized to be granted under this section to a public official shall not exceed an amount which, when added to any superannuation or retirement pension or annuity received by him in respect of any prior service under some other act of the parliament of Canada, equals the pension that might have been granted to him if the prior service and the annual remuneration upon which such other pension or annuity is calculated were, respectively, additional years of service in a public office and salary as a public official.

When the amendment now before the committee has been disposed of I will ask my colleague to move this as an amendment.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. HARKNESS: I was disappointed to hear the minister say that he was not prepared to withdraw subsection 2 (a). I had prepared an amendment almost identical to that moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, which I intended to move as a result of the minister not withdrawing the subsection. I shall certainly support the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. KNOWLES: The Secretary of State for External Affairs knows the high regard I have for his attitude toward public affairs and the high regard I have for the men who have been recruited in the service of his department. I shall endeavour to remain cool in what I have to say; but as one who has been fighting hard in this parliament since I came here for the pension rights of men who worked for forty or fifty years, true not for the government, but for a corporation in this country, I find it pretty hard to work up much sympathy for the minister's contention that we should provide pensions after five years' service in the diplomatic field. Perhaps I should not say any more or I shall get worked up about it; but when I think of the cases I have in my files of men with forty-five and fifty, one with fifty-two years of service, for which we cannot get consideration or help from this government, I think this bill is going a little too far. If any sympathy is needed for the men in this service who have had less than 10 years service they can get the protection they need under the bill we passed this afternoon, and there is always the old age pension of $30 a month at age seventy.

Mr. FLEMING: I should like to suggest to the hon. member who has moved this amendment that he bring subsection 2 into harmony with subsection 1, which would necessitate moving an amendment to subsection 1 to change the word "five in line 16, to "ten." Otherwise the two subsections will be contradictory. Subsection 1 would then read:

The governor in council, upon retirement or resignation of a public official who has served as such for not less than 10 years—

Subsection 2 as it would be amended does not make any provision for pension unless the offiicial has served for not less than 10 years. I suggest that subsection 1 should be brought into harmony.

Mr. KNOWLES: I thank the hon. member for his suggestion. Perhaps he will move that amendment after my amendment carries.

Mr. FLEMING: There is a little information I should like to have from the Secretary

of State for External Affairs. Apart altogether from the theoretical aspects of the section, I should like to know if the minister can point to any cases where an individual agreed to accept an appointment under the section as it now stands, but would not accept it with the amendment which has just been moved. Can he point to a case where an official has been appointed on an undertaking by the government to introduce legislation of this type, but who would not enter the public service on the basis of the amendment proposed?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No, there have been no undertakings given to anyone in respect of what the bill would provide. I did say to some that I would recommend a bill to parliament along these lines, but no undertaking was given and no acceptance of office was made conditional by any appointee.

Amendment, (Mr. Knowles) negatived: yeas, 40; nays, 57.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment which the minister has read.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BRYCE: I should like some information from the minister about this superannuation scheme. Last week I had occasion to speak of superannuation for the warders and guards in Stony Mountain penitentiary and I pointed out to the house that, after they had paid up all their back debt, they still had to pay for their pensions until the day they died. I want to ask the minister if the people who are being provided for by this bill—I cannot go over their names; it does not make any difference anyway—will have to pay six per cent of their salary until the day they die after they have started to draw their pensions. I want to know if there is a law for the rich and a law for the poor.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BRYCE: I cannot see it any other way. Because you have the warders and the guards in the penitentiaries—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I would ask the hon. member to deal specifically with this clause.

Mr. BRYCE: I am doing the very best I can, Mr. Chairman, to stick to this clause and I am raising this question to get information. I want to know why this difference is made. Why should the poor man have to pay for his pension to the day he dies and the rich man gets his pension right away? There is no fairness there, none whatsoever. I want the minister to answer me, and I shall not say any more if I get a satisfactory answer.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Under this clause no pensioner would pay after he becomes a pensioner. He pays six per cent of his salary while drawing his salary. When he ceases to draw salary he commences to draw pension and he does not have to pay any more. I do not know if there is any law anywhere else for any other class of pensioner. I would be very much surprised if one would cease to draw salary and continue to pay for the purpose of acquiring superannuation benefits. He has acquired superannuation benefits when he ceases to draw salary.

Mr. BRYCE: I should like to assure the minister that my facts are correct. You have these custodians and warders and guards and officers in the penitentiaries today, some of whom will retire at sixty-five years of age; they will continue to pay for their pension until they are sixty-eight and sixty-nine years old, and, after that, they are committed to pay until the day they die, after they have paid everything. But in the case of these gentlemen for whom this bill provides, they get their pension right away without paying any more. It is not fair and I will vote against it.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The hon. member may be confusing the matter. When one counts more years for the purposes of superannuation than he has actually served when he goes on superannuation, he can count those years by paying up the arrears with interest. Instead of paying up the arrears with interest in one lump sum at once he may say: I will pay them over a period of years. If they have not all been paid up when he becomes a pensioner they continue to be payable for the remaining years necessary at the instalment rate chosen to discharge the arrears. That is provided for in this bill too. If anyone goes into external affairs and counts prior service he can count his prior service, provided that he pays up the arrears with interest. Instead of making that payment in a lump sum, he may pay it off at so much a month, and if he has not finished paying it off when he becomes a pensioner he continues to pay it until he does finish paying it off. I think that is true of all superannuation systems.

Mr. BRYCE: I admit that, but the penitentiary guards and warders and custodians, after they have paid it all up, have to continue to pay until the day they die.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BRYCE: Yes, and that is the difference. Under this bill a man serves five years and gets a pension.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 5 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. ST. LAURENT moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, when I spoke in committee on this bill the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Shaw) followed me and stated that, even if I opposed this bill, it did not automatically follow that there would be an improvement in other pensions. I am not so green as to expect that anything like that would automatically follow; but, unless a protest is made in cases such as this, grievances will never be rectified, and it is for that reason that I now move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the word "now" be deleted and that the words "this day six months" be added at the end of the question.

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have listened very quietly to the debates on this question, and I must say now that I deeply resent the assumption of a monopoly of desire to help social security in Canada by any party in this house. I have worked for pensions since I was eighteen years of age. In the old country I fought for them under Lloyd George. I fought for them in Canada under the Liberal government which introduced them in 1927.

Mr. KNOWLES: Under pressure.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Today you have one of the most generous superannuation measures ever introduced into the Canadian parliament, and what do you find?

Mr. JACKMAN: Too generous.

Mr. MACKENZIE: An exhibition of political tactics, cheap and mean political tactics by the socialist group in this house opposing a real fundamental liberal measure of reform in this parliament of Canada. I wonder, if I may, without any suggestion—I am going to appeal—

Mr. JACKMAN: Count me with them and I am not socialist. It is too generous.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. member is a splendid gentleman. There is no suggestion of a partisan appeal. I am going to appeal to the idealism, to the reforming idealism of this house to resent and repudiate the mean and indefensible socialist tactics in defying and destroying one of the measures introduced by one of the greatest ministers that Canada has ever known in this house, the present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent). We challenge you on the vote. We shall meet you and we shall beat you. We shall defeat you on the vote; we shall go to the country and we shall beat you there.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the record be kept straight—

Mr. MACKENZIE: You cannot possibly do it.

Mr. KNOWLES: The Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) does not seem to realize that he has stated our case against this bill. He says that it is the most generous pension provision ever brought before the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I said the superannuation act.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is exactly our complaint against it. Among other things, it provides—

Mr. MACKENZIE: We brought in pensions before you ever arrived in this country.

Mr. KNOWLES: It provides for generous pensions, for example $3,000 a year, for people who have been in the public service for a period of only five years. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when the Minister of Veterans Affairs appeals to his followers to support this measure, as he is doing, he is doing something that they in their conscience will have a difficult job to support.

As to his suggestion that no group in this house is claiming a monopoly of interest in social legislation generally, we shall let the facts speak for themselves. I will say to him and to his followers over there that they seem to have a monopoly on this kind of legislation of special concessions and high pensions for a few privileged individuals.

Mr. H. R. JACKMAN (Rosedale): A short while ago, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned what the cost would be to the country and the value to the annuitants of these various pensions for a man in the service for only five years, who retired at an age which was lower than that contemplated in the bill. The Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) was good enough to call my attention to the fact that the age I had taken was lower than that contemplated in the bill. Taking the age at sixty-five, which is the earliest retiring age, I find —and this is where I find myself in agreement

with my hon. friends of the C.C.F. party as well as, no doubt, many in my own party—that a man can work for five years as an ambassador or in the diplomatic service, and during that time he gets a salary of $10,000 a year, which is not adequate according to the standards which they must maintain. But he is going to retire after five years' service with a pension of $3,000 a year. If he is sixty-five, then that pension, even under the extremely cheap rates which are charged by the department of annuities of the government, it is worth $30,000 to him. He has received $50,000 for his five years service, and that is where, according to my lights, the pensions are too generous. If a man has worked for ten years or longer he will have received $100,000. Retiring at sixty-five, he will have a pension which, under the same government annuity calculation, is worth $50,000 to him. I think a man who goes into the service at fifty-five and works for ten years is not entitled to a pension in that amount. We have too many needy cases elsewhere, and I must say it rebels and offends against my social conscience that those people who come into the diplomatic service at an advanced year of their life should receive a more than adequate pension for the services rendered. I do not find myself sufficiently in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to vote for it, inasmuch as he would give them nothing. I would give them something, but certainly not the amount which the minister has set forth in the bill, namely, after five years and under ten, 15/50ths of $10,000. Perhaps if the minister had been a little more reasonable and had given them 10/50ths I should find myself in a position to support the government. After a man serves in this capacity for more than twenty years, he is entitled to a pension of $7,000, and if he retires at sixty-five years of age that pension is worth $70,100. To my way of thinking, Mr. Speaker, that is altogether too much and too heavy a burden on the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I just wish to say a word before this bill passes. I have never been one of those to begrudge anybody a decent pension. On no occasion have I objected to a man receiving fair remuneration for the work he is performing for his country. I have been one of those who have fought as strenuously as I could to have the condition of the less fortunate people of this country ameliorated and for them to receive a greater amount of pension than they will receive under the bill which was passed a few days ago.

In view of the fact that not so many days ago we could not find money in this country to pay our old age pensioners more than $30 a month, I cannot bring myself to believe that on this occasion we should vote a pension of $3,000 to those in the diplomatic service for only five years. I cannot bring my conscience to justify that action and, Mr. Speaker, I must vote against it.

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): I was surprised at the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) getting so hot under the collar about our not giving more credit to his party for social legislation. There are other people in Canada who served overseas besides the men in the diplomatic service. Our men served overseas for six years. I notice that the minister's pension bill with respect to them is not nearly as generous as this is. I should like him to explain that. I think there should be some measure of fairness with regard to pensions that we pay in this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I ask a question. Is there an official system of pensions in the whole world that can be compared with our Canadian ex-service pensions?

Mr. WRIGHT: That is not the question at all. I am not questioning that. I am saying that when we in Canada can afford to pay pensions at the rate we are suggesting in this bill to certain classes in Canada, then I am not so proud of our veterans pensions.

Mr. MACKENZIE: You should be.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not think the minister should get hot under the collar about the matter.

Mr. D. S. HARKNESS (Calgary East): I do not think this question should be tied up with the old age pensions that are paid or the pensions that are paid to judges. The thing should stand on its own merits, as to whether it is a reasonable pension to pay to these men or not. As I have already indicated, when we were dealing with the amendment to subsection 2 (a) of section 3, I think that particular section which gives a pension of thirty per cent to a man who has served for five years is an unreasonable provision. Few arguments can be produced to support the pension provided by the government for those who have served over ten years. It may be generous; I think it is generous. I would not say that it is unduly excessive, but it is certainly generous. So long as subsection 2 (a) of section 3 is in the bill which gives

pensions of thirty per cent to men who have served only five years, I cannot bring my conscience to vote in favour of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): I wish to say one or two things on this amendment. First, the suggestion has been made that those who are in the diplomatic service abroad are serving Canada. I admit they are, but they are serving Canada no more than the miner is serving Canada, no more than the farmer is serving Canada—

Mr. MacNICOL: Nor the moulder or the blacksmith.

Mr. IRVINE: —and no more than any ordinary working man is serving Canada. These people are all serving Canada. As has been pointed out, many such men have forty, fifty and sixty years of hard work behind them, and yet they now find themselves without any pension.

There are two points I wish to make. The first is that the type of servant who is being provided for in the present legislation receives a very much higher reward for his services than the great masses of people who are serving Canada and, that being so, they are much more competent to take care of themselves without a pension. I am not arguing that they should not have a pension. In that regard I feel as the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston) does. I do not wish to put myself in the position of opposing a pension for any servant of Canada. But, as the hon. member who moved the amendment pointed out, we must of necessity, under circumstances such as these, make a protest or there would be no change.

The second point is that the miners, the farmers and the ordinary working people of the country must pay the pensions which these people will receive. Therefore it is not unreasonable that we should challenge the extraordinarily high pensions paid to them, while the great masses of the working people have no pensions at all. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West): I wish to support the opposition that has been expressed to the principle of this bill. I suggest that when we decide to give our old age pensioners something far better than $30 a month we can then entertain more reasonably any suggestion of providing a pension of $3,000 for service of five years, and paying high pensions to those who, in many cases, have drawn substantial salaries for a long term of years. I do not see the logic of this type of legislation and therefore, while I am not opposed to the paying of proper pensions to officials in all departments, I agree that we must make a protest against this procedure.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. MacInnis) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Adamson	Jackman
Archibald	Jaenicke
Argue	Jaques
Ashby	Johnston
Barrett	Knowles
Bentley	Kuhl
Blackmore	McCullough (Assiniboia)
Blair	MacInnis
Boucher	McKay
Bowerman	MacNicol
Bradshaw	Manross
Brooks	Matthews (Kootenay East)
Bryce	Menary
Burton	Murphy
Campbell	Pearkes
Caouette	Probe
Castleden	Quelch
Charlton	Senn
Cruickshank	Sinnott
Daniel	Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Fair	Strum, Mrs.
Ferguson	Thatcher
Fleming	Timmins
Fraser	Townley-Smith
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)	Tustin
Graydon	Webb
Green	White (Hastings-Peterborough)
Hansell	Wright
Harkness	Wylie
Hatfield	Zaplitny—63.
Hazen	
Hodgson	
Irvine	

NAYS

Messrs:

Beaudoin	Gour (Russell)
Belzile	Gourd (Chapleau)
Bertrand (Laurier)	Grant
Bertrand (Terrebonne)	Hartt
Boivin	Healy
Bonnier	Howe
Bradette	Ilsley
Bridges	Jutras
Brown	Kirk
Chevrier	Lafontaine
Cloutier	Lalonde
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)	Langlois
Coté (Verdun)	Leger
Cournoyer	McCann
Denis	McCulloch (Pictou)
Emmerson	Macdonald (Brantford City)
Farquhar	McDonald (Parry Sound)
Fournier (Hull)	McGarry
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)	McIlraith
Gauthier (Portneuf)	McIvor
Gibson (Hamilton West)	Mackenzie
Gingues	MacLean
Gladstone	Marquis
Golding	Matthews (Brandon)
	Maybank

Michaud	St. Laurent
Mutch	Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Nixon	Smith (York North)
Pinard	Stuart (Charlotte)
Raymond (Wright)	Tremblay
Richard (Gloucester)	Viau
Richard (Ottawa East)	Warren
Rinfret	Weir
Robinson (Simcoe East)	Whitman
Ross (Hamilton East)	Winkler
	Winters—70.

Mr. MARTIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. JEAN: I was paired with the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. ABBOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. CLAXTON: I was paired. Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. MacKINNON: I was paired with the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. HLYNKA: I was paired with the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. HERRIDGE: I was paired with the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Arsenault). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. HAMEL: I was paired with the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Brunelle). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Motion (Mr. St. Laurent) agreed to, and bill read the third time and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING VETERANS' PREFERENCE, INCREASED SALARIES FOR COMMISSIONERS, ETC.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Gibson moves that Bill No. 413, to amend the Civil Service Act, be now read the second time. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion? Carried. Mr. Gibson moves that I do now leave the chair—

Mr. GRAYDON: Before you call the next order of business, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid some hon. members cannot hear what order is being called. Perhaps you would repeat it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion has been put.

Mr. GRAYDON: What motion? We could not hear a single word.

Mr. SPEAKER: The item on the order paper has been called and the motion has been put. Mr. Gibson moves that I do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole to consider the said bill.

Mr. GRAYDON: Might we know what bill it is? We have to reserve our rights in respect to the principle of this bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I repeat: Mr. Gibson moves that bill—

Some hon. MEMBERS: What bill?

Mr. MACKENZIE: If I may rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is Bill No. 413, to amend the Civil Service Act.

Hon. COLIN GIBSON (Secretary of State) moved the second reading of Bill No. 413, to amend the Civil Service Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—Definitions.

Mr. BOUCHER: I am sure the civil service generally will receive with approval most of the amendments contained in this bill, and I do not think I need dwell upon it at any length. Section 1 deals with definitions, and in particular deals with the extension of certain preferences to war veterans. In checking it over, I do not find that the section takes into consideration many who went overseas, not as members of the army, the air force or the navy, but who, I believe, should have the benefit of the veterans preference in the civil service. I speak particularly of such groups as the merchant marine, the fire-fighters and the Victorian Order of Nurses. Provision is made in this bill to extend the preference to those who served with the Y.M.C.A. and other auxiliary services, who really were not in the fighting services but were overseas doing work in hazardous positions. However I suggest that a Y.M.C.A. worker or a member of some other auxiliary service did not do any more exacting work and was not in a more dangerous position than members of the merchant marine or of the Victorian Order of Nurses, or even the fire-fighters. I believe very few of these are in the civil service, and perhaps not many of them would have to be considered, but there are those who have done their duty to their country in a notable way, and who, I believe, should be given considera-

tion when seeking positions in the civil service or when applying for promotions, and so on. Would the minister make a comment on this particular clause and state whether or not the government is willing to give them the status of veterans preference?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I do not intend to make a long speech on this bill. The veterans preference covered by this bill is the result of a recommendation made by the veterans affairs committee which sat last year. That committee recommended that the preference which had been provided during the war as a temporary measure be continued.

Mr. BROOKS: Did the veterans committee not state that it should be continued for the present, and was there not an expectation that a committee on the civil service would be set up this year to give further consideration to the matter of veterans preference? The committee on veterans affairs recommended that the preference remain as it was. I am sure the words "for the present" were in there because I looked them up only yesterday.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I am not sure of the wording, but I know that was the recommendation of the committee. I was gratified to receive today two letters from civil service organizations, one of which came to me only this evening from the acting president of the civil service federation, who states:

> I thought you should know that the Civil Service Federation of Canada, at an executive meeting held yesterday (Sunday) approved of the proposed amendments to the Civil Service Act and is anxious that they be adopted at the current session of parliament.

Then I have another letter from the national joint council of the public service of Canada. I do not want to pat myself on the back because I do not deserve it, but I want to read this letter, which is as follows:

> The national joint council of the public service, having examined the provisions of the bill to amend the Civil Service Act,
>
> (1) endorses the provisions of the bill;
>
> (2) expresses its appreciation of the action of the Secretary of State in facilitating its consideration of the bill;
>
> (3) expresses its appreciation of the work of the civil service commission, the Secretary of State and the government in connection with the bill; and
>
> (4) expresses the hope that the bill will be passed at the present session of parliament.

I read those letters so that they may be on the record. I appreciate the support of the bill that we have introduced which is given by these members of the civil service.

[Mr. Boucher.]

Mr. BROOKS: I do not think the minister answered the hon. member for Carleton who asked if it were possible to have the term "veteran" include a merchant seaman and members of the other services that were mentioned.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The matter was discussed by the veterans committee, and I would not take it upon myself to put it into the bill unless it came as a direct recommendation of the veterans committee. The Minister of Veterans Affairs suggested that next session the veterans committee might be reconvened and, of course, if that happened the matter would receive consideration.

Mr. HAMEL: I want to deal with the functioning of the civil service commission and I do not know whether I can do this on section 1 or section 2.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I think section 2 would be more appropriate.

Mr. GREEN: I should like to appeal particularly to the members of the house who served on the special committee on veterans affairs which sat during 1945 and 1946. The minister was a member of that committee, but he was not able to attend very frequently. I am sure that from the beginning to the end of those sessions there was not one member of that committee who did not want to see merchant seamen treated as members of the fourth arm of the services. I do not think there was any sentiment against their being so treated. The minister has just suggested that he is not prepared to include them in this bill because there was no recommendation from that committee, but I think I can assure him that no member of that committee is against the merchant seamen being given the civil service preference. If we delay until next year, the government will not want to open up the Civil Service Act, and that is easily understood. This is the time to set that matter right.

The merchant seamen are not getting the benefits given to the members of the other forces. Many who were disabled cannot get a pension under the present law and here is a case where they can be helped. I suggest that this preference be extended to cover them. It is merely a matter of extending the definition. Time and again, leaders across the country have taken the position that the merchant navy were the fourth arm of the services. I happen to have before me the speech from the throne, delivered on September 6, 1945, in which we find these words:

> Our country will ever remember with pride the heroic exploits of Canada's fighting men and merchant seamen.

Here is a chance to do something for these men. I do not think there is one argument that can be advanced against extending preference to the men of the merchant navy. I ask the minister not to close the section without giving further consideration to amending it to include the men of the merchant navy. I appeal to those members who served on the veterans affairs committee to support us in in this respect. I am quite sure that there is not one of them who would have the law other than including preference for the men of the merchant navy. Now is the time to come to their aid.

Mr. BENTLEY: I want to support wholeheartedly what has been said by the hon. member for Vancouver South. During the sittings of the veterans committee I, along with many others, believed that the merchant seamen were going to get much more consideration than they have. Frequently benefits for merchant seamen have been requested by members on this side of the house, and I believe they had at least moral support from members on the other side. I could understand, though I could not justify, the government's reluctance to change this legislation if it meant that a great many more men were to come under pension and other benefits, but in this case it costs the government no more to hire a merchant seaman for a civil service job than it does to hire anybody else. I do not believe that the veterans organizations across Canada would oppose the inclusion of merchant seamen in the definition of those eligible for civil service positions. The government has no excuse whatsoever on the ground of costs for refusing to include them. The government might be afraid that this might be the opening wedge, which it will not be because I can assure them we shall persist in our attempts to get even further justifiable benefits for the merchant seamen of Canada. This question will be raised as long as there are veterans in this house and merchant seamen still alive, and the least the government can do is to give the merchant seamen partial recognition at least by including them in the definitions.

(Translation):

Mr. HAMEL: I would like to say a few words on this section, but I will be brief. I have begun my remarks on the resolution which preceded the first reading of the bill.

(Text):

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the hon. member for St. Maurice-Lafleche wishes to have a little more latitude allowed in discussing this bill than is permitted under the rules. He states that he rose on the second reading but did not have an opportunity to speak. Is it the unanimous desire of the committee that he should speak at this time?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

(Translation):

Mr. HAMEL: When speaking on the resolution, I showed, Mr. Chairman, that the French-speaking element makes up 30 per cent of our population and I mentioned that its representation in the civil service was considerably below that percentage. I proved that in the civil service as a whole that percentage was very low. I wished to give certain details, but I was not permitted to do so. I believe that it would be appropriate to give them now.

If we examine the various departments, from the first to the last, we find a shocking injustice in all ranks of civil servants. For example, out of twenty-two deputy ministers, not one is a French Canadian. The Montreal chamber of commerce made a complete investigation of the matter and drew up a very interesting table showing the proportion of French Canadians in the civil service, according to certain classifications. For example in the $8,000 yearly salary bracket and over, they note that the percentage of French Canadians is only 12·3 per cent, while the percentage of the French-speaking element makes up 30 per cent of the total population. Among employees earning $6,000 and over per annum, 8·12 represents the percentage of French Canadians, while among civil servants whose yearly salary is fixed at $4,000 and over, the proportion of French-speaking citizens is estimated at 9·52 per cent. In the class earning a yearly salary of $3,000 and over, the percentage comes to 11·39 per cent while at the level of $2,400 and over per annum, which includes the largest number of ordinary employees, the proportion is found to be 12·25 per cent.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, French-speaking Canadians are not given their fair share of employment in the civil service. Why? It is claimed at times that they are not sufficiently qualified and that the reason why French Canadians do not have as much opportunity for promotion in the civil service is that they lack the required ability. Such an argument is not only extremely humiliating, but it is also ridiculous. First, what is meant by ability should be determined. How are qualifications decided upon? I find, for instance, that an ambassador was appointed deputy minister of mines. In what manner does an ambassador's post lead to that of deputy

minister of mines? On the other hand, the deputy minister of national revenue, a tax collector, has been elevated to the rank of ambassador. On what basis does the civil service commission or the government judge ability?

Now, that argument may be open to question. It would be another matter if this unfairness towards French Canadians affected only a small number of employees from whom specialized scientific knowledge would be required; but that is not so, Mr. Speaker. Discrimination, as I have shown earlier, is found all along the line, in every department and in every branch. Now, it must further be assumed that in selecting French-speaking candidates, the Civil Service Commission eagerly seeks those who offer the very least in the way of future possibilities. Further, it is ridiculous to claim that among three and one half million French Canadians, sufficiently qualified personnel required to fill even the $2,400 posts cannot be found. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the ability factor does not come into play.

What does all this bring about? I have shown that because of this discrimination towards French Canadians, my French-speaking fellow-citizens lose $30 to $40 million per annum. If you add to that, Mr. Chairman, the fact that about 40 million dollars are now being lost every year as a result of tax agreements between the dominion and the provinces, you will see that French-speaking Canadians will lose about 70 million dollars each year.

Some are wondering why disunion exists in this country. Good will pilgrimages are organized across Canada. Other provinces are told, for instance, that the reason why there is not understanding is that our schools are teaching that the deportation of Acadians occurred in 1755. I say that if there is disunion in this country it is not because our schools are teaching that the Acadians were deported in 1755, but rather because in 1947, and especially since 1919, the deportation of French Canadians from the civil service is going on systematically. That is the true cause of misunderstanding in this country.

Mr. CAOUETTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. HAMEL: Who are those responsible for that situation, Mr. Chairman? I notice the French representation in the civil service has sharply decreased especially since the creation of the civil service commisison. The chambre de commerce of Montreal, which gives us most interesting facts, shows for instance that in 1918 before the civil service commission as it now exists came into being, our proportion was much greater than it is now. As regards the total number of positions in the country, our proportion was then 21·58 per cent, while it is now 12·25 per cent.

The downward trend has been particularly noticeable since the establishment of the civil service commission. Is that body responsible for such a state of affairs? I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is not the only one to blame. However, it has its share of responsibility for the following reasons: first, it has given its approval to the so-called "made-to-measure requisitions" which have been so much ridiculed. A deputy minister or the head of a department wishes to have Mr. So-and-So appointed; he sets out himself the required qualifications and does so in such a way that only one person can meet the requirements, namely the one who has been chosen in advance and who quite often is already filling the position. Secondly, the responsibility of the civil service commission comes from the obligations it has under the act. The Civil Service Act places upon the commission, among others, the following duty:

> Of its own motion to investigate and report upon the operation of this act and upon the violation of any of the provisions hereof or of any regulation made hereunder; and, upon the request of the head of a department, to investigate and report upon any matter relative to the department, its officers, clerks and other employees.

And besides:

> To report upon the organization or proposed organization of the departments or any portion of any department or of the civil service, and upon any proposed change in such organization;

I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that this clause of the Civil Service Act entrusts the commission with the duty to see that, in the civil service, the fundamental principle of our democracy "representation by population" is adhered to. The civil service commission has failed to do that and therefore bears full responsibility in the matter.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what reforms are indicated? I wonder whether the civil service commission is capable of making them. The first reform is to demand of every federal employee whose jurisdiction extends to the whole country that he be perfectly bilingual. What would be the result, I ask all hon. members of this house, if at a certain time one of them wishing to speak to the timber controller, for example, were to get the following answer: "I am sorry but I cannnot speak English." What could be the result of such a situation. If it is preposterous in the eyes of the English-speaking members, I respectfully submit that it is just as preposterous for French-speaking members.

Mr. Chairman, we are being told at times that, according to a school of thought now taking shape in the province of Quebec, the federal government is considered somewhat as a foreign government. It may be true. But who is to blame?

Take for instance the case of some constituent of mine who, coming to Ottawa and calling at various departments, finds that officials are exclusively English-speaking.

Here are a few instances: Veterans Affairs, out of four officials paid $8,000 or more, none are French-speaking. At the Department of Agriculture, out of five officials getting $8,000 or more, none are French-speaking. At the Department of Insurance, none. At the Auditor General's, none. At the Department of Commerce, none; at the Mutual Aid Board, none; at the Civil Service Commission, among those paid $8,000 or more yearly, none. I know there is a French-speaking commissioner, but he does get less than $8,000. At the National Research Council, none; at the Privy Council, none; at National Defence, out of four officials who get $8,000 or more, none are French-speaking. At the Department of Finance, out of four officials receiving a yearly salary of $8,000 or more, none are French speaking. At the Governor General's, none; at the Department of Justice, where three officials get $8,000 or more—those figures apply to 1946 and there may be one now, but of those three none are French-speaking. At the National Film Board, none; Fisheries, nil; Reconstruction, not a single French-speaking official out of seven. At National Revenue, no French speaking official. And so it runs in almost every department.

Mr. Chairman, how do you expect and how can members of this house expect that our French-speaking compatriots will feel perfectly at home in Ottawa when, for the discussion of their problems they cannot contact officials who understand their language and appreciate their outlook?

Mr. Chairman, to achieve fairness, the indispensable programme I now submit to the hon. members opposite is as follows: the appointment of six French-speaking deputy ministers; 18 officials paid $8,000 a year or more; 88 officials getting $6,000 or more; 352 officials with a salary of $4,000 or more, and 1,185 other French-speaking civil servants paid at least $3,000.

Those, Mr. Chairman, were the few comments I wished to make in this connection, and I hope they will be taken into consideration.

Mr. HACKETT: I wish to add a few words to what has just been said by my learned colleague, the hon. member for St. Maurice-Laflèche (Mr. Hamel).

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HACKETT: Unfortunately, I am the only member of my party in Quebec and since the majority of my electors are French Canadians, I believe it is my duty to support the remarks of my colleague the hon. member for St. Maurice-Laflèche.

Mr. FERGUSON: Hear, hear!

Mr. HACKETT: I have already stated in this house that it is unfortunate that a whole ethnical group should surrender to one party. That is unfortunate for the group, it is unfortunate for the party which takes in its fold; it is unfortunate also for the opponent which is deprived of its support. I think it is unfortunate that my party should have no French-speaking representatives.

As a result, we do not know exactly what they think and we do not have the benefit of their philosophy of life and of their point of view.

I say it is unfortunate for the party in power because they take the liberty of doing injustices as were described by the hon. member who has just spoken. Injustice is prejudicial to everyone, especially to those who render themselves guilty of it. It is also unfortunate for the group which surrenders entirely to one political party because they will be treated inequitously and, like poor relatives, that is like penniless relatives, who we accept somewhat scornfully and against our will.

I know that those problems are difficult to solve, but I hope that the situation will be remedied. I know the matter is being dealt with and I hope that the commission which is looking into the problem will shortly be in a position to report to the house that French-speaking Canadians are equitably represented in the public service and that there will be a sufficient number of French-Canadian senior officials suitably to represent that element of the population.

Mr. MICHAUD, Hear, hear!

Mr. HACKETT: Let us put aside that question of ability. It is non-existent and none of those who are aware of the situation would even suggest that there is lack of talent, training or experience among French Canadians.

I therefore hope and wish that a fair solution will soon be found to that problem.

(Text):

Mr. HAMEL: I wish to ask certain questions. Will the minister tell the committee: (1) whether a resolution voted unanimously

by the legislature of Quebec, in connection with the situation of the French-speaking Canadian in the civil service, has been received by the federal government? (2) Whether a delegation of the chamber of commerce of Montreal has met the federal government and presented a brief on the same matter? (3) If so, what steps have been taken following such resolution and representations?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I assure the hon. member that representations from Quebec were received sympathetically. I was present when the delegation came from Montreal, and I can assure him that the representations made have been taken into consideration and that every effort will be made to put into effect some of them, if not all, at the earliest possible date.

Mr. HAMEL: Have any official steps been taken by the government? If so, what steps?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I can assure my hon. friend that I have four major appointments in my department from the province of Quebec.

Mr. FERGUSON: Is that four out of four hundred or what?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Major, I said.

Mr. FERGUSON: In what proportion have they been made?

Mr. MACKENZIE: In the rightful proportion, according to the population of Canada. There is not, and there should not be, any preference of any province over another in our confederation. It is only a matter of fair play.

Mr. FERGUSON: Actually, has fair play been carried out according to population?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I regret to say, in my opinion, it has not been carried out.

Mr. FERGUSON: That is your fault apparently.

Mr. HAMEL: Will the Secretary of State tell the committee whether an answer has been given to the legislature of Quebec.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I cannot say that an answer has been given. The answer would not be sent from the civil service commission. I do not know whether or not the Prime Minister has sent one.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I was present at the interview, and the delegation was assured by the Prime Minister that the representations would receive the utmost consideration of the government in its different aspects.

Mr. HACKETT: I fear there is a slight misunderstanding. My hon. friend the member for St. Maurice-Lafleche is speaking about the resolution that was passed in the legislature and he is asking, if it was received, what action has been taken on it.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): I thought the hon. member was talking about the chambre de commerce resolution.

Mr. HACKETT: That is where the error has crept in. He was asking first, about a resolution passed in the legislature of Quebec and, second, about a delegation from the chambre de commerce. The second question has been answered, and he is now asking what has been done about the resolution from the Quebec legislature.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Speaking purely in a personal capacity, I must say that the resolution from the province of Quebec as such, never came to my attention, as one of the ministers of the crown. The only representations that we received as a committee of the government were from the chambre de commerce.

Mr. HAMEL: The government has received nothing from the legislature of Quebec? The government has received no resolution from the government of Quebec?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I only said I was not aware of any.

Mr. BLACKMORE: In response to a question asked by an hon. member, the minister said he regretted to say that fair play had not been carried out. I gather he meant that care had not been exercised to see that there was the correct number of appointments of persons speaking each language in relation to the population of the nation. Did he mean that there were too many English-speaking civil servants for the number of English-speaking people, or too many French-speaking civil servants for the number of French-speaking people?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am sorry indeed if my hon. friend got that interpretation from my remarks. There have been great difficulties in securing personnel, but I say, that in the result, in the final analysis, there has been a degree of unfairness, in my judgment, and I am speaking only for myself and not for the government.

Mr. BLACKMORE: And is that unfairness against the French-speaking people?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I would not say it is against the French-speaking people. There must be an equal adjustment of appoint-

ments, having regard to all the diversified peoples who make up our united Canadian country.

Mr. BLACKMORE: While on that subject, I think it is a matter of deep interest to all members of the house and to all Canadians for the minister to give us an idea who has been supervising the whole matter. Who has been watching appointments in an overall capacity, acting as a board of referees, so as to enable the government to find out whether there has been a correct appointment?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The civil service commission is an agency set up by parliament and is responsible for appointments. It is independent of any department of government and it makes appointments. It holds examinations and fills vacancies.

Mr. BLACKMORE: What I am concerned about is, what agency in the civil service commission is responsible for seeing to it that a correct proportion is maintained, that there are not too many English-speaking appointees for the number of English-speaking people and not too many French-speaking appointees in relation to the French-speaking population. Is there a definite committee whose business it is to see to that, in order to ensure that justice is maintained?

Mr. MACKENZIE: There are examining boards under the civil service commission, and they generally assess the applicants upon technical qualifications for the various positions that are vacant in the government service. Unfortunately, in some cases the necessary personnel were not available according to what one might call regional justice across Canada. That has been the result; there is no question about it, but it has not been deliberate in any sense. It is something that has developed and something that should be corrected.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I was surprised that any question should be raised at all as to whether there were not enough French in the civil service; and I wondered how that came about, whether it was a condition that actually existed, and how the person who raised the question knew it existed. What evidence did he have access to which was not available to the ordinary member of parliament? That is what I am concerned about. If someone raised the question that there were too few French-speaking people in the service I want to know where he got his information, and if the Secretary of State can give that information it will help us. I am not asking the question in any spirit of unfairness, because I want to make sure that there is fairness, just as everyone else does. All I want to know is, have we an objective way of determining this matter? If we have not, I think it is time the house and the government took steps to see that a committee is appointed to see that justice prevails. Can the Secretary of State set at rest these anxieties which are in the minds especially of English-speaking members of the house?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): If anybody asks a question on the order paper as to the relative numbers, that question is answered. I am not sure, but I rather think that earlier in the session some questions were asked, and the answers were given. There is no secrecy about the matter. But as my colleague mentioned, the situation did gradually develop with the result that the civil service commission was holding competitions and making appointments according to the marks obtained on the examination; and it was found that the service had become somewhat out of balance. I know that many representations have been made recently on the same subject by members of parliament.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The minister used the expression "out of balance". Does that mean that there are more English speaking civil servants than there ought to be, considering the English-speaking element of Canada, or that there are more French-speaking civil servants than there ought to be?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I cannot say what there ought to be, but I can say that there are fewer French-speaking civil servants than representation by population would entitle them to.

Mr. REID: Is there any intention to change the regulations? Is there any intention to change the examination of the civil servants with a view to adjusting that, because that to me would be important? I do not know how it can be adjusted if the regulations call for certain qualifications and the papers are marked accordingly. The nation is watching what is going to happen and the people are wondering—and I am wondering, too—if the examination will be made a little different because one speaks French and another speaks English.

Mr. FERGUSON: The civil service commission is a separate body and is not supposed to be dictated to by members of the government, as I understand it. Civil servants are admitted to the civil service by examination. Surely that rule has been followed. If not, why not? This government has been in power for some time now. It is supposed to be supervising these things to some degree. We now find a considerable amount of turmoil

across this country over the contention that there are too few French-speaking Canadians in the civil service. I understand that the rule is that the man who obtains the highest marks in the examination is the one who is appointed. If we are following the correct course, irrespective of whether he is a French-Canadian or not, the man who attains the highest standard is the one who should have the job. Where does this trouble creep in which the Minister of Veterans Affairs says he is sorry to say exists? I believe we are entitled to an explanation for a statement like that. He must be firmly convinced that this condition exists because civil servants did not pass the examinations correctly or did not obtain the high standard necessary to obtain the position. What has it to do with whether a man is a French-Canadian or not? If the civil service is being run properly, the condition cannot exist which the Minister of Veterans Affairs would have us believe he is sorry to say does exist. If it does, then this thing is not being run properly. I think the committee is entitled to an explanation.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I never said that, and I resent the suggestion.

Mr. FERGUSON: Words to that effect.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I never said anything of that kind.

Mr. FERGUSON: Then repeat it so that members can understand it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: There are two principles to be observed: first of all, there is the efficiency of the civil service; second, there is the promotion of national unity in Canada. Those are the two principles which we are endeavouring to observe and which we shall continue to observe.

Mr. FERGUSON: I am just as much in favour of national unity in this country as the minister is; and I do not take second place to anybody in this committee in that regard. Divide and rule is the principle followed by the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. member does not help unity very much.

Mr. FERGUSON: The minister will do anything to be elected.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I was elected long before the hon. member was born, I think.

Mr. MacNICOL: Oh, you are not that old.

Mr. FERGUSON: The minister must have been a child then and still talks like one.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2, 3 and 4 agreed to.

On section 5—Appointments of veterans who were permanent civil servants.

Mr. BROOKS: This section deals with the appointment of veterans who were permanent civil servants and who served overseas. The other day, on the resolution stage, I mentioned the fact that in crown companies the preference was not recognized. I asked the minister at that time if in this bill something could not be done to see that the veteran was given the preference in these crown companies, as well as in other departments of the government.

I should also like to ask the minister with reference to the permanently employed. We know that in the civil service there are a great many temporary employees, as well as permanent ones, who went overseas. There were a good many young men who left this country, who went overseas and came back, who were not permanent employees in the civil service, but were temporary employees. Why does this bill not include the temporary employee as well as the permanent one? If the minister checks up, I think he will find there were a great many of these young men in temporary employment. I also understood that temporary employment was the first step towards permanent employment in the civil service. I think that is correct, in a great many cases.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): That is not necessarily so, but usually it is the case that a man is first appointed temporarily.

Mr. BROOKS: A case in point would be as follows: A young man had just entered the civil service as a temporary employee. He was looking forward to being permanently employed later on. He goes overseas and comes back. Being a temporary employee of the civil service, under this measure the government department would not be compelled to take him back and give him the same preference he would receive had he been employed by a civilian company. Under the Reinstatement in Civil Employment Act, the company would have to take this man back and give him the same position he had before. Under this bill, if he were employed as a temporary employee and came back from overseas, the government has no responsibility at all with regard to taking him on. I would suggest to the minister that the word "permanently" should be struck out, so that the section would read, "a person who was employed in the civil service and who had resigned", and so on. I should like the minister to comment on that and give his opinion.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): This section deals with extending the privilege which was granted after the first world war to veterans of the second war. During the first war, permanent employees who had resigned and joined the forces were not automatically taken back into the service and they were not granted the privilege of coming back to their employment. But after the war was over, they were reinstated. Early in this war, in order to prevent the permanents from resigning and going overseas, they were told they would not be reinstated at the end of the war. However I think better judgment was displayed later. Those who had permanent positions before the war now have the right of being brought back to the service, but in many cases the positions for them are not available. For example, a man does not come back and resume the permanent position he had before the war. As will be understood, it being a permanent position, when the man resigned the position was filled. The result is that the man who resigned applies to the commission to be reinstated in the civil service and the commission places his name on the list of eligible persons. Then, when there is a vacancy he is entitled to be taken back to a position of the same kind as that from which he had resigned. I quite agree with my hon. friend that this does not specifically provide for temporary employees. A man who resigned from his temporary position is entitled, when he comes back, to take a position for which he is qualified, but I admit that this forces the commission to place his name on the eligible list.

Mr. BROOKS: Could the word "permanently" be taken out? Do you think that would injure the clause at all? I believe it would make it stronger. I should like to hear the opinion of the Minister of Veterans Affairs on that point. Section 5 says "a person who was permanently employed," and I suggest that the temporary employee who went overseas should also have the opportunity of resuming his position. If the word "permanent" were taken out this clause would cover both temporary and permanent employees.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Perhaps this section could be left over for a moment, so I can discuss that suggestion with the chairman of the commission. It is possible that could be done.

Mr. BENTLEY: I should like to follow up what was said by the hon. member for Vancouver South and myself on the first section. At that time we were endeavouring to have merchant seamen included in the definition of "veteran."

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. BENTLEY: I am right on this section, which has the word "veteran" in it. At that time the minister did not even comment, indicating that he was not remotely interested in the welfare of merchant seamen, and the committee gaily passed the section without further comment. I should like to find out from the minister whether any men, either temporary or permanent employees, resigned from the civil service to join the merchant marine and, if so, whether on their return they will be included as veterans under this section and reinstated. Or does the word "veteran" in line twenty-six simply apply to those who are described as veterans in section one?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The word "veteran" means a veteran as defined in section one of this bill.

Mr. BENTLEY: Has the minister nothing further to say in regard to the attitude of the government toward the suggestion that the interpretation be widened to include members of the merchant marine previously employed in the civil service, who resigned to join the merchant marine, and who gave the sort of service we have heard so much about from all sides of this house? Has the minister anything to say on the suggestion that they be included within this section so that they will have the same opportunities they had before?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): No, I have nothing to add. This section simply extends the same preference to veterans of the second war that was given veterans of the first war, and I am not prepared to widen the definition in section one.

Mr. BENTLEY: And the minister is not prepared to include the merchant seamen under any section of this bill? Is that the situation?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Yes, that is the situation.

Mr. BROOKS: According to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, the veterans affairs committee is being set up again next year.

Mr. MACKENZIE: We hope so.

Mr. BROOKS: Would the minister entertain a recommendation in this regard coming from the veterans affairs committee next year?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The government gives careful consideration to the recommendations of the veterans affairs committee; that is why the committee is set up,

in order to get the advice of those who were veterans of the two wars. My hon. friend brought up the possibility of removing the word "permanently". I have spoken to the chairman of the civil service commission, who tells me they now have a regulation under which any temporary employee who saw service overseas may be reinstated upon his return to this country.

Mr. GREEN: In regard to the setting up of the committee next year, am I to understand that the only reason the merchant seamen are not included in the amendments this year is that there was no recommendation to that effect from the veterans affairs committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE: If I may reply to my hon. friend, that is not the reason at all. Last year in the veterans affairs committee there was a certain amount of confusion of thought, if I may use the expression, as to whether my good friend and colleague the Minister of Transport or the Minister of Veterans Affairs should accept direct responsibility for either the initiation or approbation of legislation in regard to merchant seamen. I am sorry I have not my files with me tonight, but I should like very much to have the privilege of informing this committee how much has been done for the merchant seamen of Canada. We have done more than any other country in the world, more than England has done. I must bring the list down some day and read it to the committee on my own estimates, because I think I owe it to myself as one who had something to do with the matter before my hon. friend took over active direction. And I had the cooperation of my hon. friends opposite. Today, under veterans' legislation there are fourteen distinct and specific benefits given merchant seamen in Canada.

Mr. GREEN: May I ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs this question? Is he against giving this preference to merchant seamen who served in a theatre of war?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend knows I have been prominent now in these endeavours for nearly thirty years—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE: —and I am not going to be caught in any trap that may be set by my hon. friends.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I would ask hon. gentlemen to take their seats when the Chairman or the Speaker rises. There is not room for two on the floor at one time. I should like to call attention to the fact that the minister has repeatedly said this section does not apply at all to merchant seamen. He has explained that several times already, and no good purpose is to be served by discussing a matter which has no relation to this clause.

Mr. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, but—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I would ask my hon. friend to tell me how merchant seamen can be discussed under this clause.

Mr. GREEN: We are asking that the merchant seamen be put under the clause.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But the minister has said repeatedly that he is not putting them under this clause, and no good purpose can be served by repeating the same question.

Mr. GREEN: But because the minister says he is not going to do it does not prevent us from speaking about it.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any speech in committee must be strictly relevant to the clause under discussion. How can my hon. friend discuss the merchant marine under this clause and abide by the rules?

Mr. GREEN: We are entitled to ask that merchant seamen be included.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But my hon. friend has asked and the minister has answered.

Mr. GREEN: The Minister of Veterans Affairs has made a statement, and I have a right to ask him a question on it. I asked him a question which was perfectly straightforward, which was not a trick in any sense of the word. I asked whether or not he thought the merchant seamen should get this veterans preference. He should be able to answer either yes or no to that.

Mr. MUTCH: He is not a witness.

Mr. GREEN: My hon. friend should have got up a few moments ago and said what he had to say.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member not to discuss the point further.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The matter has been referred to by the minister himself, as I understand it. As can be verified by the records, I was one of those in the committee who definitely asked that this particular problem should be considered. We were requested to delay the matter, because it would be dealt with by the Minister of Transport. The records

will show that this matter was discussed in the committee on veterans affairs. I disagree with your ruling, Mr. Chairman; I say we have every right to ask whether this is or is not going to be considered.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I want to tell the hon. member for Fraser Valley again that this question has been asked and the minister has answered definitely that it is not going to be included in this bill. Furthermore, the other night the Minister of Transport gave a summary—this is on the record—of what has been done for the merchant seamen. Apart from all that, there is no place in this clause for a discussion of merchant seamen.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: With all deference to your ruling—and I shall abide by it—may I say that we were given to understand in the veterans affairs committee that the Minister of Transport would bring forth a section which would cover the members of the merchant marine in the way asked for by the hon. member.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You were given to understand no such thing by the minister.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The minister did not give us to understand that because he was not privileged to be a member of the veterans affairs committee, but we were definitely given that understanding.

Mr. BENTLEY: Do I understand that you have ruled that no hon. member has the right to argue with the minister that merchant seamen should be included in this?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is right.

Mr. BOUCHER: May I ask your reconsideration of the statement you made a moment ago? If your ruling is that nothing that is not in the bill can be discussed it will mean that we cannot discuss an amendment.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member knows very well that speeches in committee must be strictly relevant to the clause, and there is no provision in this clause for the merchant seamen. The question has been asked several times, and the minister has repeatedly said that he had no intention of including that in this clause. I cannot see what good purpose can be served by repeating this discussion which is out of order.

Mr. BOUCHER: As you have asked that question, I will answer it. I do not think there is any necessity to hammer at the same question, but I do not think the rules of this house are that you must stick to the positive enactment of any piece of legislation. When legislation is put before the House of Commons it is for hon. members to speak on what is in it and as to what improvements should be made. That being the case, they must go beyond the wording of the bill. I think your ruling to restrict discussion on the bill goes altogether too far.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I want to take exception to that ruling. I may be corrected and called to order, but my definite understanding in the veterans affairs committee was that the Minister of Transport would bring in legislation which would bring forth what we are now asking for. It was given to us as a distinct understanding and now members of the merchant marine are left out in the cold.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I deny that.

Mr. CROLL: Then they were left out in the heat.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The Minister of Veterans Affairs comes from a good province and he is generally in good humour, but the members of the veterans affairs committee had that distinct understanding. If we cannot discuss it now, when can we discuss it?

Section agreed to.

Section 5 agreed to.

On section 6—List of competitors eligible for appointment.

Mr. HAMEL: In order to find out how this section would work, I should like to place a case before the minister. Suppose five candidates have sat for an examination. One receives the minimum marks, and he is a veteran. Another receives higher marks and he is not a veteran. Another is still more qualified, and he has no veterans preference. Who will be chosen?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): As long as the man with veterans preference gets the minimum requirements he will get the position over a man who may have got full marks but who is not a veteran.

Mr. HAMEL: The veteran will get the position, provided that the minimum marks are obtained?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): That is correct.

Section agreed to.

Sections 7 to 9 agreed to.

Schedule A agreed to.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Mr. Speaker—

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Mr. Speaker—

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GOLDING: Item 583.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman, before you proceed. I think we should have more respect in this house. I think the Speaker should look to see if anyone wants to speak to the motion. If the leader of the house was as keen about his duties as he is to criticize this side of the house he would see that there was a better deal for us in this house.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am sorry if my hon. friend feels that there has been any injustice to any of his group. If I had been aware that anyone intended to speak before the Speaker left the chair I would have seen that my hon. friends were completely protected.

Mr. MacINNIS: They are not fully protected. The hon. member rose to his feet before the motion was put.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am sorry; I did not see him.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I was on my feet before the Speaker put the motion and I said, "Mr. Speaker" several times and members of the house heard me.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is quite probable that we shall have supply tomorrow, and my hon. friends will have every opportunity if they so desire to debate any question they wish.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: On a point of order, I do not often disagree with my own party, but the hon. member was definitely on his feet and asked for a hearing before the Speaker had left the chair. Surely if parliamentary procedure is followed and if we represent the people, as I think we are supposed to represent them, the hon. member is entitled to be heard.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. member will certainly have an opportunity tomorrow to say whatever he wishes to say. I can assure him that if I had seen him on his feet I would have protected his right.

Mr. HACKETT: If the right hon. gentleman were to move that the committee rise and report progress that might be a way out.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Is it necessary to do that?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: On a question of privilege, it will involve no more time tonight than it will take tomorrow, if expediting the business of the house is to be considered. We have no guarantee that the same thing will not be repeated tomorrow. I would therefore ask the leader of the house to move that we report progress and ask leave to sit again, so that I may say what I want to say, because it is a matter of urgency.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I think my hon. friend and the committee will admit that my attitude has been very reasonable. I am sorry that I did not see my hon. friend on his feet. I assure him that he will have an opportunity to speak tomorrow and that postponing what he has to say until then will not infringe his rights in the slightest. I can assure him definitely that there was not the slightest intention, so far as the government is concerned, of depriving him of his rights.

Mr. KNOWLES: I think the house appreciates the attitude which the leader of the house has taken, and I am sure the hon. member for Dauphin shares in that appreciation. I would just point out, however, that there have been occasions before when the Speaker has left the chair and a minister has got him back. In fact, a few days ago he came back and we put through another piece of legislation. So it can be understood how the hon. member for Dauphin feels.

Mr. MACKENZIE: His rights will be amply protected tomorrow.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I have been bewildered in the last few weeks at this new way we have of conducting business in this house. A number of precedents are being set, amounting to a serious thing for parliament. The ordinary rules of procedure have been broken and the order of business interfered with. It is not a question of whether the minister will protect the rights of the hon. member tomorrow. We all saw the hon. member standing on his feet and calling to Mr. Speaker, but Mr. Speaker deliberately ignored him, walked from the chair and left the chamber. That is a serious matter. It is something that should be righted now if there is any way in which it can be done.

Mr. MacINNIS: We have drawn the attention of the house to the matter, and I would be very much pleased and think it would be better if we now let the matter drop.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I can assure the hon. member for Dauphin that we will accom-

modate him in every possible way in regard to any grievance he wishes to present to the house.

Mr. BENTLEY: With that assurance, will the minister also couple the assurance that this will never happen again in the house?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I had no responsibility in the matter. As a matter of fact I was speaking to one of my hon. friends behind me when the motion was put and I did not see the hon. member for Dauphin on his feet at all. If I had seen him on his feet—I think I have as much respect for the rules of this house as anyone, though I sometimes break them—I certainly would have drawn attention to the fact that the hon. member had risen. But I think now, as the hon. member for Vancouver East has suggested, we had better let the matter rest until tomorrow.

Mr. BENTLEY: His Honour the Speaker is surely not unapproachable. Someone can draw to his attention what happened tonight so that he will look to right and left before he leaves the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE: As leader of the house, I cannot for one second permit any reflection on the Speaker. I have the greatest personal admiration for him, for his conduct of business in this house and for his fairness to all parties. If something happened tonight, things sometimes happen quickly without anyone being responsible for it, and I am sure it was not the fault of the Speaker. I, as leader of the house, at once accept full responsibility that the hon. member for Dauphin was not seen on his feet, and I assure my hon. friend that he will have ample opportunity to speak tomorrow.

Demobilization and reconversion—
583. Departmental administration, $72,740.

Mr. GREEN: Will the minister explain this item? It comes under demobilization and reconversion. I should like to know for what purpose the money is being voted.

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): It has to do with the administration arising out of demobilization. During the war we had certain administrative services in the Department of Transport having exclusively to do with war. The vote is gradually going down. It has to do with demobilizing these services.

Mr. GREEN: There is an increase this year over last. What are the services performed in this connection?

Mr. CHEVRIER: There is transport control, for instance, which is being wound up; nautical services; compensation for loss of effects; joint Canada-United States defence.

Mr. GREEN: What is that?

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is a service we shall discuss in a moment. It was set up during the war to purchase property on behalf of the United States government. That is now being wound up. It also operated and disposed of property. This service was established in the Department of Transport for other departments.

Mr. McLURE: I wish to draw to the minister's attention that vote 583 for $72,740 comprises an item of $66,700 for temporary assistance. All through the estimates of the Department of Transport there are items for temporary assistance, totalling eight or nine million dollars. It is very hard to get a satisfactory answer from any minister to the question, what is temporary assistance?

Mr. CHEVRIER: So far as this item is concerned, there cannot be much difficulty because this was a non-continuing service and, of necessity had to be temporary. That is why it is so described in the details.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—
585. Director of merchant seamen, $425,340.

Mr. GREEN: This is a vote of nearly half a million dollars. Is any provision being made for the training of merchant seamen for the future?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Provision is made for vocational training within the seamen's calling.

Mr. GREEN: I do not mean that. The Minister of Reconstruction explained very fully a few weeks ago that Canada proposed to maintain a merchant navy of considerable size. Is any plan in effect for training the personnel for that merchant marine? We had such a plan during the war and quite a few thousand men were trained for the merchant navy. Has such policy been dropped, or are we going to have any facilities for training these men for our merchant marine?

Mr. CHEVRIER: During the war we had two schools, one at Prescott for engineering and one at St. Margarets, Nova Scotia. Both were set up specifically for the training of merchant seamen during the war. These two schools have been discontinued. There are, however, a number of schools such as existed prior to the war, as for instance, the marine technical training school at Prescott; school of navigation, Vancouver;

the Hopkins School of Engineering, Vancouver; government navigation school, Halifax; dominion navigation school, Yarmouth; and vocational training such as I mentioned a moment ago. At the schools men receive training for engineering and seamanship generally.

Mr. GREEN: These facilities could train only a few men.

Mr. CHEVRIER: A limited number.

Mr. GREEN: Is the government accepting any responsibility for training the personnel that will be required to man the Canadian merchant navy? In the United Kingdom I believe they have regular training schools for the merchant navy, and probably the same thing is true of the United States. It does seem reasonable that Canada should have some provisions of the same kind. We cannot continue to keep an efficient merchant marine without efficient personnel. New men will be coming in all the time. What facilities are there, if any, for giving that training?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I can only repeat what I said a moment ago. During the war we had the two schools mentioned, and we have closed them down. There are no facilities for training merchant seamen now. I know that at the I.L.O. convention in Seattle a recommendation was made to the effect that certain groups of the navy should be certified. If that recommendation is approved—

Mr. GREEN: Certain groups of what?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Certain groups of the merchant seamen should be certified as cooks, able-bodied seamen and other groups such as boatswains and so forth. If that convention is ratified, then we shall have to set up schools here.

Mr. GREEN: Will the dominion accept the full responsibility for providing facilities for training?

Mr. CHEVRIER: If the convention is approved I presume that will follow.

Mr. MacINNIS: The minister referred to a number of schools. Are these schools carried on under the auspices of the Department of Transport?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No.

Mr. MacINNIS: Are they private schools?

Mr. CHEVRIER: They are not carried on under our auspices, but we subsidize them.

Mr. MacINNIS: They are private schools subsidized by the Department of Transport?

[Mr. Chevrier.]

Mr. CHEVRIER: They are provincial schools assisted and subsidized by the Department of Transport.

Mr. MacINNIS: What is meant by "provincial schools"? Does that mean schools under the provincial government?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not necessarily; it means schools within the province such as the one I referred to at Prescott, a marine technical school. I think I spoke of a school of navigation at Vancouver.

Mr. MacINNIS: Can the minister give us any idea of the number of students in these schools at the present time?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I cannot give the information now. I shall have to get it by communicating with the directors of these schools. I can get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. MacINNIS: Has the minister any information as to the number of seamen in Canada now unemployed, if any? I am not suggesting that there are any.

Mr. CHEVRIER: From the position as I know it, I would think there are very few because there is a great demand for seamen.

Mr. HERRIDGE: What are the duties of the director of merchant seamen?

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I be allowed to answer the previous question? I am informed that at the moment we are paying out-of-work benefits to fifty unemployed seamen.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Can the minister explain briefly the duties of the director of merchant seamen?

Mr. CHEVRIER: The director of merchant seamen had important duties during the war. He was responsible for the manning of merchant ships; he was responsible for the manning pools, the schools that were set up, the various bonuses that were paid and so on. Now that the war has come to an end, there are a number of benefits to which merchant seamen are entitled and which must be administered by the department. They are administered by the department through the director of merchant seamen. For instance, there is a war service bonus of ten per cent paid to certain groups of merchant seamen who served in dangerous waters. That bonus is paid through the office of the director. Likewise there is a special war service bonus which is also paid through him. Vocational training for merchant seamen is under his direction, and the claims for detention allowances, claims by merchant seamen who lost their effects, or by dependents of merchant seamen who lost

their effects, some of which are still coming in, are under the direction of the director of merchant seamen. His duties are, I must say, diminishing considerably.

Mr. MacINNIS: Do the out-of-work benefits which the minister referred to a moment ago come under the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No, it is a different thing altogether. This comes under the Unemployment Insurance Act.

Mr. MacINNIS: For persons who had war service?

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is correct. They are put in the same category in so far as unemployment insurance is concerned as the members of the armed forces.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Do the provinces have a director of merchant seamen?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Who is in charge of the manning pools?

Mr. CHEVRIER: They were under the direction of the director of merchant seamen during the war, but they have now been closed.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They are not active now?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No.

Mr. GREEN: How many men are there in the merchant navy at the present time?

Mr. CHEVRIER: About fifteen thousand.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Who looks after the merchant seamen in the province of British Columbia? Apparently veterans affairs have disowned them.

Mr. CHEVRIER: In so far as their employment and discharge are concerned, the shipping master at the port of Vancouver looks after them. In so far as their benefits under these various orders in council are concerned, it is the director of merchant seamen.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Apparently veterans affairs have disowned them. If they have a complaint in British Columbia, do they have to bring it to Ottawa? Is there nobody in that Pacific coast port to whom they can take their complaint?

Mr. CHEVRIER: They are referred by the various seamen's organizations across Canada to the director of merchant seamen.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: In other words, they have to go to their unions and the union has to take it up by indirect control with Ottawa; is that correct?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not necessarily the unions. There are many groups looking after merchant seamen who are not unionized or organized.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The federal government has no representative in the main coast port of British Columbia?

Mr. CHEVRIER: My department has many representatives on the Pacific coast, but not all of them deal with merchant seamen. They deal with various matters. A moment ago I referred to the shipping master who has to do with engaging and discharge of merchant seamen, the registration of seamen and so on. The supervisor of nautical services has these responsibilities under his control.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What I am trying to get at is this. If a merchant seaman on the Pacific coast has a complaint, veterans affairs have told me tonight that they disown him entirely; has that merchant seaman any recourse?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am afraid I have to disagree with the hon. member. The Minister of Veterans Affairs did not say that the department had disowned merchant seamen.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I do not agree with the minister and he does not agree with me. What recourse has a merchant seaman on the Pacific coast? Who does he approach with his complaint? Does he have to come to Ottawa?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I should like to know to what my hon. friend is referring. If he will give me an example of the complaint he has in mind, perhaps I can give him a more definite answer.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Suppose a merchant seaman considers that he was unjustly treated in the merchant marine.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If he considers that he has not received a bonus or has not received the benefits to which he was entitled, what I suppose he would do would be to complain to the minister. I have received some such complaints and the Minister of Veterans Affairs has received a number of such complaints. If he is referring to matters dealing with nautical service or with registration, then I presume he would make his complaint to the shipping master in the port where he is stationed.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The minister has surmised correctly what I meant, but what I wish to know is this. Is there no means on the Pacific coast of dealing with his

application? Is it necessary that he should have to go through all the red tape at Ottawa in order to present his case?

Mr. CHEVRIER: He makes his complaint through his organization in the port where he resides, whether it be the west coast seamen's union or the Canadian seamen's union or the seamen's welfare society if he is in Montreal. There are various organizations in all parts of Canada, and if he has a complaint to make he can complain directly to the minister or through one of these organizations.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Montreal is a long way from Vancouver. My question is this: Have you no representative in your department in Vancouver?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have already told the hon. gentleman that there are several representatives of my department in the port of Vancouver.

Mr. GREEN: Are we clear as to who is responsible for the merchant seamen? We have had a good illustration tonight of the difficulties of getting fair treatment for merchant seamen. They are involved in the two departments of transport and veterans affairs, and I do not believe they will get justice until it is decided which department is responsible for them. The minister said on July 2, at page 5001 of *Hansard:*

> I wish someone would clear up in my mind and to my satisfaction whose responsibility this is.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Hear, hear.

Mr. GREEN: I feel exactly like the minister. I should like to know whose responsibility this is, because the Minister of Veterans Affairs promised the other day that next year a special committee on veterans affairs would be set up again. This injustice will be brought up in that committee, certainly if I am a member of it, and I am sure that the hon. member for Fraser Valley would take the same view. There are certain injustices to be considered, such as failure to give these men pensions for disabilities, failure to provide vocational training, and failure to give the benefits of the Veterans Land Act and many other benefits. Who is to be responsible for them—transport or veterans affairs? We should like to know, because when we sit on that committee next year the whole question will be gone into thoroughly and someone will have to answer all the questions that are asked. We are not going to fall between two stools as we did last year.

[Mr. Cruickshank.]

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am afraid I shall not be the one to answer those questions. However I will answer the first part of the question my hon. friend asks, when he wishes to know what the responsibility of this department is. In so far as the engagement and discharge of seamen, the amount of payment due, and so forth are concerned, that has been the responsibility of the Department of Transport through the shipping master in the various ports. In so far as benefits approved by the government under various orders in council are concerned, they have thus far ben under the administration of the director of merchant seamen. That far I can go, but beyond that I cannot.

Mr. GREEN: There is one item of $97,040 for vocational training, but that means only vocational training for merchant seamen who want to go to sea.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Those who do not want to go back to sea do not get such training?

Mr. CHEVRIER: They are not covered by the order in council.

Mr. GREEN: Then I am correct in putting it that way.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You are correct.

Mr. GREEN: If a recommendation is made next year by the veterans affairs committee that these men should get vocational training apart from training to fit them to go to sea, or that they should get the benefit of university grants, such recommendations would have to be carried out by the Department of Transport?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not necessarily. The government would then have to decide whether the recommendations should be carried out by the veterans affairs department or the director of merchant seamen. It may be that next year the latter may not exist. I do not know.

Mr. MacINNIS: I do not know whether this discussion is in order, but I have listened to the hon. member for Vancouver South on several occasions making a plea for merchant seamen who were in the merchant navy during the war. I too have said a little on the subject, but I felt that, as the matter was being discussed, we could not get anywhere in a debate of this kind. My feeling is that the government must decide where the responsibility rests. They should refer it to the veterans affairs committee if they think these men have service comparable with that of men in the armed service as I believe they

have. I suggest that the question should be referred to the committee on veterans affairs and have it decided once and for all, so that we can get away from this discussion.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I have the greatest appreciation of the hon. member for Vancouver East, but I would point out that the hon. member for Vancouver South and I were vocal on this point last year when we tried as members of the veterans affairs committee to have it decided. Every member of that committee will bear me out when I say that we were two members who were vocal on the point. We fought this matter and we are not now satisfied as to who is responsible.

Mr. HOWE: This is about the sixth debate I have heard on the question of injustice to merchant seamen. Let us analyse the question of the merchant seamen. He was a civilian doing a hard and dangerous job. He had always been a civilian free to work or to stop work. He got special bonuses for going into dangerous situations. But there were other dangerous jobs in the country. I could mention one where the percentage of loss in a civilian job was higher than it was among merchant seamen, and that is among men in commercial transport service, the operators who ferried new planes across the Atlantic.

Mr. GREEN: That is another complaint we have. Those men are not protected either.

Mr. HOWE: They were not as numerous as the merchant seamen.

Mr. GREEN: And they are not protected.

Mr. HOWE: Now here were men doing a civilian job. It is true that some of them went into dangerous waters, while others did not. I know about the work of the merchant seamen because I have suffered with them, and I know how tough it is, but I am not prepared to say that a man who did not put on a uniform, who did not sign up for a term of duty, who did not place himself in the position where he would have to go into a dangerous stiuation when he was so ordered, is in the same position as the veteran who wore the uniform. My hon. friend contends that he is. I am not even prepared to agree that the terms of reference to the veterans affairs committee extend to men who did not serve in uniform. The position of the merchant seaman has been well taken care of. He is not a man who was put out of his job when the war ended. There are more jobs for Canadian merchant seamen today than at any time during the war, and there will be more jobs five years hence, or at any rate three years hence, than there are today.

Seamanship is a trade like any other. My hon. friend might as well ask who was responsible for carpenters. The man responsible for carpenters, as far as the government is concerned, is the Minister of Labour, and the Minister of Labour is responsible for merchant seamen. The merchant seaman has a union which is well able to protect his interests, and he has the Minister of Labour to arbitrate in any differences he may have with the government.

It seems to me that we are wasting a great deal of sympathy to men well able to take care of themselves. The wages of merchant seamen have increased more as a result of the war than the wages in any other line that I know of. These men have kept all their wartime gains and bonuses and have had two or three substantial increases since the war ended. I would say that the merchant seamen of Canada are in an excellent position today and they have a future which few other tradesmen in this country can look forward to.

Mr. GREEN: I am amazed that a responsible minister of the crown would take an attitude like that.

Mr. HOWE: What is the other attitude? The poor downtrodden merchant seamen!

Mr. GREEN: Just sit still and listen.

Mr. HOWE: I have been listening for weeks.

Mr. GREEN: Right from His Majesty down, responsible leaders of the democratic nations have taken the position that the men in the merchant navy were the fourth arm of the service, and quite properly so. The minister's own leader, the Prime Minister of this country, just two or three days ago, on Dominion day, praised them and treated them as though they were members of the armed service. Now the Minister of Reconstruction stands up in this house and says they were just the same as a carpenter working on land.

Mr. CHEVRIER: He did not say any such thing.

Mr. HOWE: I did not say anything of the kind. May I ask the hon. member not to carry his prejudices so far as to put words into my mouth?

Mr. GREEN: He said that they are not entitled to any special consideration. I would point out to him the fact that there were thousands of young men, and older men too, who went into the merchant navy to do their bit in the war.

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: They were not regular merchant seamen. They do not want to go back to sea now that the war is over. They went in there to do their bit. Perhaps they were not eligible physically to go into the army. They did a grand job. They suffered many casualties. I think the casualties in the Canadian merchant marine were heavier in proportion than those of all the other three arms of the service. If the minister talks for ten years, he cannot tell me that a merchant navy man who was crippled for life by falling on a ship in the blackout, say in Liverpool, is not entitled to any pension.

Mr. HOWE: I am not trying to say that.

Mr. GREEN: That is the position the Canadian merchant seaman finds himself in today. He is not covered for that. He gets pension only where he suffered by reason of direct enemy action. In the same way a young lad from Vancouver not even waiting until he is eighteen—even at sixteen and seventeen they went into the merchant navy—gets a tropical disease. His health is ruined for life, and he can get no compensation under our present law. Nobody can tell me that is fair. Nobody can tell me it is fair that a young man who served in dangerous waters with the merchant navy has to pay his way through a Canadian university when a boy who served only in Canada in the army gets his way paid. Having listened to the minister, we have probably now got the reason that it is so hard to get justice for these men. The Canadian Legion welcomes them to membership on the same basis as a member of the navy, the army or the air force. Without exception, the members of the veterans affairs committee treated them as though they were in the same category as men who served in any of the other forces.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Almost.

Mr. GREEN: The hon. member for Fraser Valley will bear me out in that. There is not a member of the veterans affairs committee who will get up and deny that statement. We are trying to see that they get a fair deal. Apparently they fell between the two departments, the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Transport; and they are still falling between those two departments. We believe they have had a raw deal and we want to see that they get a fair deal. It does not matter what the Minister of Reconstruction says. In my opinion, he is wrong again, just as he has been wrong on many other occasions in the past few years.

[Mr. Howe.]

Mr. HOWE: Will my hon. friend tell me what country gives the type of treatment which he proposes? Does Britain or the United States give it?

Mr. GREEN: What is that?

Mr. HOWE: What country gives to merchant seamen the same benefits as they give to their troops?

Mr. GREEN: I am not interested in what other countries do.

Mr. HOWE: No, evidently not

Mr. GREEN: We hear the Minister of Veterans Affairs—

Mr. HOWE: Everybody is wrong but the hon. member for Vancouver South.

Mr. GREEN: Well, sometimes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Quite often.

Mr. GREEN: This is one time when we are all right except the minister of reconstruction. We hear so much in this house about the benefits for the veterans being so fine in Canada, and their being better here than they are anywhere else in the world.

An hon. MEMBER: That is right.

Mr. GREEN: They are still not good enough. There are many things still to be remedied with regard to benefits for veterans. We cannot see why the merchant seamen should not be put in the same position. I warn the government that sooner or later it will have to be done; because if it is not forced on them by the opposition it will be forced on them from their own back benches. Sooner or later this thing must be faced. I would suggest that some thought be given to it in the interval between this session and the next one.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I should like to say one word in reply to what the minister said. Apparently everyone except the merchant seamen got the O.B.E. or the M.B.E. All you had to do was to serve as a dollar-a-year man in Sorel or somewhere else, making a fortune, and you got the O.B.E. or something. I want to tell the minister that it is all poppycock to tell me that the salary we pay to merchant seamen is adequate compensation, and nobody knows it better than the minister; he himself was sunk in the middle of the Atlantic. The fact that we have done so much does not answer the question raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South. I am surprised, and I think some of the legionnaires will be surprised, that the members of the veterans

affairs committee from the various parts of Canada have not risen in this debate and mentioned what was said in that committee. We were deliberately side-tracked.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The committee was not deliberately side-tracked because I was there every day.

Mr. GREEN: Oh, no, the minister was not.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I shall not dispute my own minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. member had better not.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: We could not get anywhere because we were told the matter was going to be raised under another branch. That is what we were told, and no member of the veterans affairs committee sitting in this house will dispute that. We were told it would be brought up under another department when we insisted that equal treatment be accorded members of the merchant marine. To tell me that they got extra pay is no answer. I want to tell the minister something in connection with a man from my own battalion. I served with a good battalion in the first great war. In that battalion there was a man named Conley. I hope he does not mind my mentioning his name. He was an Irishman who served in the 29th battalion in the first great war, was wounded and contracted tuberculosis in this war while he served in the merchant marine. He is suffering now in Tranquille and can get no proper benefits. I am told that he was getting extra pay for working down in the stokehole where he might get sunk any day. I want to tell the minister and my other military friends—and I have many of them—that it is all poppycock to talk about extra pay being paid these men for serving down in the stokehole, when they might be sunk at any moment, and to say that they are not entitled to all the benefits enjoyed by members of the force.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Will the hon. member be kind enough to give me the name of that case privately because it cannot be true, and it is not true?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I have given it publicly. I do not know why I should hesitate to give it privately. The name is Patrick Conley of the 29th battalion.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If he has overseas service, he is getting treatment.

Mr. GREEN: There is no law to cover a case like that.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, there is.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I want this to be borne in mind. I should not like to see this man suffer one iota from my mentioning his name.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I ask my hon. friend if I can get the name from him privately ? If so, I will give a public answer in the house tomorrow in regard to that case to prove that what he says is not true.

Mr. MacNICOL: He gave the name publicly.

Mr. MACKENZIE: He did not.

Mr. MacNICOL: He did.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: If this man suffers one iota as a result of my mentioning his name, his condition, and the way he has been treated, I shall be very sorry. And the minister tells me that they get extra pay—

Mr. MACKENZIE: I never told you that.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: —in the merchant marine. I feel bitter about that merchant marine. I think they got a dirty deal.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I absolutely resent that remark. It is not true. It is a falsification of the facts. They did not get a dirty deal. They got a very generous deal in Canada.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Vancouver South or the hon. member for Vancouver East made me retract one time. I think that is hardly parliamentary.

Mr. MUTCH: I should not like this debate to conclude without saying a word; and if my intrusion is resented by the last speaker, perhaps he will realize that more than anyone else he invited it, in spite of the fact that the other day in the committee he told me I talked too much. There can be no doubt that in the veterans affairs committee of last year consideration of the claims of the merchant seamen were set aside from our deliberations because the committee understood that the whole question of merchant seamen, excluding the civil service preference which was within a different department, was being considered by the Department of Transport. We were not told that the transport department was going to provide benefits paralleling the veterans benefits, but our understanding clearly was that certain benefits were being considered for merchant seamen and that our committee, which was to deal strictly with veterans' matters, should await the decision on that legislation before entering into the discussion.

I have forgotten the date, but I believe it was about February 12 when a sub-committee of the veterans affairs committee was set up, of which I had the honour to be chairman, and we were asked to consider such benefits accruing to Canadian veterans of the last war as might be applied to those who had served in a civilian capacity during the war, and the extent to which our committee would be prepared to recommend that these veterans benefits be extended. At that time the terms of reference to the sub-committee expressly excluded from our consideration the large question of the merchant seamen, and that sub-committee did not report on merchant seamen except with respect to those benefits, limited in number and chiefly with respect to pensions and other benefits which would accrue to merchant seamen who had become pensionable through being injured in action or in evasive action, which had already been announced.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Fourteen in all.

Mr. MUTCH: I do not remember the number, but subsequently they were extended and I am told they now number fourteen. It is not correct to say, as was said in the house some time ago, that the veterans affairs committee expected that transport would deal with the question, for instance, which was up a little while ago; that is, the matter of the veterans preference. It was realized then that this would have to be part of the larger picture, on which the committee did not make a recommendation last year; and I presume, in fact I know, it will be a part of that larger picture when these things come up again. But in my view it is not fair to say, as was said here tonight, that the committee was misled, that the committee was told the merchant seamen were being taken care of and, by implication, that we in the veterans affairs committee did not need to make a recommendation. Quite frankly, I do not think a suggestion of that kind would have been swallowed by that committee or by any member of it.

The record is clear. The statement in that regard, if I remember rightly, was made by the chairman of that committee, the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, who told us quite frankly that the matter was under consideration by the Department of Transport as to what benefits were to be given, and by implication I think we all understood that, should our committee feel the recommendations of the Department of Transport did not adequately meet the case—and certainly many members of the committee now feel that they do not meet the case—we would have an opportunity of considering them specifically. That, I think, is an honest and fair picture of what took place then. When the committee rose after some fifty-one sittings, and I do not know how many sub-committee meetings, there was still no definite programme before the committee from the transport department with respect to merchant seamen; and I think in the mind of every member of the committee the situation with respect to merchant seamen and such war benefits as should accrue to them was and is unfinished business.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I feel I should say just one word, and I would not do so but for what was stated a moment ago. I do not want to repeat, but this matter has been gone over frequently this session; I think this is the third debate we have had thus far on merchant seamen. I am sorry it has to take place, but I feel that I should place the position of the Department of Transport clearly before the committee once more, for the third time. I, as minister, certainly had no understanding as to what was being done by the committee on veterans affairs, nor did I or my officers have any such understanding as was stated here. I have to repeat that statement in fairness to the officers of my department. I did have in mind bringing down a bill, which I brought down later, concerning compensation to merchant seamen. That was in the nature of workmen's compensation, for injuries arising out of the nature of the occupation.

Mr. GREEN: And only post-war.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes, beginning in 1945. That was the only thing I had in mind. Over and above that was the question of unemployment insurance to merchant seamen. There was the matter of vocational training for merchant seamen in their own calling, and there was one other matter which slips my mind at the moment. Those were the things for which I was responsible, which I brought before this house and which received the approval of the house. Beyond that I know nothing of what took place in the veterans affairs committee. So I wonder if we could not get along with these estimates and particularly with this item. We have had three or four debates on it this session.

Mr. FERGUSON: The Minister of Veterans Affairs has said that he attended the meetings of the committee quite regularly. In order to end this debate, since we are now discussing the Department of Transport, if in his opinion the merchant seamen are not receiving fair treatment, why does he not, as Minister of Veterans Affairs, get up in the house and

briefly express his opinion, and say he will try to work on his colleague the Minister of Transport to see that the merchant seamen are looked after as in his opinion, speaking as a veteran, they should be looked after.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to accept an undeserved rebuke from an hon. member who is sadly misinformed about this whole situation. I have been working on this problem for thirty long years; I have given my whole life to it. I know the problem of the merchant seamen; I know what England has done for them; I know what Canada has done for them; and if my hon. friend knew the facts he would be proud of what Canada has done for them in comparison with any other country in the world. If he is trying to dragoon or bludgeon me into any admission of failure he is talking to the wrong man, I can tell him. I will have the policy outlined as the government may determine that policy. That is the Liberal doctrine. The Tories might have one minister declare a policy for himself, but not the Liberal government; because we are a collective agency of democratic independence. Our policy is prepared by our spokesmen for the party, and by those policies we stand always.

Mr. FERGUSON: Did I understand the minister to say this is the Liberal doctrine and the Liberal way of carrying out these matters? He has not yet stated his personal opinion as a veteran, as to whether he thinks this is fair treatment. That is a precise question, which should receive a precise answer.

Mr. HOWE: What did the Tory government do for them after the first war?

Mr. MACKENZIE: They sent them to slave camps.

Mr. FERGUSON: I can speak as one who had over four years of service—

Mr. MACKENZIE: I tell my hon. friend that our record in regard to the veterans will far outshine anything the Tories ever did for them.

Mr. FERGUSON: As a veteran of four and a half years of service in the first war, I can say I believe I received everything I was entitled to. I did not fight in the hope of getting a pension. I considered it a privilege to fight for my country. I tried to do it again in this war, even going so far as to dye my hair.

Mr. WARREN: Answer the question.

Mr. FERGUSON: I will answer it. I think the Tory party gave the veterans all they were entitled to. We did not try to buy votes one way or the other.

Mr. MACKENZIE: You did not get them, anyway.

Mr. FERGUSON: Is the past going to run the country? You say the Tory party never did anything. Is that any reason why you should do nothing?

Mr. MACKENZIE: You never did anything for the merchant seamen in all your existence.

Mr. FERGUSON: You say we did nothing, and neither will you. Is that your answer?

Mr. CHURCH: We had a large number of members of the air force, the army and navy in our city during the war. This item 585 covers the director of merchant seamen. There is an item of $70,000 a year to extend for eight years, or a total of $560,000 for life-saving. Why should the city of Toronto go all over the great lakes to do the work of the Department of Transport? There are no life-saving stations on the great lakes on the Canadian side. I asked the minister on his main estimates what they proposed to do about setting up a national life-saving system on the great lakes. All the money for this purpose is spent on the gulf and on the oceans. Will the minister make a reply before the transport items are finished?

Mr. CHEVRIER: The hon. gentleman's question is not within the scope of this item, but I shall give him the information he wants. On the main estimates he asked what life-saving equipment and appliances we had on the great lakes. There are on the great lakes between Kingston and the Canadian-United States border near Fort William, 426 light stations, fog-alarm plants and light and signal buoys and, in addition thereto, there are approximately 1,100 unlighted buoys, beacons, et cetera. Also, there are seven ship to shore radio telegraph and telephone stations to provide constant 24-hour communication with ships on all the great lakes. These stations regularly broadcast weather forecasts, storm warnings and notices of dangers to navigation. There are also fifteen automatic radio beacons from which ships take their bearings by radio. Over and above that, a number of ships are equipped with special appliances such as radar equipment, which is of great assistance in combating weather conditions.

Mr. CHURCH: When a ship on the Canadian side is in trouble it must sound its siren and wait for the United States life-saving station to send out help.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—
Marine service—
587. Nautical service, $106,450.

Mr. GREEN: Part of this vote is to cover the repatriation of Canadian merchant seamen prisoners of war. Some of these merchant seamen who were prisoners have been brought back by the Canadian government and charged their fares.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am informed by the director who is here that there are none. If my hon. friend has any cases I wish he would give them to me.

Mr. GREEN: I have a case right here which I will place before the minister privately, in which a man was charged $423.38 repatriation expenses.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If the hon. member will give me the particulars I will look into the matter. I am sure there must be some error.

Mr. GREEN: All these men were brought back by the government?

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is right.

Mr. GREEN: And they are not supposed to be charged for their repatriation?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not if they come under the description of a merchant seaman prisoner of war.

Mr. GREEN: How wide is that description?

Mr. CHEVRIER: It covers the personnel of Canadian ships and Canadian seamen on other ships as well.

Mr. GREEN: Would it apply to a Canadian who served on an allied ship?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes. If the hon. member will send over the case I shall be glad to look into it.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—
Railway and steamship service—
590. Steep Rock mines—construction, $50,000.

Mr. MacINNIS: How much has been paid under this item altogether?

Mr. CHEVRIER: $3,000,000.

Mr. MacINNIS: Can the minister give the same information for the next item?

Mr. CHEVRIER: $453,153.58.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

Mr. MacNICOL: On my return from Steep Rock, I was informed that they were held up because of a lack of cars, and I should like to know if this company is now able to get all the cars it requires to send out its ore?

Mr. CHEVRIER: They are not able to get all the cars they require, but they are in a better position than they have been at any time because of the cars they have on lease and the new cars that are being purchased by the Canadian National Railways.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—
Government employees' compensation—
592. Administration, $24,000.

Mr. JAQUES: I want to bring to the minister's notice the unsatisfactory train service on the Canadian National Railways between Calgary and Edmonton. I had occasion to bring this to his notice last session and I believe it was referred to the railway board. At that time I compared the service on the Canadian National with that on the Canadian Pacific. On the Canadian Pacific they have three trains each way each day and, besides, there is a paved highway and a good bus service. On the Canadian National there is one train south one day and then the train goes north the next, so that they get a train every other day. There is no paved highway and no bus service. My constituents feel that they are entitled to at least one train a day in each direction, which is what they used to have before the war. This was discontinued, and they feel there should be at least one train a day each way. I might give an instance. If a person wanted to go to Edmonton for some function on Saturday evening he would have to start on Thursday afternoon and he could not get back to Mirror until Monday afternoon. I trust that the minister will take that into consideration.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes. If I might take one moment to reply to my hon. friend, it is true, as he says, that the service on the Canadian Pacific is excellent and that there is a difference between their service and that on the Canadian National, the reason being that the Canadian National railway between Edmonton and Calgary has a mileage of 232, as opposed to 194 for the Canadian Pacific, and the population along the Canadian National line is much smaller than along the Canadian Pacific and the traffic much lighter. Those are the reasons for the difference in service. I drew the situation to which the hon. member refers to the attention of the management of the Canadian National rail-

ways. I wrote him at some length on it, but in view of my hon. friend's added representations I shall be glad to take the matter up with them again.

Mr. JAQUES: We do not expect a service similar to that on the Canadian Pacific railway because they have three trains each way each day. All we ask is one train each way each day.

Item agreed to.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, July 8, 1947

The house met at two o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Tenth report of standing committee on banking and commerce.—Mr. Cleaver.

Third report of standing committee on railways and shipping owned, operated and controlled by the government.—Mr. Clark.

Second and third reports of the standing committee on industrial relations.—Mr. Croll.

RADIO BROADCASTING—THIRD AND FINAL REPORT

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre) presented the third and final report of standing committee on radio broadcasting.

Mr. FLEMING: On a question of privilege, I should like to say that this is a majority report. No Progressive Conservative member of the committee voted for it.

Mr. REID: I did not vote for it.

PRIVATE BILLS

On the order for first reading of senate bills:

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Croll, for Mr. Maybank, moves, seconded by Mr. Winkler, that bills Nos. 432 to 442 inclusive, divorce bills, be now read the first time.

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): I wish to take exception to these bills being read the first time until we have a copy of the evidence. I have not a copy of the evidence of Bill No. 432.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I call the hon. member's attention to the fact that the first reading of senate bills is not debatable.

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 432, for the relief of Pierre-Ben-Danais Warren.—Mr. Maybank.

83166—332

Bill No. 433, for the relief of Ethel Florence Rhodes Pompetti, otherwise known as Ethel Florence Crowdy Pompetti.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 434, for the relief of Elisa Jamoul Hull.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 435, for the relief of Ernest Stanley Rundell.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 436, for the relief of Thelma Lillian Dalton Hilger, otherwise known as Thelma Lillian Dalton Goernert.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 437, for the relief of Mary Alice Berrigan Hamelin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 438, for the relief of Dorothy Mary Boyce Jackson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 439, for the relief of Edith Oberfeld Mintz.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 440, for the relief of Roger Lebeau. —Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 441, for the relief of Sheila Marcus Issenman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 442, for the relief of Zenobia Perrow Broadbent Emond.—Mr. Maybank.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Croll, for Mr. Maybank, moves, seconded by Mr. Winkler, that the said bills be now read the second time.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Speaker, I do not think any member of the House of Commons should be asked to pass any bills about which he knows nothing at all. As I see it, we should have the evidence before we pass the bills. I object to Bill No. 432 being passed until we have a copy of the evidence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: No. On a point of order, I am entitled to that information. A bill cannot be passed when the evidence is not submitted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the bills will be distributed today. We have had first reading this afternoon. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: On a point of order, a bill cannot be submitted to the house for second reading unless the evidence has been made available.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is any objection, next sitting of the house.

NATIONAL PARKS

ADJUSTMENT OF BOUNDARIES, ADDITIONS, ETC.

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Acting Minister of Mines and Resources) moved the third reading of Bill No. 365, respecting certain national parks and to amend the National Parks Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING VETERANS' PREFERENCE, INCREASED SALARIES FOR COMMISSIONERS, ETC.

Hon. COLIN GIBSON (Secretary of State) moved the third reading of Bill No. 413, to amend the Civil Service Act.

Mr. T. J. BENTLEY (Swift Current): Last night on second reading and in the committee stage there was considerable debate on this bill because of the failure to include in the definition of veterans for civil service preference members discharged from the merchant navy of Canada. Quite a few hon. members have different interpretations of the understanding that members of the veterans affairs committee of last year and the year before had with regard to merchant seamen rehabilitation. In the main I agree that most of us on that committee believed that we were to have something better than we have had. As I pointed out last night, it does not cost the government any more to hire merchant seamen than it does to hire veterans of any other service. Hon. members on all sides have supported the view that merchant seamen should be given the preference. Because the veterans committee was composed of hon. members of all political parties, and because I should like to see veterans affairs kept as free from partisan politics as possible, I am going to move, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), who has given yeoman service to the cause of the seamen, that the bill be not now read a third time. I do not want to detract from the very valuable work that is being done by other hon. members, but because the hon. member for Vancouver South was in the forefront of the battle last night he is going to second my motion. I move:

That Bill No. 413 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole with instructions to amend the said bill so as to extend to merchant seamen the provisions accorded to veterans in the said bill.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): I am very glad to have the privilege of seconding this amendment, and I trust that the Prime Minister will allow the government supporters to treat it as non-controversial and let us have a test of the feeling of the house on the question. I am quite sure that the members of the veterans affairs committee which sat last year were unanimous in the view that the merchant seamen should be treated as the fourth arm of the forces, and I do not think any of them would object to these merchant seamen being given the veterans preference under the Civil Service Act.

After all, Mr. Speaker, this veterans preference is based on the principle of service to the nation. That is the reason the preference was given after the first war to men who had served in the Canadian forces, and is also the reason it has been extended to men who served in the forces in the second war. I submit that the merchant seamen should be considered, as indeed they are considered, as having constituted the fourth arm of the Canadian service.

I would refer the Prime Minister to the speech from the throne in the session of 1945, dated September 6, which, as members will see, was only about three short weeks after the fighting had stopped. In that speech from the throne we find this expression:

Our country will ever remember with pride the heroic exploits of Canada's fighting men and merchant seamen.

Just a week ago today, on the first of July, the right hon. the Prime Minister made a statement which was really very much to the same effect. Speaking on Dominion day, he said, as reported at page 4888 of *Hansard:*

We look back with tremendous pride on the part which our defence forces were able to take, along with those of allied and associated forces; the contributions made by our army, our navy, our air force and the merchant marine; . . .

There you have the picture. The Prime Minister himself treated these men as having been one of the arms of the service, and I repeat that they should be given the veterans preference under the Civil Service Act. I would appeal for support for this amendment from the Prime Minister and his cabinet, and also from the private members of the government party.

Hon. COLIN GIBSON (Secretary of State): This subject of the veterans preference is one that received very careful consideration last year by the veterans affairs committee. I do not take second place to anyone in my admiration of the merchant marine and the members thereof, but I do feel that there is a difference in service as between the merchant marine and those who served in the armed forces overseas and are now entitled to the veterans preference in the civil service.

Various other benefits have been provided for members of the merchant marine, and I would refer to a letter that was received by all members of parliament from the merchant marine rehabilitation society, head office, Vancouver, British Columbia, dated April 22,

1947. The letter was sent out by A. J. Heide, secretary treasurer, addressed to the Department of Transport, in which he states:

In answer to your request, in the course of our conversation last Saturday, for specific benefits this society believes the men who served in Canada's merchant marine during the war years are entitled to, we submit the following three as the most urgent.

Then he sets out the three as follows: first, medical and dental care; second, educational and vocational training; third, disability grants.

I submit, sir, that the merchant marine do not consider that the veterans preference is one of the benefits in which they are particularly interested or to which they are particularly entitled. I would also refer to the resolution passed by the army, navy and air force veterans of Canada, in which they state:

Therefore be it resolved that the dominion government be requested to maintain this preference as it now stands in the statute of this dominion.

I want to point out that consideration has been given to extending or modifying the veterans preference, but it has been considered that if the veterans preference is to mean anything it should not be extended to such a wide field that those who served overseas would not secure any particular advantage. For that reason the veterans preference has not been extended to those who served in the armed forces in Canada, and I can see that if we started extending it there are other groups that could come in, particularly for example those members of the Royal Canadian Air Force who were in Canada in the air acting as instructors in very dangerous work. They would have a claim and could say that they had also risked their lives.

The preference could be extended widely if we opened the door. I feel we have adopted the right policy in restricting it to a limited number and I do not think that we should open the door any wider. I would also point out that in the recommendations of the veterans affairs committee last year the committee recommended in its final report:

Various proposals have been examined for extension or curtailment of the veterans preference for employment in the civil service. Your committee does not recommend any change in the existing legislation at the present time.

In view of that recommendation the present bill has been submitted, and until a further recommendation is received from a similar committee I think that the veterans preference, as included in the act, should stand.

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): As one who was closely identified with the activities of the veterans affairs committee a year ago I want to endorse entirely the remarks of my colleague, the Secretary of State (Mr. Gibson). If anyone should be inclined kindly to the cause of merchant seamen it should be I, because my father was one in the service of the merchant navy in Scotland. But I wish the committee would know the facts as the facts were adduced before us last year.

Last night my hon. friend the member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) made a statement in this house which I resented and still resent. He said that these men were left out in the cold. Let me tell the house what was done for these merchant seamen by the people of Canada. The monthly remuneration was increased to a basic rate of $89.93, to which was added a war risk bonus of $44.50, making a total of $134.43 per month. Was that leaving them out in the cold?

Income tax was paid on the basic rate only, war bonus and subsistence being exempted. A special bonus was paid on gross earnings, for a minimum period of six months' service in dangerous waters prior to April 1, 1944, provided a seaman signed an agreement to serve for two years or the duration of the war, or alternatively, signed an agreement to join a reserve of seamen if called upon. Merchant seamen who have received a special bonus for war service prior to April 1, 1944, are eligible to participate in the Veterans Insurance Act. Was that leaving them out in the cold?

A war service bonus of ten per cent on gross earnings was paid for service subsequent to April 1, 1944, until the end of the war, for seamen who served on agreement or were listed as permanent employees of a Canadian company. Was that leaving them out in the cold?

Leave on pay at the end of each year on agreement was allowed, together with round trip rail transportation from a manning pool to the seaman's home, at the low cost of one-third of the one way fare. Was that leaving him out in the cold?

Merchant seamen on completion of service were entitled to receive railway transportation from the port of discharge to their place of permanent domicile. During service on a manning pool two year agreement a merchant seaman, if incapacitated for sickness or injury, received basic pay for a maximum period of twelve weeks. Was that leaving him out in the cold?

Merchant seamen who qualified for the special bonus are entitled to vocational training to assist them to advance in their profession at sea. Is that leaving them out in the cold?

Mr. GREEN: But not general vocational training.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Within their own profession. Merchant seamen who left civil employment to serve at sea during the war are entitled to the benefits of the Reinstatement in Civil Employment Act. Is that leaving them out in the cold?

An hon. MEMBER: That did not give them much.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Merchant seamen entering insurable employment are entitled, after fifteen weeks in such employment, to have their service at sea during the war counted under the Unemployment Insurance Act as if that time had been spent in the insured employment subsequently entered upon. Is that leaving them out in the cold?

Thus the extent of unemployment insurance benefit is calculated on the fifteen weeks plus the time spent at sea for which a merchant seaman has received a war service bonus. Is that leaving him out in the cold? Any unemployment occurring prior to the end of the fifteen weeks is covered by a special out-of-work allowance, provided the merchant seaman had received a war service bonus and was in good standing with the manning pool on August 1, 1946. Is that leaving him out in the cold?

Pension for disability incurred from enemy action or counter-action is payable to merchant seamen serving on any Canadian ship, and to Canadian merchant seamen serving on ships of allied nations employed in service essential to the prosecution of the war. Is that leaving them out in the cold?

A disability pensioner is entitled to free medical care, with allowances during hospitalization for his pension disability, and is eligible to participate in the benefits of the Veterans Land Act and the Veterans Insurance Act.

Mr. GREEN: Only if a pensioner.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I said so.

Mr. GREEN: There are very few of those.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I said "a disability pensioner". My hon. friend did not hear me aright.

Mr. GREEN: There are only about thirty pensioners.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If debarred by their disability from following their former profession of seamen, they may be given vocational training under the Veterans Rehabilitation Act for any other occupation.

In case of death from similar causes, widows and dependent children are pensionable. A Canadian merchant seaman in receipt of a pension from an allied nation is entitled, during residence in Canada, to have his pension raised to the Canadian scale.

Merchant seamen detained by the enemy received a detention allowance equivalent to their basic pay and war risk bonus, and also the special bonus. Dependents of merchant seamen who were detained by the enemy received appropriate portions of this detention allowance for their maintenance, the balance being paid to the seaman on his return to Canada.

Mr. CHEVRIER: And workmen's compensation.

Mr. MACKENZIE: And there was a compensation measure introduced by my colleague in addition to that.

Mr. GREEN: That was post-war.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Would the hon. member like to compare what Canada is doing with what is being done in England?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKAY: This is Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, this is Canada; and we are far ahead of any other country in the world in what we have done for our merchant seamen. I do not take second place to anyone in this house in my sympathetic friendliness to the merchant seamen of Canada. I think they are a glorious band of men.

Mr. GREEN: Then why not give them the preference?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Because there is an essential and fundamental difference between the terms of service of the merchant seamen and those of the members of the armed forces. Listen to this question which was asked in the English parliament. This was on February 27, 1945. Sir W. Wayland asked the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of War Transport whether His Majesty's government propose to accord to the personnel of the merchant navy any recognition of its splendid services on the same lines as the services gratuities. Mr. Noel-Baker, who is a thorough democrat if there is one in the empire, made this reply:

> His Majesty's government have frequently expressed their deep appreciation of the magnificent services rendered to the nation by the officers and men of the merchant navy. But they must take into consideration the fact that these officers and men have been employed throughout the war at industrial rates of wages, negotiated and settled by the national maritime board. In view of this fact, the government consider that they would not be justified in granting to the men of the merchant navy the gratuities which the services will receive.

In conclusion, sir, may I say this. This government is most kindly disposed to the case of the merchant seamen. I am sure that I have the support of my Prime Minister in saying this, that the government will be glad to give further consideration to this entire problem. But in the light of what has been done in these fourteen benefits already extended to them, when I hear anybody in this house say, as happened last night, that they were left out in the cold, I get a little bit sore, as I did. I can assure the house that the government is not indifferent. The government will not be forgetful. The government will be generously disposed towards every possible further consideration of this problem. At the present time, however, I think the bill as it is should be passed by this house.

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): May I say a word, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. MacNICOL: Get in out of the cold.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Apparently the hon. member for Fraser Valley has been left out in the cold. I am sorry I have not the poetry of expression enjoyed by my colleague, the minister from British Columbia.

Mr. KNOWLES: The hon. member is better off without it.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: But I can still appreciate, as I am sure he can, that patriotism and service to one's country cannot be judged in dollars and cents. When I hear my good friend, with all his eloquence, describing the men as not being left out in the cold, I wonder how the minister would feel if he were in the stokehole, with no chance of escape, and the boat was sunk in the middle of the Atlantic ocean. Would he be left out in the cold?

An hon. MEMBER: He would be all wet.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I am proud of what Canada has done for her merchant seamen, and of what Canada has done for everyone who served his country. But no minister or any one else can tell me that service to country, or the patriotic feeling which impels it, can be measured in dollars and cents. I do not know anything about the merchant marine. I never had any experience in serving in the navy. But I know something about soldiering; and I want to tell my friends that my experience in soldiering was in the front line. I do know something of the feeling of a man who is staking his all, not for $1.10 a day as in the first great war or $1.50 a day as in the last war, but because he believes in something; because he believes in Canada, because he believes in democracy, because he believes in all the things that are right and just. When these men went out there to serve in the cold Atlantic they took all the chances in the world. I want to point out that in our own literature we boast of the fact that the largest convoy to cross the Atlantic in the last war consisted of 167 ships from Canada. Under the leadership of the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe) we produced the sinews of war. The people at home did their part, but they did it at good wages. I saw pictures of that convoy published by a board; I think it was called the information board, or the national film board, or something. Anyway I know it cost a lot of money. Those people stayed at home; certainly they did not get cold. This picture showed all those boats deploying for the trip across the ocean, guarded by destroyers; and on that trip they were at all times subject to attack by submarines. Neither the minister nor anyone else can tell me you can judge what these men did for their country in dollars and cents, even at $134 a month, with income tax paid only at the basic rate. I don't care what the income tax was paid on. We in this House of Commons paid income tax, but we sat here in security because the merchant seamen were able to get the sinews of war over to Britain to enable the Canadian army to carry on. The minister mentions people being left out in the cold. I want to tell you that those who should feel left out in the cold, those who should feel cold in their hearts, are the people who sat in security in this house while the merchant seamen were crossing the Atlantic.

I admit that Canada has done much. I grant all the points mentioned by the minister. But I do not take into consideration what any other country has done. I am a Canadian and proud of it. I was not born in Canada but in the United States, and came to Canada when I was eight months old. My father was born in Canada and all my people were Canadians. I am proud of Canada, proud of her record in the war, proud of what she has done for her veterans and for her merchant seamen. But I tell the minister that I think these people are being left out in the cold as long as there is anything more Canada can do to improve the lot of the merchant seamen.

Mr. A. J. BROOKS (Royal): Mr. Speaker, this question of the merchant marine has been discussed on many occasions since the opening of parliament and, as has been pointed out, it was the subject of some discussion in the veterans affairs committee last year. The

point I think we must consider is that the merchant seamen have been placed in the same category as soldiers, sailors and airmen as far as fighting was concerned. Only the other day the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) joined these four services together, indicating that in his mind he considered that these men should be placed on a par with those in the other branches of the service. It was for this reason that last year the veterans affairs committee felt these men should receive the same consideration. I do not think a member of the veterans affairs committee had any other opinion; and I am satisfied that the feeling we have seen manifested in this house on this and other occasions during the present session arises from the belief that those who gave service to their country equal to that given by men in the other branches which have been mentioned have not been shown the same consideration.

I think that is the kernel of this whole matter. Possibly the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) does not consider that these men are wards of his department. They should have been; but he says they have received favourable consideration. There is no doubt that some consideration has been given them, but they have not received the benefits the other branches of the service have been given. The minister spoke of education. A few merchant seamen are being given vocational training so they may carry on in the merchant marine; but many of them do not wish to continue in the merchant marine. These young men who joined during the war did so for patriotic reasons. Today they wish to attend universities, to become doctors, lawyers and so on, and take their place in this country, just as the airmen, the soldiers and sailors are doing. That is the point. Why, I have letters from young men at different colleges throughout Canada. These young merchant seamen sit down beside young men who served in other branches of the forces. These other young men are getting their $60 a month; the merchant seamen are getting nothing. The minister asks who is left out in the cold. I say the young merchant seaman is being left out; he is not being paid his $60 a month while thousands of men who did not leave Canada are receiving that amount while going to college. These young merchant seamen who were in the battle of the Atlantic, who were convoying ships in all kinds of weather, who were perhaps torpedoed, receive absolutely nothing. To my mind that is rank discrimination. The minister speaks of dental care. I am given to understand that the only dental care merchant seamen receive is the extraction of teeth. That is not dental care. There were older men in the merchant marine, who received very little medical attention. Today these men would like the opportunity to come under the Veterans Land Act. As the minister knows, only those merchant seamen receiving pensions are today eligible for the benefits of the Veterans Land Act, though I think all merchant seamen are entitled to it. Then the minister spoke of the bonus. As we know, a ten per cent bonus was given to members of the merchant marine, but I would point out that the bonus was not given to men who served on other than Canadian ships, and I believe almost fifty per cent of our merchant seamen served on the ships of other countries. To my mind this is also a grave injustice.

A few moments ago the Secretary of State (Mr. Gibson) said the government did not want to extend the civil service preference to these other branches, that to do so would make it too limited. That is not a very logical argument. I would point out to the minister one way in which that preference could be extended to merchant seamen, if no other way can be found to make room for them. Since the beginning of this session we have been pressing that crown companies, for instance, should come under the civil service commission. If the benefits and privileges of the preference were extended to crown companies I am satisfied that ample provision would be made for any men who might be taken from the merchant marine.

I think enough has been said on this matter to convince the government, as I am sure the people of Canada are convinced, that these men have not received the justice to which they are entitled. Last evening the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Mutch) spoke about the consideration of this matter by the veterans affairs committee. There was a complete misunderstanding in that committee from start to finish. Not until the last few days did the members realize that this matter was not receiving the attention of the Department of Transport, and that something more should be done. It was then too late for the members of the veterans committee to give it the attention it should have received.

I could go on and mention many other matters, but I do not think it is necessary to do so. These men are not receiving the same privileges as the men who served in other branches of the service. They have been mentioned in this house by the Prime Minister, and they were considered as rendering equal service by General LaFleche when they were asked to join up. The Canadian Legion has taken them in as comrades in their organiza-

tion. They are recognized everywhere as equal to those who served in other branches of the services. The sacrifices of these men were as great as, if not greater than, the sacrifices of those who served in other branches. There were more casualties in the merchant marine than in any other branch of our service. If blood be the price of service, they certainly have done their duty. I think we should give serious consideration to this matter, and this bill affords us an opportunity of giving these men at least some measure of justice until something can be done later on.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, we in this group are of the opinion that the men of the merchant marine are entitled to the same benefits as the men of the armed services. To my mind it has always been incredible that men who served on oil tankers and faced such tremendous hazards should be denied benefits given to men who served in the armed forces in bomb-proof jobs. I recall that when this matter was brought up from time to time in the veterans committee the majority of the members were of the opinion that greater benefits should be given these men.

When we were discussing the Veterans' Land Act we requested that merchant seamen be included in its provisions, and at that time the minister said that he did not think it would be wise to include them because their services would be required on ships after the war. We know now that many men for one reason or another have had to leave the merchant marine, and surely those men should be entitled to full benefits under the Veterans' Land Act rather than having those benefits confined to those who receive pensions. For these reasons we in this group will support the motion before the house to refer the bill back to committee with instructions to amend it so as to extend to merchant seamen the benefits extended by the bill to veterans.

Mr. RONALD MOORE (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Bentley) does not involve any expenditure of money by the government; it merely gives to the members of the merchant marine the same right to apply for positions in the civil service as is now accorded to veterans of the three armed services.

It can be stated with a great degree of truth that the men who served in the merchant navy went through experiences equally as difficult and dangerous as those faced by any of the other services. It is true that the only men who faced experiences more difficult were those who served in the air crews of the allied forces. It must be remembered that the men who served on merchant ships had little protection during the early days of the war, particularly in 1941 and 1942, when escort vessels were few in number. At this period merchant ships went down by the dozen in the north Atlantic, and the casualties were extremely high. As I say, the protection provided by the allied powers was meagre indeed. In answering some questions which had been asked by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Gibson) the minister stated, as recorded on page 1651 of *Hansard:*

> The monthly remuneration of able seamen was increased to a basic rate of $89.93, to which was added a war risk bonus of $44.50, making a total of $134.43 per month.

But no mention is made of the fact that the war risk bonus was paid only while the ship was at sea. It is impossible for a ship to operate any length of time without going into port for repairs or to load or unload a cargo. Thus a ship would be actually at sea for probably not more than nine months in the year, so there would be three months during which the war risk bonus would not be paid. That would bring down considerably the monthly remuneration when averaged over the year. It should also be remembered that the merchant seaman had to buy his own wearing apparel, which meant a considerable reduction in his monthly pay.

A little further on the minister said:

> Pension for disability incurred from enemy action or counter-action is payable to merchant seamen—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I am not sure whether he is referring to a previous debate in this session. If he is, he is out of order.

Mr. IRVINE: He is following the argument of the minister.

Mr. MOORE: Those were answers to questions which had been on the order paper.

Mr. MacINNIS: I understand the hon. member is referring, not to a debate but to answers to questions on the order paper.

Mr. MOORE: On April 16 I asked how many men who had served in Canada with the merchant marine during the war were in receipt of disability pensions. The answer I got was that there were 22 receiving such payments, together with ten Canadians who had served on ships not under Canadian registry. That makes a total of 33 men who served in the Canadian merchant marine or on ships of

the allied nations who are receiving disability pension. That is not a very large number when we remember that more than 3,000 Canadians serving on our merchant ships were lost during the war. I have not the total number of those who served during the war years, but the number must be great. When these things are taken into consideration it will be recognized by all members of the house that something more should be done for these men who served so well during the war years.

I do not think it need be mentioned again that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Claxton) have given many indications of their understanding of the status of merchant seamen as compared with other war veterans. It was a mistake right from the start that these men were not considered to be on the same basis as others who served in the three armed services. I urge upon the minister that immediate steps be taken to give veterans of the merchant marine the same rights when applying for civil service positions as are accorded to members of the other armed forces.

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as the minister charged with the responsibility of administering the branch of the director of merchant seamen I think it is fitting that I should say a word in this debate. I am pleased to note the difference of attitude in the debate on this subject today from that last evening and in previous debates. The attitude today is to the effect that the men of the merchant navy are not entitled to the same benefits as the members of the armed forces.

Mr. GREEN: I do not know where the minister got that idea.

Mr. BROOKS: I would like to correct the minister. I stated definitely that I thought they were entitled to the same benefits.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am quoting the words of certain hon. members in this debate. I have them down before me now. One said: The men of the merchant navy are entitled to the same benefits as those of the armed forces. That is the whole problem we are faced with, whether or not they are so entitled. That is an entirely different attitude from the one that was taken last night which was, first of all, that the men of the merchant navy were left entirely out in the cold, and secondly, on a previous occasion the attitude of one hon. member on the other side of the house who said that Canada had treated her merchant navy shamefully. My colleague, the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) dealt with that point, as I did myself on another occasion, and placed on the record enough evidence to establish I think to the satisfaction of the house that those charges are not well founded and are far removed from the truth.

The point is this, that the men of the merchant navy, rightly or wrongly, were not treated as being entitled to the same benefits as the members of the armed forces. I am not going to debate whether or not that should have been done at the time. I am simply making the statement that faced with the position that they were not considered as veterans in the same light as were members of the armed forces, the government had to deal with the problem accordingly. And so what happened was this. The government gave consideration to a number of recommendations that were made by the veterans affairs committee, by the director of merchant seamen and by others, granted some of those recommendations and refused others.

The members who have spoken thus far feel that we have not done enough. That may be so. But I am still of the opinion, and I do not think there can be any successful contradiction of this, that Canada has done for her merchant seamen far more than any other country has. It has certainly done more for them than the United Kingdom because in that country neither of the two bonuses that Canada gave were given to their merchant seamen—the special bonus of ten per cent granted by Canada on certain earnings of merchant seamen who served for six months in dangerous waters, and the war service bonus on gross earnings for the year. Neither of these was granted by the United Kingdom. My colleague has given the reason why that was done in the United Kingdom. It was because there the merchant seamen were considered as civilians and were not placed in the same category as members of the armed forces and were dealt with accordingly. We followed the same practice in this country. But notwithstanding that we granted benefits to men of the merchant navy which they did not receive either in the United Kingdom or in the United States.

One hon. gentleman went on to say something about the number of those who had received pensions. I placed figures on the record the other day showing that 6,752 merchant seamen had received the ten per cent war service bonus at a cost of $1,500,000, and 4,700 merchant seamen had received the special war service bonus at a cost of $1,300,000

which together with other benefits ran the total to something close to $5,000,000. The total expenditure made by Canada on behalf of merchant seamen during the war and since ran over $14,000,000. In the face of that I do not think it can be said that nothing was done by Canada for her merchant navy.

I want to conclude with this, and I think it is significant. In 1945 the estimates of the director of merchant seamen were brought down in the house and very little, if anything, was said about the treatment given to the men of the merchant navy. In 1946 again the same thing happened. Very little was said about the ill treatment that parliament or the government was giving to the men of the merchant navy.

Mr. BROOKS: In 1945 the veterans affairs committee was sitting and it was felt that these men would be considered.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Answering my hon. friend I will quote the conclusion of the report of the veterans affairs committee at page vii. Let my hon. friend listen to this:

> Various proposals have been examined for extension or curtailment of the veterans preference for employment in the civil service. Your committee does not recommend any change in the existing legislation at the present time.

Mr. BROOKS: At the present time.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That was in 1946, and at that time that was the conclusion of the committee.

Mr. GREEN: They did not deal with the merchant seamen in that at all.

Mr. CHEVRIER: In 1946 the Minister of Transport brought before the house an act establishing compensation for merchant seamen. Was there any discussion on that bill concerning additional benefits for merchant seamen? There was a discussion as to extending workmen's compensation to the merchant seamen, I grant you, but there was no discussion such as we heard in the house last night and again today concerning extensions. What has brought this on? There is an organized campaign by a certain group in favour of additional benefits. I have no quarrel with that. They are entitled to make all the representations they want provided they present the facts accurately. Unfortunately the facts have not been presented accurately, and until recently the story had not been told of the benefits Canada had given to her merchant seamen. I say that now in the dying days of the session there is an organized attempt to extend benefits and to allege that absolutely nothing or very little has been done for the men of the merchant navy.

Mr. GREEN: You had us ruled out of order months ago.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Since 1946 over and above what was mentioned by the Minister of Veterans Affairs these additional benefits were granted: unemployment insurance, out-of-work benefits, vocational training in their calling, and the act granting workmen's compensation. I think this country has done pretty well in assisting these men. And now a motion is made, that this bill be sent back to the committee, with certain instructions. In the face of the benefits granted to the merchant seamen I do not think it can be said that Canada has treated her men of the merchant navy shamefully or has left them out in the cold. I only wish that other countries had done as much for men of the merchant navy as the Dominion of Canada has done. In view of that I submit the house should reject the amendment and adopt the motion.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have hesitated to say anything about this amendment up to this moment, believing it would be to the advantage of the house to hear the arguments which might be presented from both sides as to giving additional consideration to the position of merchant seamen at this time. I have, in listening, been impressed by remarks made by two hon. members which would indicate that, in their minds at least, there may be some doubt whether this amendment is in order. I refer, first, to the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Moore), who at the time he was speaking said there was nothing in the amendment which would involve any additional imposition of taxes. In that, I disagree with him entirely. It is not to be expected that we are going to be able to assist in a substantial way the merchant seamen without an additional outlay of public money. I would point out to hon. members that the bill it is now sought to amend was introduced by a resolution because it involved an expenditure of public money. It has passed the second reading and committee of the whole. The principle of reference to the armed forces has been adopted. If we are to deal with merchant seamen at this time, I submit that will require, in the first instance, a resolution, and a recommendation from the crown, and, later, a bill based on the resolution. That is the point which I would raise at once. The amendment is not in order because it does involve a contingent additional impost on the public which was not contemplated when the crown

recommended that only certain expenditures be made under the bill to amend the Civil Service Act.

The hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks) was the other hon. member whom I had in mind. I sympathize very strongly with many of the arguments he put forward, but he made one statement which, at the time he made it, I thought was incorrect. He said, we can do so and so in this bill. He will remember saying that we could amend this bill so as to assist the merchant seamen.

Mr. BROOKS: I did not intend that, if I said it. What I meant was that we could assist them by extending the civil service preference, which, to my mind, would not increase the expenditures in any way. It would have to be done in other ways.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My point is that we have a certain bill before us at the present time. My hon. friend admits the truth of what I am saying, that we have a bill before us which is before the house for third reading. That bill has gone through the committee stage. The committee had power to do certain things under the general powers of the committee of the whole. It did not exercise those powers to the extent that some hon. members at this moment would like to have them exercised. I submit that the bill cannot be dealt with as suggested. The amendment is to the effect that the bill be referred back to the committee with certain instructions. I contend that that is out of order, and I shall give my hon. friend the reasons for so contending. I would quote first of all Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition, 1943, citation 407:

> An instruction is a motion empowering a committee to do something which it could not otherwise do, or to direct it to do something which it might otherwise not do. It directs the order and course of the committee's proceedings and extends or restricts the order of reference according to the discretion of the house. If the subject-matter of an instruction is within the scope of the question referred to the committee then such instruction is useless and irregular. Committees, in case of doubt, may ask instructions from the house as to the course they should take with reference to the matters under their consideration.

Surely that is as clear as language can make it that when the bill was in committee of the whole the committee had full powers to do what the instruction purports to ask. The committee would be instructed at this stage to do something which it has already considered, and had power to do at the time. May I—

Mr. BENTLEY: Will the Prime Minister permit a question?

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just a moment, please; I should like to complete the citation. I now turn to Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure at page 513:

> Considerable misapprehension appears to exist as to the meaning of an instruction. An instruction is given to a committee to confer on it that power which, without such instruction, it would not have. If the subject-matter of an instruction is relevant to the subject-matter and within the scope and title of a bill, then such instruction is irregular since the committee had the power to make the required amendment.

I need not cite the cases that are set forth in Bourinot. It is perfectly obvious that the facts are as I have stated them. But let me say this, listening to the hon. members presenting the arguments which they have, and knowing the point of view from which this matter was considered by the government, I would say that it would be a misfortune if we were in any way to divide on this question at this time, and that the proper way to proceed would be to have the position of the merchant seamen further considered at another session of parliament. I will undertake to say that I would advocate that that course should be taken before a special committee in the light of what has been said here this afternoon. But I do say that we would only be prejudicing the case of the merchant seamen were we to seek to amend a measure in a manner which is contrary to the rules of the house. There is more that I might add, but I think what I have said is sufficient to cover the point at issue.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am not rising now to deal with the merits of this amendment. If I were I would argue in support of it. I am rising only to deal briefly with the point raised by the Prime Minister, namely, that this amendment is out of order. I will deal with only one feature of it. I think every hon. member recognizes that if a private member brings forward a proposal which would increase the tax burden on the people or lessen the tax revenue of the government it would be out of order. As I understand this amendment, it proposes not a greater expenditure by the government on the merchant seamen but only that they be given preference in appointments to the civil service. If that is correct, it means no additional expenditure by the government of Canada, and from that point of view I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment is in order.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Would it not be possible for the government to make a survey of this question? If it is too late to

do it now, it could be done next year, and make it retroactive. I do not want to see the country charged with acting the part of the deadbeat, but these men who helped to save us in the battle of the Atlantic and on the great lakes should be given a preference. In the marine city from which I come we have large numbers of these men, some of whom are almost in destitute circumstances.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on the point of order raised by the Prime Minister—

Mr. CHEVRIER: A great authority.

Mr. KNOWLES: I thought I would—

Mr. MacINNIS: Give us a better one.

Mr. CHEVRIER: There are many on this side of the house but they are not as loquacious.

Mr. KNOWLES: I submit that any hon. member has the right to fall back on the rules of the house without being subjected to sniping from the other side. I ask, Mr. Speaker, your consideration first of all of citations 112 and 113 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition. Citation 112 reads as follows:

A point of order against procedure must be raised promptly and before the question has passed to a stage at which the objection would be out of place.

I submit that for the Prime Minister to let the debate go on for over an hour, during which time three cabinet ministers took part, and then to raise a point of order, is contrary to citation 112. I would ask Your Honour to consider citation 113, which reads:

The Speaker decides questions of order only when they actually arise and not in anticipation. He is bound to call attention immediately to an irregularity in debate or procedure and not to wait for the interposition of a member.

I submit that if in Your Honour's opinion there was anything irregular about this motion it should have been pointed out immediately, and that you would be violating citation 113 if you acted now after the interposition of the Prime Minister.

With regard to motions for instructions, I would point out that citation 708 gives the authority for a motion of this kind. It reads:

When a bill comes up for a third reading a member may move that it be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole for the purpose of amending it in any particular.

That is what the motion now before the house does.

The Prime Minister read from citation 407 to suggest objection to this measure, but he should have gone on and read citation 408 which gives the general principles regarding instructions. There are three laid down and I shall read all of them. They are as follows:

First, an instruction must empower the committee to do something which the committee is not otherwise empowered to do. Secondly, the purpose of the instruction must be supplementary and ancillary to the purpose of the bill, and must fall within the general scope and framework of the bill.

That is what this instruction does. It proposes something supplementary and ancillary and at the same time within the general framework and scope of the bill.

Mr. HARTT: Not supplementary and ancillary, I respectfully submit. It is contrary.

Mr. KNOWLES: By no means. The general provisions of the bill call for extending the civil service preference to veterans. The proposal of the amendment is that the term "veterans" be extended to include those who served in the merchant marine. I submit that this is supplementary and ancillary.

Mr. MACKENZIE: One is civil and the other military.

An hon. MEMBER: That is right.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is where you are all wet.

Mr. KNOWLES: I hope that language is on the record.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I hope it is. It will be on the platform too.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask hon. members not to interrupt the hon. gentleman who has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLES: In view of the interruptions that have been made I feel that I should call the attention of the house to the fact that in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition, it is stated:

The principles that lie at the base of English parliamentary law, as Bourinot so aptly says, are to protect the minority and restrain the improvidence or tyranny of the majority.

I submit that the minority in this house has a right as well. On the point of order that the Prime Minister raised with regard to the fact that a resolution preceded this bill, a resolution which had the royal recommendation, on the basis of which he contended that this was a money bill, may I point out that the reason there had to be a resolution with the royal recommendation preceding this bill was that one of the provisions in the bill was for increasing the salaries of the civil service commission.

But so far as the veterans preference is concerned, no expenditure is involved. Even if that were the case, I submit that citation 486 is quite clear:

The committee is not bound by the terms of provisions which ministers have inserted in the bill, and when no amount has been mentioned in the resolution—

That is the case here.

—any member may propose to increase the grants specified in the bill or to extend the application of the provisions of the bill, whatever may be the cost resulting therefrom, so long as the power conferred by the royal recommendation is not exceeded.

I submit that on every count this amendment is clearly in order, and that some day in this House of Commons the rules should be used to protect the rights of the minority; in other words, that the rules that are permissive in character should be respected as well as the rules that are prohibitive.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question before the house is the third reading of Bill No. 413, an act to amend the Civil Service Act. We have before the house now an amendment moved by Mr. Bentley, seconded by Mr. Green, which reads:

That Bill No. 413 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole with instructions—

It is not written, "for the purpose", but "with instructions".

—to amend the said bill so as to extend to merchant seamen the provisions accorded to veterans in the said bill.

The point of order has been raised that this amendment is out of order because it imposes upon the crown an expenditure. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), both today and a few days ago, has left with the house the impression that, in certain cases it is the privilege of any member, by means of an amendment, to impose expenditures upon the government. I would like to draw the attention of the house to a book entitled The Law and Custom of The Constitution, by Anson, from which I quote, at page 268:

Money only granted on recommendation of the crown.

I believe it is important to read this to the house in view of what was said the other day in moving an amendment to the old age pension bill, and what has been said again today by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre:

The responsible advisers of the crown, the ministers of state, are alone capable of proposing that public money should be raised, or if already raised should be spent; and the house would not entertain a motion by a private member for a specific outlay on any object which he might consider deserving of public support. The relations of crown, lords and commons in respect of money grants cannot be better stated than in the words of Sir Erskine May.

The crown demands money, the commons grant it, and the lords assent to the grant; but the commons do not vote money unless it be required by the crown; nor impose or augment taxes, unless they be necessary for the public service as declared by the crown through its constitutional advisers. No private member may propose specific grant.

It is possible for any member of the House of Commons to move a resolution to the effect that public money might profitably be expended upon purposes specified in the resolution; and if the house agree to the motion it thereby commits itself to a general approval of such an outlay. But it would not be in accordance with the rules of the house for a private member to move that a specific sum be granted for a specific purpose; such a motion could only proceed from a minister of the crown. For it cannot be too strongly impressed upon the student of constitutional law, that all the money spent for the public service is spent by the crown; that all the money granted for the public service is granted by the commons, and that the commons have imposed upon themselves a rule that they will not grant a penny unless it is asked for by a minister representing the crown for a purpose specified in the terms of his request.

Such a rule is the great safeguard of the taxpayer against the casual benevolence of a house wrought upon by the eloquence of a private member; against a scramble for public money among unscrupulous politicians bidding against one another for the favour of a democracy.

The amendment proposes that the bill be referred back to the committee of the whole with instructions to amend the said bill so as to extend to merchant seamen the provisions accorded to veterans. The Prime Minister called the attention of the house to 407 of Beauchesne, third edition, which I believe is quite clear. Previously, basing my ruling on the same citation, I have declared out of order an amendment drafted on the same lines, and an appeal was made from my decision. That appeal was sustained by the house.

An instruction is a motion empowering a committee to do something which it could not otherwise do, or to direct it to do something which it might not otherwise do. It directs the order and course of the committee's proceedings and extends or restricts the order of reference from the house. In other words, an instruction gives power to the committee in that it enables the committee of the whole to do something which the committee had not the power to do. The committee of the whole had the power, and moreover had the opportunity, to amend the bill in such a way as to read as the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. gentleman reads. So according to Bourinot

and Beauchesne I have no reason to do other than say that this amendment is out of order.

Mr. BENTLEY: In spite of my great respect for you, Mr. Speaker, I shall have to appeal from your decision.

Mr. SPEAKER put the question as follows: Mr. Gibson (Hamilton West) moved, seconded by Mr. Howe, that Bill No. 413 be now read a third time. Mr. Bentley moved, seconded by Mr. Green:

That Bill No. 413 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole with instructions to amend the said bill so as to extend to merchant seamen the provisions accorded to veterans in the said bill.

Mr. Speaker ruled the amendment out of order on the ground that it was in the form of an instruction and that an instruction could not be given to a committee to do that which it already had the power to do. From this decision Mr. Bentley appealed.

The house divided on the question: Shall the Speaker's decision be sustained? And the decision of the chair was sustained on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Arsenault
Beaudoin
Belzile
Benidickson
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Blanchette
Boivin
Bonnier
Bourget
Bradette
Breithaupt
Bridges
Brown
Chevrier
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Coté (Verdun)
Cournoyer
Croll
Emmerson
Eudes
Farquhar
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gariépy
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gibson (Hamilton-West)
Gladstone
Golding
Gourd (Chapleau)
Grant
Hallé
Hamel
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Hartt
Healy
Howe
Jean
Jutras
King, Mackenzie
Kirk
LaCroix
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Langlois
Lapalme
Lapointe
Laurendeau
Leger
McCann
McCulloch (Pictou)
Macdonald (Brantford City)
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McGarry
McIvor
Mackenzie
MacKinnon
MacLean
MacNaught
Maloney
Marier
Marquis
Martin
Matthews (Brandon)
Maybank
Mayhew
Michaud
Mitchell
Mullins
Mutch
Nixon
Parent
Picard
Pinard
Power
Raymond (Wright)
Reid
Richard (Gloucester)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Rinfret
Robinson (Simcoe East)
Ross (Hamilton East)
Sinclair (Vancouver-North)
Sinnott
Smith (York North)
Stuart (Charlotte)
Tremblay
Warren
Weir
Whitman
Winters—93.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adamson
Archibald
Argue
Barrett
Bentley
Blackmore
Blair
Boucher
Bowerman
Bracken
Bradshaw
Brooks
Bryce
Burton
Campbell
Caouette
Case
Castleden
Charlton
Church
Coyle
Cruickshank
Daniel
Drope
Fair
Ferguson
Fleming
Fraser
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Graydon
Green
Harkness
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Henderson
Herridge
Hodgson
Irvine
Jackman
Jaenicke
Kidd
Knowles
Kuhl
Lennard
Lockhart
Low
McCuaig
McCullough (Assiniboia)
Macdonnell (Muskoka-Ontario)
MacInnis
McKay
McMaster
MacNicol
Manross
Massey
Matthews (Kootenay-East)
Menary
Merritt
Moore
Murphy
Probe
Quelch
Ross (St. Paul's)
Shaw
Skey
Stephenson
Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Stirling
Stokes
Strum, Mrs.
Timmins
Townley-Smith
Tustin
Webb
White (Hastings-Peterborough)
Wright—76.

Mr. McLURE: I was paired with the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Dionne). Had I voted I would have voted against your ruling being sustained.

Mr. CLAXTON: I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted to sustain your ruling.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I was paired with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver). Had I voted I would have voted against your ruling being sustained.

Mr. HANSELL: Mr. Speaker, it has always been against my principles to pair, but this afternoon I find myself paired with the right

hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent). Had I voted I would have voted against your ruling being sustained. I would have voted for justice.

Mr. MARSHALL: I was paired with the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare (Mr. Baker). Had I voted I would have voted against your ruling being sustained.

Mr. HLYNKA: I was paired with the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker). Had I voted I would have voted against your ruling being sustained.

Mr. WYLIE: I was paired with the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Gour). Had I voted I would have voted against your ruling being sustained.

Mr. J. I. HAMEL (St. Maurice-Lafleche): Mr. Speaker, before this bill is carried I want to put on record my strong opposition to it. To my mind, to raise the salaries of the members of the civil service commission at this time is to give a premium for incompetence and systematic discrimination against almost one-third of Canada's citizens, those of French origin. I charge publicly and formally the civil service commission with being responsible for the disunity existing so openly in this country at the present time. I charge formally the civil service commission with having violated the fundamental principles of our democracy, namely, representation by population. I charge the civil service commission with being responsible for the loss of millions and millions of dollars of income yearly by my compatriots of French origin.

Before I resume my seat I want to express my deep regret at not having heard the leaders of the various political groups in this house take their stand on this all-important matter. That being so, those same leaders should stop wondering why they cannot obtain and secure substantial support in the province of Quebec.

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I want to express briefly my disappointment that this bill does not include merchant seamen in the veterans preference. I support the argument put forward by various members in that connection. I want to read a resolution which was passed at the provincial convention of the Canadian Legion held in Vernon, British Columbia, in May, and at which there were in attendance some three hundred members. I want to draw this resolution to the attention of the right hon. ministers. It reads:

Resolved that this convention request the dominion government to extend vocational training, university grants, and all other rehabilitation benefits to all veterans of Canada's wartime merchant navy who had service in any theatre which authorized the payment of the war risk bonus.

Veterans preference is a rehabilitation benefit. I hope that before another session rolls around the government will listen to the views of the troops, not only those in British Columbia but I am sure those throughout Canada, the men who served overseas and who recognize the great work these merchant seamen did.

Mr. GEORGES H. HEON (Argenteuil) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to say a few words on this matter before the motion for third reading of the bill is carried?

The debate on this measure has made clearer the deplorable treatment meted out to our French-speaking fellow-citizens in the dominion civil service.

Mr. LANGLOIS: The Conservatives speak along the same lines.

Mr. HEON: So do intelligent liberals.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HEON: Right-thinking people, who are free from narrow-mindedness or language or religious prejudice, recognize the merits of the representations submitted in that connection by the chambre de commerce of Montreal, the Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HEON: It ill becomes you to laugh it off! The Quebec legislature and other representative bodies and they admit how urgent it is that according to principles of justice and equity and in the common interest, something should be done to remedy such a situation which reflects no credit on those who created and encouraged it—

Mr. RINFRET: Who created it?

Mr. HEON: The hon. member had better ask who encouraged it. It is an insult to the racial group so victimized.

Mr. Speaker, need I repeat that it is dishonest to appeal for unity and point out that the two great races should cooperate in making this country greater, and more united, if in the dominion executive and administrative field, the representatives of the French-speaking group are excluded? It might also be worth while to emphasize that never, in the last twenty-five years, has French-Canadian public opinion within all provinces been so much roused than on this matter. It is obvious that such concern will only cease when the wrongs are remedied and redressed.

I, for one, believe that the government should have the courage to deal at once with this problem; in so doing they will have the support of Canadians from all groups which are not blinded by fanaticism and hatred.

We are also informed that a committee of French-speaking members has been established for inquiring into the manner in which our fellow-citizens are treated, to the end that it may make whatever recommendations are called for under the circumstances and that our people may obtain full justice.

I am second to none in wishing the greatest success to my hon. friends in the tremendous task which they have so resolutely tackled.

(Text):

Motion agreed to on division, and bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

FLOOD DAMAGE IN MANITOBA—STATEMENT OF MR. ZAPLITNY

Mr. F. S. ZAPLITNY (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair there is a matter of urgency I wish to bring to the attention of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I take this occasion to suggest to the hon. member that when a motion is put from the chair, and before the Speaker says "adopté—carried", if an hon. member wishes to speak he should rise and address the Speaker. If he does not do so the Speaker does not know whether the hon. member wants to speak or to leave the chamber. Moreover, I would suggest that if there is a noise in the house an hon. member who rises should speak in such a voice that he can be understood. I am sure all hon. members will appreciate that, because they are very jealous of the prerogatives of the house and will be pleased to have the Speaker recognize and hear an hon. member who rises to address the house.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your guidance. The matter I wish to bring to the attention of the house will not take long but must be brought up at this time in order that effective action may be taken. I refer to the serious flood damage which has been caused in Manitoba by the recent torrential rains. I realize that the house is in a hurry to get on with its business, but this is a matter of urgency and importance to the farming economy of Manitoba, and I am sure that other members from Manitoba will appreciate some of the things I am going to say.

I shall not take much time to describe the damage which has been done, because it has been published in the press and over the radio. The rains in the area of Dauphin and north and south of Dauphin have been unprecedented. We have had in some parts of Manitoba what amounts to disaster. The area immediately around Dauphin was most seriously affected, but the area around Brandon, and I understand south of Brandon, also suffered severe damage. I could quote figures as to what the damage amounts to, but as hon. members realize, it is difficult to get exact figures of damage of that kind. Estimates vary. In order to avoid argument I will give a round figure which is a composite of the information given to me, and that is that the damage to crops, buildings, bridges, roads, live stock and so on will amount to around two million dollars. This is in a part of Manitoba which has been one of the best farming areas of the province for many years. It is a serious blow to the farmers in the areas affected. It is also a serious blow to food production in this country.

I want to place certain representations before the government in order to impress upon them the urgency of coming to the assistance of the people in the area of Dauphin and also in the area of Brandon. But first I wish to thank publicly the officials of the Department of Reconstruction and Supply, who have cooperated cheerfully and kindly with me up to this point in providing priorities in lumber, steel and nails in order that repair work may begin immediately on the bridges which have been washed out in that area.

I might quote from a telegram which I received from the reeve of the municipality of Dauphin in order to impress on the house the extent of the damage in that area. This telegram, which is addressed to myself, reads:

> Damage to municipality three hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

That is to the municipality alone, which includes bridges, culverts and so on. The telegram goes on:

> Crop damage over million dollars. Farmers on Lake Shore total loss of hay and crop over area of fifteen miles long and three miles wide. Lake Shore extended one and a half to five miles. Immediate action required to lower level of lake Dauphin.
>
> William Cruise, Reeve of Dauphin.

There is an area of approximately forty-five square miles on the lake shore of lake Dauphin completely inundated by water, an area which is settled by farmers who now have an absolute one hundred per cent crop loss.

To throw a sidelight on the seriousness of the situation I quote from a clipping which I have taken from the Dauphin *Herald,* our local paper, it refers to a farmer who waded in water up to his neck and got the cattle and horses to swim and wade through a quarter mile of water until they reached dry land. The clipping also states:

> The first passenger train between Dauphin and Flin Flon for more than a week went through Sifton on Monday evening.

It goes on to say that certain towns still are isolated and that travel on some of the roads is an impossibility.

I bring this matter to the attention of the government because the damage is so serious and so extensive that it is not possible for the local authorities to cope with the situation.

I should like to extend thanks publicly to the Canadian Red Cross which as soon as the disaster struck our district extended their offer to help. It was not necessary to take advantage of their offer at the time, but I wish to put it on record that they were right on the spot and ready to help.

The extent of the damage is such that it will not be possible for the local authorities to come to the assistance of individual farmers, and although we have asked the province of Manitoba to come to the assistance of farmers in that area it may not be possible even for the province to cope with the damage to the crops. I am therefore asking the federal government to assist in every way possible to get these people rehabilitated.

I want to appeal particularly to the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply to continue to cooperate in providing priorities for timber and steel in order that the bridges may be restored. The requests I have received so far have covered only one rural municipality, the one most severely hit, but there will be requests coming in from other municipalities and I hope they will be dealt with as promptly as the ones I have already taken up with the department.

I also wish to appeal to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), who I regret is not in his seat today, to do everything possible to make sure that the provisions of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act are so interpreted that the farmers—who have suffered such a serious crop loss, running all the way from ten to one hundred per cent, and averaging probably forty per cent throughout—may receive compensation for that crop loss. The recent amendments to the act will make compensation easier than it was before in the case of flood damage. In previous years as those who are familiar with the act realize, it has been difficult, if not almost impossible, for farmers to apply for crop damage under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act because of the way in which the damaged areas were described, and because of other regulations. The recent amendments placing the act on a township basis make it a little easier, but there will still be difficulties because of the extent of the damage done. There are areas in certain districts where one-third of the township has been completely inundated and the crops completely destroyed, while the other two-thirds may still have a crop. In such a case there may be just enough of a crop in the whole of the township to put it over the top so far as the act is concerned. In these borderline cases I hope the minister will stretch a point in coming to the assistance of those whose crops have been completely lost.

Over the years from 1939 to 1946 the farmers of Manitoba have contributed to the Prairie Farm Assistance Act well over $3,000,000. During that same period they collected from the fund just a little over a million dollars. In other words since 1939 they have contributed to the fund more than twice as much as they have received from it. As I said before in this house, I have never used that as an argument for withdrawing from the act, although some people are inclined to take that view. I have always taken the stand that the Prairie Farm Assistance Act is beneficial to the farmers as a whole. Here is an opportunity for the government to show the value of this act by being as generous as possible in the interpretation of the provisions of it in order that people who have suffered this severe damage may receive compensation out of the fund.

There are other things which the federal government can do and in which they might cooperate with the provincial authorities where there is a division of responsibility. For example, a while ago I mentioned the level of lake Dauphin, which is extraordinarily high at the present time. There is an immediate demand from people living around the lake that the level of the lake should be lowered. It is a burning question with them, because if the lake is allowed to remain on their property for a few months it may destroy permanently the value of the land. One of the ways in which the lake might be lowered is by cleaning out the silt which has

accumulated at the mouth of the Mossy river where it enters into lake Winnipegosis and drains lake Dauphin. Not very much dredging work has been done there recently, and I am given to understand that there is a serious obstruction at the mouth of the river which prevents water from running off as quickly as it otherwise would.

There is also the question of control dams on the run-off side, the west side of Riding mountain, which is not a new question so far as the government is concerned. I have taken it up before and I bring it to the government's attention now only because I believe that had work been done in the area at the time representations were originally made, a great deal of this damage could have been prevented. I want to be fair and say not all of it could have been prevented, but a great deal could have been prevented in the immediate area. I have a great deal of correspondence with the Department of Mines and Resources dealing with the question dating back as far as April 30, and earlier than that, of 1946, in which I urged upon the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen) the necessity of building control and diversion dams on the creeks and rivers coming down that mountain side in order to prevent flooding in the future. I will quote from one dated July 16, 1946 in which I said this:

> This is a grievance of fairly long standing and we are hoping that something of a concrete nature will be undertaken this year in order that flood waters may be prevented from doing damage again in future years.

That was about a year ago. In fairness I must admit that the Minister of Mines and Resources did make an effort to get a survey of the area to which I referred. Steps were being taken to cooperate with the provincial authority to find out what could be done to prevent flood conditions in the future; but unfortunately the action that was taken was too slow and we find that this year the damage done in that particular area is such that I believe if half of that amount of money had been spent in building control and diversion dams on these creeks we would have prevented a great deal of the damage.

As a permanent feature possibly the only thing that will prevent floods in the future in the long run will be a programme of reforestation on the side of Riding mountain which affects that district. I do not want to go into that in detail, but it is something which the government might look into in the near future. I merely wish to add that when the government receives the applications which have been made by the rural municipalities for assistance under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, I hope they will be generously considered. We have had some experience in that same area before where it has been difficult to collect compensation under that fund. I wish to quote a representation taken from an editorial of the local paper, the Dauphin *Herald,* which I think sets out the question clearly and briefly:

> The rural council's appeal to the dominion government for aid through the prairie farmers' assistance act is completely justified. In withholding payment of huge sums of money to effect permanent control measures, the federal authorities should surely be prepared to shoulder the cost of damage which can be directly attributed to their policy.

The policy referred to is the lack of control by dams to which I have been referring. I continue with the editorial:

> This is aside even from the responsibility assumed by the federal government in past years with regard to finanical help for drought areas. It follows logically that assistance should also be forthcoming to farmers who suffer loss of income from flooding.

I want to emphasize again that the farmers in the area which I have the honour to represent have for a number of years contributed to the prairie farm assistance fund and have not been in a position to collect from it, because in that area we are not severely subjected to drought; but we have had repeated losses from floods, none of which have been nearly as serious as this one. Now we have had something which amounts to a disaster in the area, and I hope that the government will realize that the farmers are entitled to a little extra consideration because of the fact that they have contributed so much.

What I say about the area around Dauphin applies to a greater or lesser extent to the other areas which have been affected, namely Brandon and the section south of the city. I hope that the government will do everything that is possible and as quickly as possible to come to the assistance of the people there, who have for a number of years been producing large quantities of food and doing excellent work as farmers and who at this time are not asking for a handout but simply for something which I believe is coming to them.

Mr. J. E. MATTHEWS (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation of the remarks of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Zaplitny). He has explained what is really a serious situation. I have been in touch with it to a greater or lesser degree for the last two weeks and have had representations from various municipalities,

boards of trade and other civic bodies. Manitoba is being blessed with a banner crop practically all over the province, but that does not assist very much the unfortunate farmer or market gardener whose crops are completely destroyed by this flood.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) is in the west, I understand, and I have no doubt that before his return he will have acquired first-hand knowledge of the losses which have been sustained. I believe I speak for practically every hon. member of this house when I say that I hope something may be done to alleviate the losses which these men have met after the hard work of putting in their crop. I am sure we are all one in hoping that they may be amply recompensed.

PRICE OF USED CARS—STATEMENT OF MR. ARGUE

Mr. H. R. ARGUE (Wood Mountain): I wish to refer to a matter which is of considerable importance to hon. members and to the people of Canada generally. It has to do with the situation which prevails in the used and slightly used car market. On May 26 I asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) a question as to the situation which was developing in that regard. His reply was that he believed the situation was spotty and did not warrant any action by the government at that time. What I referred to are the very high prices that are being charged for used cars, prices which, according to newspaper reports, are from $500 to $1,000 higher than the retail selling price of a new car, and often obtained after the car has been sold and driven only a few miles.

The basis of my first question in the house was a report in the Toronto *Daily Star* of May 28, which set out the situation which had arisen in the city of Quebec. The report in that paper reads as follows:

> There are plenty of new cars of most makes available in Quebec city, and anyone, regardless of priority or waiting lists, can get one—provided he is willing to "tip" the salesman a cool $500 in addition to the top price of the car. This practice is more or less general at present, although the average buyer is loudly protesting and refusing to come across.

It goes on to say that the tip ranges from $300 to $500. The used-car dealers are cleaning up on the car shortage too. Everything from battered jalopies to well-used 1938 taxis are selling for fantastic prices in the $1,000-plus class, and most of the cars are little better than heaps of junk.

In the Montreal *Standard* of May 10 there was an article referring to a similar situation which had been developing in the city of Montreal. I have here an article that appeared in *Le Devoir* of June 11, some twelve days after I asked my question, and at a time when one might have thought that, in the words of the minister, the situation might have cleared itself. I have had this article translated, and I will quote from extracts from it:

> We have stressed several times in this column recently the hard-to-believe state of affairs of the automobile market, used and new cars. Our last article, of last week, I believe, dealt with a statement which had just been made in Toronto by one of the principal officers of the automobile salesmen's association and which confirmed what we had previously exposed and denounced, that is, that a real black market existed and that transactions at exorbitant prices are currently taking place. Old cars, which were used during ten and twelve years, are being sold at unbelievable prices, while recent models may be obtained only at prices $500 to $1,000 over those of new cars of the same make. Very few new automobiles, or none at all, are available on the normal market. On the other hand, automobiles in new condition which have travelled but a few thousand miles, and even a few hundred miles, are frequently offered for sale at prices far beyond list prices established by manufacturers' agents and by regular automobile salesmen.

This article goes on to quote from a letter written to the paper by the vice-president of the Ford Motor Company of Canada, Mr. R. M. Sale, who stated:

> The articles you forwarded to me deal with a matter of great concern to the people in the automobile industry. Even if the manufacturers, no more than their salesmen, are unable to check the exorbitant prices asked for used cars owned by individuals or dealers, we note that the public reaction is very unfavourable.

What I want to point out is that the vice-president of the Ford Motor Company in this letter to the newspaper admitted that cars are being sold at exorbitant prices.

I have here an article which appeared in the *Financial Post* of June 14. Most members, I believe, will agree that when it comes to financial matters the *Financial Post* is accurate. I may say that this article is headed "I try to buy a car!" Then there is a subhead which reads:

> Slightly used machines bring double list price, in crazy market—public cashing in on fantastic prices.

The article states:

> There's gold in used car lots these days. And to strike it rich, the second-hand car dealer doesn't have to do any prospecting. All he needs are some shiny new used cars, and car-hungry Canadians will beat a path to his door.
>
> In a two-hour survey of half a dozen used car lots in Toronto this week eighty-five '46 and '47 cars were counted. And this represents only about one-tenth of the lots in the city.
>
> So far, the trade hasn't been able to stop this traffic in a scarce commodity. Makers have men out checking the serial numbers of cars

found on lots to trace the original owner and put him on a black list, but at best, this can only have a slight effect on the back-alley trading.

One lot was jammed tight with 41 new cars. Not one was priced lower than $1,995. Highest was $4,500 for a four-door Cadillac sedan, listed at $3,775.

On another lot was the newest car seen in the survey—a sleek Oldsmobile which still had some of the factory-wrapped brown paper around the bumpers. In the new car showroom, it sells for around $2,775; in the used-car lot, $3,595. The speedometer registered 165 miles.

The article goes on to state that a man brought in a 1941 Ford and wanted to trade it in for a 1947 model Tudor Ford. He was asked to pay for the new Ford $2,295, in spite of the fact that that particular car is listed with the retail dealers at $1,437, and he was allowed $895 for the '41 model. There is a good deal more to that article, but I think I have quoted enough to show the situation which has been developing and which exists in Canada today.

I have received a number of letters from business men in Montreal confirming what has been stated in these articles and saying that anyone can get a new car there if he is willing to pay from $500 to $1,000 above the list price.

Recently in Regina I saw a 1941 four-door Dodge for sale with a price ticket of $1,350. I was told by the owner of a 1942 Chevrolet, four-door, that he had numerous offers of $1,550 for that car and was about to sell it and expected to close the deal the following day. In Ottawa I was asked by the owner of a 1936 Nash coupe whether I cared to buy it for $1,200. Imagine $1,200 for a car that is more than ten years old! I see some members chuckling. They see where they can cash in on some money too.

I think it should be pointed out that the situation which has developed is perfectly legal. I do not think anyone is breaking the law in doing this. Used cars and new cars have been removed from price control. The companies selling cars in Canada do not condone the situation that has developed. They are asking for their cars only the regular retail price, but some people are willing to take a car and then sell it and make a good deal of money. I believe the people of Canada are law-abiding, and if the government would reinforce price ceilings on cars the people would be willing to live up to the law and a situation of this kind would be curbed.

I notice the Minister of Finance is not in his seat, but I would ask that this matter be brought to his attention and that the government take proper action. He stated on April 14, as reported in *Hansard*, that he would be willing to do so if such a situation developed, with respect to a commodity which had been removed from price control and with respect to which the people of the country were being exploited. Farmers who have not been able to buy a car for five or six years, and who need a car to carry on their farming operations, and the many people who have to travel, carry on business and make their livelihood, and need a car for that purpose, should be protected; but at the present time these people are being exploited. If the government means what it said on April 14, it should reimpose fair and proper price ceilings on cars. Certainly no car should be sold by anyone in this country at a price even one dollar higher than the ordinary retail selling price.

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): I should like to endorse the request made by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Zaplitny) and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Matthews) for assistance for these unfortunate people who have suffered from floods. Many of them will lose the fruits of their entire year's work as a result of this extreme flood condition which has taken place in the past few weeks. It was my experience to be in Dauphin when that flooding took place and later to go through Brandon. It is an extreme situation and is something which I have never seen happen at this time of year in the province of Manitoba; and I was born and raised there.

The hon. member for Dauphin also spoke about the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. Under this one per cent deduction, up to date the farmers of Manitoba have contributed approximately double what they have ever received out of the fund. Since new regulations are now being put into effect, based on amendments recently passed in this house, I sincerely trust that they will be interpreted so that the people in that area—and there is a large area in that great and productive area of Dauphin, where the people have lost their all in the matter of this year's work—will get some help. I hope these regulations will be interpreted so that something can be done under them for these people. There are many people along the Assiniboine and in Dauphin and also in other isolated areas in southwest Manitoba, who will lose their entire year's work so far as their crop is concerned. I just want to add my word to that of other hon. members in their plea for assistance from the proper authorities in the not too distant future.

Mr. J. A. CHARLTON (Brant): I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without saying just a word regarding the flood conditions in Manitoba. We in the east can all, I am sure,

appreciate fully how the farmers of Manitoba feel regarding the situation. I just wish to point out again that we in the east this year encountered the worst flood conditions which have existed in years, and that includes practically the whole of eastern Canada. I am sure that in many districts the crop will be less than thirty per cent. In many districts it will be practically nil. Some others may be fortunate enough to get around fifty to sixty per cent. I just want to point out to the government that if they see fit to give aid, eastern Canada should certainly receive something as well as Manitoba.

ASSISTANCE IN EXPORT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA AND NOVA SCOTIA APPLES—MR. HERRIDGE

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West): Just briefly I wish to bring to the attention of the house a matter of great importance to the apple growers of British Columbia and Nova Scotia, with regard to the possibility of exporting certain export varieties of apples to Great Britain this year. Some few days ago, after the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had made his statement with regard to Canada giving $20,000,000 aid to relieve distressed conditions in Europe I asked him this question: In view of the fact that the British government have announced that, owing to the shortage of dollars, they will not be able to purchase apples from Canada this year, will the Canadian government give consideration to making similar arrangements for the export of certain varieties of Canadian apples to Great Britain, say in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000 worth. This proposal originated with the fruit organizations in my own constituency in British Columbia, has been widely publicized and has received support from the fruit organizations both in British Columbia and in the maritimes. It is of particular concern to growers of certain varieties of apples, particularly in British Columbia. There is the Jonathan, a small red variety which has little sale on the Canadian domestic market, but which is purchased to a great extent in Great Britain by poor families. They like to buy a box of apples, which contains a great many of them, and give the children an apple a day before going to school. A box lasts a long time. There is a certain variety known as Cox's Orange, which is exported largely to Great Britain. There is very little sale for Cox's Orange in Canada or in the United States because the Canadian palate does not seem to be attracted by that variety. I understand that the same condition exists in Nova Scotia with regard to Gravensteins. Again I urge that consideration be given to this question.

I might say that the fruit growers of British Columbia have received hundreds of letters this year from housewives in Great Britain, expressing appreciation of the apples which have been shipped to Great Britain since the end of the war, and how much they would like to see them again. I hope that some arrangement will be made so that the British people, particularly the poor people, may have an opportunity to purchase the varieties I have mentioned. I urge the government to give consideration to assisting the fruit growers of British Columbia and Nova Scotia in this respect. At the same time they will be assisting a great people whom we should be concerned about assisting.

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction and Supply): I wish to say to hon. members who have spoken in this debate that the attention of the appropriate ministers will be called to the subject matter of their remarks. The government has been deeply impressed with the serious situation at Dauphin, as mentioned by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Zaplitny) and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Matthews). I understand that the Brandon area is also being damaged by flood conditions. The hon. member for Dauphin was kind enough to say that the Department of Reconstruction and Supply had given highest priority to the requirements of that area for reconstruction. I can assure him that if anything further is needed in that direction it will be forthcoming.

The attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) will be called to the remarks of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Zaplitny) in the matter of the interpretation of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. I think I know the Minister of Agriculture well enough to be able to say that if the situation comes within the orbit of the act, the act will be interpreted in as favourable manner as is possible. The hon. member mentioned work in progress by the Department of Mines and Resources. It is unfortunate that this acute flooding occurred before the results of that work could alleviate the situation, but I can assure the hon. member that the surveys which have been made will be followed up and that remedial steps will be taken so that, we hope, the same condition cannot occur in other years.

I shall be glad to call the matter of both used and new car prices, to the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott), under whose jurisdiction the matter came before the removal of controls. Whether at this late stage it is possible to consider the restoration of controls in a market which was

always difficult to control, even under war conditions, I am doubtful; but in any event the minister will be informed of the remarks which have been made.

The matter of apples is receiving the urgent attention of the government, and I feel sure that a solution will be found to the conditions which have arisen as a result of a shortage of dollars in the United Kingdom.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Air service—

440. Air transport board, salaries and office expenses, $150,000.

Mr. BENTLEY: I wish to bring to the attention of the minister and of the committee a situation which is greatly disturbing the good people of my little city.

Mr. KNOWLES: Just the good people?

Mr. BENTLEY: There are no bad people; they are all very good, and the great bulk of them are very much concerned over a situation that has arisen there. I do not want to take any more of the time of the committee on this matter than is necessary, but it has to do with Donald M. Walz, a veteran with a wonderful record in the air force. He gave good service as an instructor in Canada. Then he went overseas and was shot down behind the enemy lines shortly after D-day. He was taken prisoner but escaped through his association with the underground. He came back, reported for duty and flew again until he was later shot down over Germany, where he remained a prisoner until the end of the war. He returned to Canada, where he obtained a licence as a civilian pilot, and is an excellent one by every standard on which he has been tested. Then he formed a partnership with another man by the name of Schrader, who operates a farm south of Swift Current and also a business, in both of which he is very successful. I might add that Mr. Shrader is not a veteran, not by design but because he was not accepted for service. This partnership was formed with the intention of operating an air training school and a charter air service for that part of southwestern Saskatchewan, which requires a service of that kind.

Prior to Mr. Walz being released from the air force, another gentleman, who is not a veteran but who otherwise is an excellent citizen, made application for a similar licence. Please do not misunderstand me when I compare these two men. One is a veteran with a fine service record; the other is a good citizen and a successful business man. He arrived in Swift Current some time before Walz and Schrader came there, and both asked the air transport board for a licence to operate the same kind of service. The civilian gentleman is Mr. Karels. He operates several cold storage plants in Saskatchewan and Alberta and has other business interests which make him independent and not in need of rehabilitation measures, while Mr. Walz needs to be rehabilitated. That is the difference between the two. They both applied to the air transport board, and I have in my hand decision serial numer 211, which sets out the application of Russell E. Karels as follows:

> . . . for a licence to operate the following commercial air services from a base at Swift Current, Saskatchewan: non-scheduled charter to transport passengers and goods, flying training and recreational flying (sightseeing and barnstorming).

In his case the application was approved. The other application is described as follows:

> Application by Donald M. Walz and Charles W. Schrader, carrying on business under the firm name and style of Swift Current Air Services, for a licence to operate the following commercial air services from a base at Swift Current, Saskatchewan: non-scheduled charter to transport passengers and goods, flying training and recreational flying (sightseeing and barnstorming).
>
> Decision: application denied.

I take exception to the denial of this licence, particularly on the grounds set out by the examiner for the air transport board, who stated that Karels had a substantial investment in local business and a permanent residence in Swift Current. He also had his application in slightly before the other application, and his financial statement shows assets in the air service of over $28,000, including a capital investment of $25,000, with $40,000 in cold storage plants at Swift Current and elsewhere and substantial interests in Calgary, Lethbridge and Humboldt. Apparently it was considered that because of his financial position he was more likely to be a successful operator of an air service. I should like to point out to the minister that Swift Current Air Services, comprising Walz and Schrader, have assets of $12,000, of which $10,000 have already been subscribed, and that the partners have additional assets of $30,900, consisting of bonds, grain, farm machinery, land and sundry assets which could be easily liquidated, and which would furnish sufficient capital for their purposes.

The air transport board sent a gentleman to hold hearings and decide the issue. The hearings were held, and I have in my hand a complete verbatim transcript of the proceedings. I am not going to take time to put it on the record, but it indicates that the reasons I

have cited as those given by the examining officer are correct; that is, it was felt that Karels had a prior claim because his application had been made first and also because he was in a slightly better financial position. I believe the decision should have been the other way, because the veteran and his partner had sufficient assets and certainly needed rehabilitation more than the well-off gentleman.

I am not alone in this view. I have had frequent representations from the Canadian Legion there, and there have been items in the local weekly newspaper, which is one of the best in Canada, having frequently won the prize in that field. Even the board of trade, while it did not make any particular recommendation, threw the balance of its support in favour of Walz and Schrader on the ground that Walz is a veteran with an excellent record, and that the partners have sufficient capital and knowledge to go ahead with the project. I have also letters from other branches of the Canadian Legion and others supporting the case of the veteran, but I do not think it is necessary to take time to put them on the record. They are available to anyone who wishes to look at them, and I am trying to make a fair presentation of the case. I am not saying anything that cannot be supported by documentary evidence, and the file on this matter is quite lengthy. If I may, however, I should like to read a resolution on this matter by the board of trade, which appeared in the *Sun*, the newspaper I mentioned a moment ago:

> At a general meeting of the board of trade in the Healy hotel on Tuesday evening, a resolution was unanimously adopted in connection with the recent announcement that in the granting of a commercial air service licence, a veteran, Don Walz, had been denied a licence, one of the reasons being given that one service is all that is economically feasible for Swift Current.
>
> The meeting went on record as disapproving this action of the examining officer who later made his recommendations to the air transport board at Ottawa. In addition the meeting felt that a returned veteran should have been given equal consideration when he was trying to re-establish himself and apparently had been led to believe that his application would get favourable consideration. The resolution will be directed to the proper authorities at Ottawa. President Slater Alexander presided at the meeting.

Mr. Slater Alexander is a fine gentleman. I should like to draw attention to another factor that entered into this examination. When any person makes an application to the air transport board for a licence to operate a service anyone who feels that that person is not the proper type can make representations to the board and oppose the application. Mr. Karels made representations which are to be found in the transcript of evidence. He opposed the granting of a licence to Walz and Schrader, the veterans concerned. His opposition was on the ground that there was not room for two services in the area.

On the other hand, the evidence showed that Mr. Walz and Mr. Schrader were prepared to compete for the field. They were willing to spend what money they had in the belief that they could give the kind of service which would either make them paramount in the field of competition or establish the fact that there was room for two services. They made no representations opposing the application of Mr. Karels. This should be distinctly in favour of Walz and Schrader when the matter is being considered by anyone who believes in the right of free competition, as many in this committee do. Walz and Schrader were not asking any favours; they were willing to let Karels operate, provided that they could operate. They contended that if there were room for two they would both be able to exist; if there were not, the best man would win. I understand that to be competition. They were willing to adopt that attitude, but Mr. Karels was not. He opposed the veteran and his partner getting a licence.

I have another clipping from the *Sun* dealing with the same matter, and if the minister and the committee want it placed on the record I shall do so, although it is fairly long. It simply supports the statement I have already made. I do not wish to delay the deliberations of the committee, but I did want to place this matter squarely before the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply who administers the air transport board and to plead with him to see that the government do what they have said they are going to do, give the veteran every opportunity to rehabilitate himself.

As I said before, anyone reading the evidence will arrive at the same conclusion, that the veteran and his partner are qualified by every test that could be made. These men have the ability and the means and the knowledge of business administration to operate this service. They are willing to compete and they ask for a charter. On the other hand, the other man wants to exclude them from that field in order to have it for himself. While I do not think he is a wealthy man, he is well enough established in other lines of business not to require rehabilitation. He can get along quite comfortably without his air operations.

I should like the minister to give the committee and myself, and particularly the people back home who are so concerned with this, some assurance that he will take a personal interest in this case. I believe if he does he

will have no hesitation in saying that this veteran flyer has at least as good a right if not a greater right to this charter. I say all this without any criticism or charge against the examining officer. I expect that he had certain terms of reference and probably he did what he thought was best. However I disagree with his finding, and I want to impress the minister with my reasons for disagreement. If the minister cannot make a statement now I ask him to assure us that he will give personal consideration to this matter which is so deserving.

Mr. HOWE: I want to thank the hon. member for Swift Current for placing this matter before the committee in some detail. I am quite familiar with the case, as it was called to my attention some days ago. I have read the evidence and looked into the matter thoroughly. There were two applicants for the same licence. The function of the air transport board is to rehabilitate the veteran in a manner which will permit him to make a living, not in a manner which may get him into difficulties where he may lose his gratuity and other assets. That is the reason why some care is taken in sorting out applicants for licences of the type in question.

As I say, there were two applications. Karels' application was the prior one, the application of Walz and Schrader coming in at a later date. The examiner was sent to Swift Current to investigate. A hearing was held and written evidence was taken. The recommendation of the examiner was followed in issuing a licence to Karels. My understanding of the situation is that Karels is a resident of Swift Current, whereas the veteran Walz has never been a resident there.

Mr. BENTLEY: Karels had not been a resident for long. He came in there only recently; I think he was there for less than a year when he made his application.

Mr. HOWE: It was thought by the board that there were other desirable locations as a centre for flying and that possibly the veteran Walz could locate in an area which might provide a better living. Representations were made by the board of trade and responsible citizens of Swift Current suggesting that licences should be issued to both parties. Personally I am reluctant to accept them because I think eventually one of the licensees will lose his investment, but who am I not to bow to local opinion? There is no great principle at stake. The air transport board is holding hearings in the west at the present time, and I have asked the board to stop at Swift Current and hold another hearing so as to ascertain whether there is any serious reason why both applications should not be granted. I am inclined to think the result will be that both applicants will be granted a licence. I hope my hon. friend will not be reluctant in taking his share of the responsibility in case the situation ends in disaster.

Mr. BENTLEY: I will not. I thank the minister very much.

Mr. WINTERS: Under what items will the T.C.A. be considered?

Mr. HOWE: The T.C.A., being a self-supporting enterprise, has no estimate. It earns its own revenue and does not depend on parliament for funds.

Mr. CROLL: From the report I had, I thought there was a deficit.

Mr. HOWE: It had an earlier surplus to cover the deficit. I shall be glad to have my hon. friend discuss the T.C.A. under this item if he cares to.

Mr. WINTERS: I should like to say a few words in connection with what seems to be a growing complaint about T.C.A. service in the maritimes. Almost everyone who flies to Ottawa comes to see me to complain about what they say is an increasingly bad service to the maritimes, a service which I had always thought was increasingly good. They complain of long stop-overs in Montreal which make it necessary for people to leave here in the middle of the night, wait in Montreal, leave Montreal still later in the morning and then arrive in Halifax on the same day. They complain of the lengthy stop-overs.

Another serious cause for complaint is the uncertainty as to when the planes will leave both from Halifax and from Montreal. I hear an increasing number of complaints from people who have called up the air port to find out what time the plane is leaving; when they get to the field they find the departure has been delayed for an hour or two, and they come back to town and then find still further delays. During the past week or so, an eminent gentleman from the maritimes took off from Halifax and the plane made an unscheduled stop at Blissville. There were ladies on the plane, and at Blissville there were no facilities whatsoever for ladies or anybody else.

Mr. HOWE: I have stopped at Blissville several times. I hope my hon. friend has.

Mr. WINTERS: I was told that the facilities had been removed from the buildings. It was a hot day and the place was almost insufferable because of mosquitoes. In the light of all these complaints I should be

pleased to hear the minister make a statement, because I know there must be something to be said on the other side too, on the service to the maritimes.

Mr. HOWE: I am surprised to hear my hon. friend speak of a lack of service to the maritimes, as operating results indicate that T.C.A. may be giving them too much service. T.C.A. has four flights daily from Montreal to Halifax and these are running about fifty per cent occupancy, whereas in the very busy section, Montreal-Ottawa, Toronto-Winnipeg, there are four flights, all running nearly 100 per cent occupancy, with many complaints because of lack of accommodation. The same care is taken in operating T.C.A. in the maritimes as elsewhere on the system. I would not mention the peculiar weather conditions on that route at a time like this, but sometimes we do have difficulty at the Halifax end, and sometimes difficulty at Pennfield. The only reason for going to Blissville was that Pennfield was closed in on that particular day. Blissville is not a regular stop at the present time. Pennfield is a well-equipped air port and ordinarily that is the stop. I can assure my hon. friend that, so far as weather in all parts of Canada is concerned, we have had the worst four months that have ever been experienced on our air lines. I think he will find that the operation is sound, and that, with the improved weather that we always get in summer and autumn in the maritimes, we shall have first-class operation.

Mr. WINTERS: Would it not be possible to arrange a schedule from Ottawa to Halifax to avoid the lay-over in Montreal and work out a better through service?

Mr. HOWE: There are four services daily, but perhaps my hon. friend takes the evening plane. That plane is held to meet the convenience of the Post Office Department, to collect the last mail from Montreal. If my hon. friend would take one of the earlier services he could make better connections.

Mr. GREEN: Would the minister give us a short statement with regard to the domestic aviation situation and the policy of the government at the present time, also with regard to the international aviation picture. For example, I understand that it has not been possible to work out any multilateral agreement, which was the original policy announced by the government several years ago. I think it would be helpful if the minister would give us a short statement with regard to both the domestic and the international aviation situation.

Mr. SKEY: I was going to ask the minister much the same question. Would he include in his statement a comparison of how T.C.A. has survived the last six or eight months, which have been so difficult for the United States air lines, and has he any views to offer on our organization as compared with theirs?

Mr. HOWE: In the international field, as hon. members are aware, PICAO, the international civil aviation organization, has Canada as its location and Montreal as its headquarters. That orgnization has been meeting continuously since its formation, and at its last assembly, in May of this year, it became a permanent organization, with its headquarters at Montreal. The location of the international organization in that city has been helpful to Canadian aviation, and has helped to place Canada prominently on the world air maps.

The international organization has been dealing with the matter of a multilateral agreement. An attempt has been made to arrive at common ground, but to date that attempt has not been successful. The last meeting of the international organization debated the subject at great length, but failed to reach agreement and decided that a special meeting of the organization would be called for this autumn in Rio de Janeiro for the sole purpose of discussing the problem of a multilateral agreement. Therefore I can report at the present time that there is no multilateral agreement covering traffic matters other than the first two freedoms; that is, the freedom to fly over a country for peaceful purposes and the freedom to land for repairs or refueling. The first and second freedoms are the only multilateral freedoms at present. In the meantime, a great many bilateral agreements have been made. Canada has made five or six, all of which have been reported to this House of Commons. To date we have not given the fifth freedom, as have some other countries. We believe our location is such that our agreement should be confined to the first four freedoms. We have kept to that course.

Mr. GREEN: Would the minister explain the third, fourth and fifth freedoms?

Mr. HOWE: The first freedom is the right to fly over a country for peaceful purposes. The second freedom is the right to land for repairs or refueling. The third freedom is the right to pick up passengers in the home country and take them to any other country with which Canada has a fourth freedom agreement. The fourth freedom is the right to pick up passengers in any country in which Canada has traffic rights and bring those passengers to the home country. The fifth freedom is the right of a Canadian air line to pick up passengers, we will say, in the United

Kingdom and deliver them in France. It is the right to handle passengers who are not nationals of its own country or destined to or from its own country.

Mr. GREEN: We are not prepared to give that freedom?

Mr. HOWE: We have not as yet. We are prepared to give it on a multilateral basis. If there is a universal exchange of fifth freedom rights we are prepared to join, but our situation on the air lines is such that we feel that bilateral agreements granting fifth freedom rights would work to our detriment so far as Canadian traffic is concerned.

On the international routes at the present time we are operating eleven round-trip crossings a week between Montreal, Prestwick, Scotland, and London, England. The flights are running full at the moment. We are operating the new North Star planes. These planes have worked out amazingly well. I think no other new aircraft has taken the punishment in its initial operations that the North Star has been subjected to. With five planes in commission, we have been operating eleven round trips a week across the Atlantic, which is rather a phenomenal operation. In some cases the turn-around time at London is no longer than an hour and a quarter. The plane delivers its passengers there, takes its load and returns to Canada with no more overhaul than can be performed in that time.

Mr. MacNICOL: What is the length of time taken in crossing over each way?

Mr. HOWE: The schedule is fourteen hours from Montreal to London, with an intermediate stop at Prestwick.

Mr. FRASER: Can the minister say whether the United States firm which operates out of Montreal cuts into the T.C.A. business at all?

Mr. HOWE: What United States firm is that?

Mr. FRASER: I saw an advertisement in the paper in which a United States firm was advertising flights to England.

Mr. HOWE: That would not be the Ontario government immigration project?

Mr. FRASER: No, from Montreal.

Mr. SKEY: Acting in competition with you.

Mr. HOWE: The Ontario government immigration plan has made arrangements with a United States charter operator, I believe, to bring their immigrants from the United Kingdom to Canada, but there may be some difficulty about working out details of the operation.

Mr. FRASER: This was an advertisement in the Montreal *Star* advertising flights to England. I do not know whether they go via New York or not.

Mr. HOWE: They must be advertising a flight from some point outside Canada which can be reached by a connecting line.

Mr. SKEY: Do you not need more than five aircraft?

Mr. HOWE: We have twenty on the way. As my hon. friend knows, we are using an interim aircraft now. We took five of the twenty aircraft being built for the R.C.A.F. As a matter of fact, we are using these until the pressurized version is completed, the first of which will be out this month. By late autumn we expect to have twenty pressurized aircraft, which will represent the permanent international planes for T.C.A. As far as the domestic services are concerned, they have been expanded. In the maritimes we are operating four services a day between Montreal and Halifax; two of them go on to Sydney and Newfoundland. We also have a new service operating between Halifax, Yarmouth, Pennfield in New Brunswick, and Boston; two services each day. In the central region service is about as last reported. From Winnipeg west there have been some changes. We have opened a new route, Winnipeg to Edmonton by way of Saskatoon, a direct route. We have opened a new route between Winnipeg and Calgary direct, and we have put on a service from Winnipeg to Lethbridge, with stops at Swift Current and Medicine Hat. These are the new developments in the field.

Mr. GREEN: When are you flying across the great lakes?

Mr. HOWE: We are flying across the great lakes at the present time. All flights from Toronto to Winnipeg are across the great lakes, with stops at Sault Ste. Marie, Port Arthur and Winnipeg.

Mr. REID: What time is cut off by crossing the great lakes?

Mr. HOWE: As I remember it, about an hour and fifteen minutes.

Mr. GREEN: What is the main obstacle to the completion of a multilateral agreement? Is the United States against a multilateral agreement at the present time? Originally that nation was very much in favour of a multilateral agreement. What are the main obstacles to the completion of such an agreement?

Mr. HOWE: The main obstacles to a multilateral agreement are that the various

countries believe that there should be limitations to competition, and limitation on the number of services. There are various differing opinions which I think can, in time, be reconciled. Discussions seem to be coming more in the direction of reconciliation, and I am quite hopeful that the conference in Rio this autumn will bring about agreement. The reason there is no multilateral agreement today is that the countries have not been able to reach a sufficient measure of agreement to make it possible.

Mr. GREEN: What position does the United States take?

Mr. HOWE: That country has its own idea of what an agreement should be, which differs from ours and differs from that of the United Kingdom, and differs from that of many countries. In the last assembly, the Canadian proposals seemed to have the support of the smaller countries, but they did not have the support of the United States or of the United Kingdom.

Mr. GREEN: When is it expected that the transpacific flights will be started? I believe the Australians are now giving that service, and New Zealand is also doing so. When will Canada have a service to Australia and New Zealand?

Mr. HOWE: The present service is being operated under the sponsorship of Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom which share the expenses. It is actually being operated by a private company in Australia, Australian Airways. The undertaking was that Canada would run a parallel service as soon as we could make the necessary arrangements, and that still holds. Just when it will be I cannot say at the moment. We had never expected to be running eleven round trips a week across the Atlantic. I think we could put twice that number of trips on and still be booked full in both directions. Faced with that situation, we are at the moment, reluctant to divert planes from that service. With more planes coming out this autumn, I hope that early next year we shall be able to undertake the Pacific service as well as the service through the West Indies to South America.

Mr. SKEY: Are there any penalty clauses in the agreement to take delivery of these machines from Canadair because it definitely penalizes the T.C.A. in its further expansion to be held up for months and months in getting delivery of aircraft? As I understand it, the first machines to come off the line were R.C.A.F. machines. They are just a temporary measure, and if competition is very keen in this field and the T.C.A. is to keep up its good reputation, then an assured supply of planes on schedule is absolutely necessary to its continued operation.

Mr. HOWE: Trans-Canada Air Lines could have borrowed more of the military type planes except that the cost of converting them into luxury passenger planes and converting them back to military planes is an item that should not be enlarged too greatly. There has been no particular hold-up. The only hold-up has been the slow delivery of Rolls-Royce engines, which resulted from the black-out in industry in the United Kingdom last winter. I understand that deliveries are now improving. I understand that ten or a dozen of the military type planes are ready for delivery, except for engines. The arrangement was that the military type of plane would be finished first, and the pressurized type, which has a good many differences in structure, would follow. The schedule for the first pressurized type plane was always July. It is my understanding that there will be no delay in delivering the twenty pressurized planes to the T.C.A. on schedule set up in the contract.

Mr. SKEY: Has the minister investigated the possibility of having a good aircraft engine made in Canada or a Canadian contract to make the Rolls-Royce engines here? The ridiculous part of this whole business is having an American boat company manufacture an American hull with a British engine in the Dominion of Canada. Our air picture is just as ridiculous as that.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend has his own idea of what is ridiculous.

Mr. SKEY: I say that is.

Mr. HOWE: This whole production was Canadian sponsored. The original design was turned out by Canadian engineers and the original production was carried out by Canadians. It is only the fact that the government felt it should not properly be in the business of manufacturing and selling aircraft that induced it to sell to a company which, though certainly it has United States capital, contains on its board of directors a number of able Canadian business men. It is no more a United States company than a good many others that I could name which are respectable Canadian companies as far as ownership goes. We believe that Electric Boat had a type of experience that was valuable to the operations. It is not a United States plane. It is true we have a basic design from the United States, but Douglas would be the last to say that they care to sponsor a design that is flying the

Atlantic in the name of the North Star today. It is a Canadian version of what is required for the route, based on Douglas design. The Rolls-Royce was chosen, first, because it is of British make. It did not represent a drain on Canadian dollars, and we believed it was the engine most suitable for aircraft to perform the service we had in mind in the North Star planes.

Mr. SKEY: I am aware of all these things, but you cannot control operations properly nor can you control production if you cannot get parts in Canada. You should set out to have every part you can make in that aircraft produced in Canada, employing Canadian labour and industry.

Mr. HOWE: The immediate requirements for Rolls-Royce engines would be perhaps 160 or 170 or 200. The cost of setting up an establishment to build them would be in the neighbourhood of $15 million or $20 million. The cost per engine would be colossal. I was criticized by hon. members opposite for what they thought would be the cost of the North Star planes. That they were mistaken about that cost does not mean that they would not be fully justified in condemning such a capital cost for so small a production of engines. We must use reason in these things. I admit at once the desirability of the objective. I wish we made Rolls-Royce engines in Canada, but I would not recommend to parliament appropriations of the size necessary to bring that about.

Mr. SKEY: Did the minister not explore this matter during the war? He spent $21,825,777.33 on Cartierville. The sum of $15 million more spent during the war to produce a good engine in Canada would have been money well spent in a post-war programme.

Mr. HOWE: During the war we spent $21 million on Cartierville and we had a production in excess of $100 million worth of equipment over the years. If I could spend another $15 million and turn out $60 million worth of engine equipment I would be happy to recommend the expenditure.

Mr. SKEY: Probably the mistake was made during the war.

Mr. EMMERSON: I should like to ask the minister a question in reference to the air service in the maritime provinces. What principle governs the schedule by which these planes fly? It seems to me that they are not getting as great a popular support as they should, and I was wondering to what extent the flights were used for passenger and mail service respectively. Going east from Ottawa, there are two flights a day. One takes place at an opportune time in the morning but the other comes at midnight. If one is going to Moncton and from there on to the island, one has to fly at an uncomfortable hour and can get no sleep. The passenger arrives around five-thirty or six-thirty o'clock in the morning. There is another flight that could be made in the morning if you could get to Montreal to catch the six-thirty o'clock plane. If there were some other hour at which these planes flew there might be a more popular use of them. I am wondering whether the schedules have been drawn up from the point of view of passengers or with the mail service in view.

Mr. HOWE: On all routes we must have one mail service. There is one plane that serves the convenience of the Post Office Department and that plane is never very convenient to passengers. It must not be forgotten that we get considerable revenue from the post office. The schedules are balanced to meet connecting planes, having in mind the desirability of choosing hours that are of the greatest convenience to the travelling public.

Mr. KNOWLES: Although this has been said before, I feel that this item should not pass without a word of commendation to the minister for the service and the courtesy and safety being afforded in the operations of Trans-Canada Air Lines. Those who have travelled by air can appreciate the point of view expressed by an hon. member to the effect that it is a bit annoying sometimes to have to wait for a take-off, but most of us who have had that experience realize that it is a guarantee of safety so far as the operations of the air lines are concerned. The experience that has been had in some other countries in recent months during some bad weather we have been having simply serves to highlight the splendid record that our Canadian air line has achieved, and we are all extremely proud of it.

I think, too, a word should be said, not only for this record of safety, but for the service which Trans-Canada Air Lines is rendering to this country, and which may not be fully recognized until historians of the future write about this period. It is serving to unite the country, and in every way, it seems to me, this is one achievement that the minister can speak of with a great deal of pride. On the other hand, there are one or two questions I should like to ask the minister about another phase of the work of the air transport board, or indeed about another phase of civil aviation policy. I would ask the minister whether

the government or the air transport board is giving any consideration to an over-all plan with respect to Canada's north land. The minister knows the disagreements I have with him over the policy he is pursuing with respect to the north land, but at the moment I will confine myself to a few questions.

I take the position that we have, to the north in this country, a continent in itself, rich in minerals, oil and other natural resources, and the fact that we have that country up there places certain responsibilities upon us. We should be thinking in terms of its fullest development, both for its own sake, for the sake of Canada and for the sake of the world at large.

I recall remarks that the minister has made in the past about mistakes that were made in the early days of railroading. I hope that similar mistakes are not now being made in the early days of civil aviation. I do not like the idea of that north country seeming, as it does to me, to be just a field for exploitation by private companies in the direction of transportation on the one hand, and mining on the other, particularly when these companies are interwoven as they are.

We have up there minerals and oil in a great expanse of country, and I think that in the process of developing new plans for that country we should be looking, not just in the direction of private exploitation, but in the direction of what is best for that country for the sake of Canada and for the benefit of the world at large. I should like to know from the minister whether the air transport board is just receiving such applications as come along from Canadian Pacific Air Lines and others, considering them and granting them; or whether any over-all planning is being done with respect to the northern half of this country, particularly in relation to air service.

Mr. HOWE: I may say that the most careful planning of the northern services has been and is being carried out by the air transport board. One of the first acts of the board was to travel over every existing route and service in Canada. The requirements of each area were investigated. The service being given was explored and the needs for further service were noted. I might point out to hon. members that a tremendous expansion in aviation has taken place from 1939 to the end of 1946. The personnel engaged in the air services has been multiplied approximately by ten; the miles flown have been multiplied by more than six, and the areas served have been greatly increased. Before the war there was a great deal of dissatisfaction with the service given in certain areas, and among those engaged in air transport work there was a good deal of dissatisfaction with regard to unfair and cut-throat competition. Both complaints have pretty well disappeared. I know of no area today which has more than an occasional complaint about the service being rendered by air transport.

I was happy to look over the operating results for 1946 of all the air operators in Canada. I may say that one service which the air transport board has rendered is the establishment of a statistical department which gives prompt and accurate statistics of the industry as a whole. A study of those results for 1946 indicates that, with amazingly few exceptions, the operation of air services had been profitable to the operators. A great number of new services have been undertaken by retruned men. It has been the business of the board to try to place these veterans in areas where they could make a satisfactory living; and that objective has been attained beyond my greatest expectations. Occasionally we are told that in carrying out that objective we are being unfair to someone. The hon. member for Swift Current suggests that we are being unfair to a veteran in his city. My own thought was that the difficulty arose because we were trying to be fair to the veteran. We were trying to tell him that he would find a better field in some other part of western Canada. However we cannot carry these points too far. If the veteran feels we are doing him a wrong, we will right the wrong, and let his own judgment prevail. Perhaps we were wrong. But in general we have succeeded in convincing new operators that they would be wise not to enter the territory they had in mind in the first instance. We have been able to show them the potential traffic in the area. Careful traffic studies have been made of every part of Canada. When a veteran or pioneer in aviation comes to the air transport board and talks about an area, the board is able to produce a traffic study of the area and tell him what they believe to be the potential traffic of the area and give him advice as to whether or not he is wise to undertake to make an investment and try to make his living from that particular area. I believe the air transport board has performed a great service for aviation in sorting out the industry, in making sure that the user of the service has service, and in making sure that operators in the service are given a fair competitive position.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister indicate the proportion in the northern services, say on the route to Yellowknife and the routes down in the Mackenzie? What is the proportion as between Canadian Pacific Air Lines

on the one hand and these smaller services operated by veterans on the other? Will the minister also tell us if Canadian Pacific Air Lines is now showing a profit on these northern operations?

Mr. HOWE: I cannot give an arbitrary proportion. In general, a preview of the routes by the air transport board resulted in the Canadian Pacific Air Lines retaining the routes that could be operated on wheels with heavy equipment. They kept the route from Edmonton over the northwest staging route to Alaska. They kept the service to Yellowknife. They gave up a great variety of services which were formerly operated on floats and skis; and those services, generally speaking, were assigned to newcomers in the field.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does anyone else operate on those main lines?

Mr. HOWE: No. Similarly, we do not allow anyone else to operate on routes which we assign to operators of floats and skis, if it is a scheduled operation.

Mr. KNOWLES: What about profits?

Mr. MacNICOL: Does the minister mean that some other operator now flies the plane from Norman Wells to Aklavik?

Mr. HOWE: I am not sure.

Mr. MacNICOL: I went on a Canadian Pacific plane.

Mr. HOWE: I am not sure who operates that particular service. I shall be glad to look it up. As I remember it, that is a seaplane operation. I think it is flown by others.

Mr. MacNICOL: It is a float plane from Norman Wells to Aklavik. I went by Canadian Pacific plane; at least, I thought so.

Mr. HOWE: Yes. But that was a year or two ago. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre asked about profits. Canadian Pacific Air Lines showed a small profit last year, the first year of operation when Canadian Pacific Air Lines have shown a profit.

Mr. CROLL: Has the minister available here comparable figures on the incidence of fatal accidents? He may or may not have those figures with him. In the case of fatal accidents and claims being made, does Trans-Canada Air Lines carry its own insurance, or does it reinsure through some other company? How are the claims settled?

Mr. HOWE: I do not know that I can give just the figures on fatal accidents which my hon. friend wanted. The airways have the best record of any form of transportation with regard to number of fatalities for the number of miles travelled. Their record is much better than that of the railroads, and much better than that of the highways. In its history T.C.A. has had two accidents in which passengers have been lost. The first occurred at Armstrong, Ontario, I think in 1941; the second tragic accident occurred this year, when a plane flying from Lethbridge to Vancouver was presumably lost in the Pacific ocean off Vancouver. At the present time T.C.A. carries its own insurance funds, and claims are settled promptly. In the early days it was customary to reinsure part of the liability, but the fund is now strong enough so that T.C.A. carries its own risk.

Mr. CROLL: The figures I had in mind were those giving comparisons with other air services in the United States, not ground services. If the minister has the record it might be well to put it on *Hansard*.

Mr. HOWE: Our safety record still stands high among the air lines of the world. We were almost perfect until the accident this spring, but it is difficult to make comparisons, as some of the smaller operations have never had an accident. Among the transcontinental operations, I think T.C.A. is easily the best.

Mr. ADAMSON: I want to ask the minister a question in regard to the West Indies service, particularly the service to Bermuda. I understand that there was some disagreement or difficulty in getting an agreement with the authorities at Bermuda, whom I understand to be the United States army which operates the airfield there. Can the minister say what the difficulties have been, and whether any progress has been made in overcoming them. Will he also say whether it is the intention to operate an air service from Canada to the West Indies. I have one or two other questions, but this is the main one, if I can get an answer to it.

Mr. HOWE: Canada has been ready and anxious to operate a service to Bermuda since December, 1945. The difficulty has been that the airport in Bermuda is one of the American bases built in British territory. The Americans were reluctant to allow other countries to use the base until an over-all agreement could be reached between the United Kingdom and some of her colonies and the United States covering the operation of all those bases. I understand that the agreement is now complete in all particulars except in regard to the use of Gander airport at Newfoundland. We have reason to be hopeful that within the next two weeks that difficulty will be overcome and the agreement in regard to the bases signed. It is the present

intention to start the service to Bermuda not later than September 1 of this year.

Mr. ADAMSON: What other bases would come under the general agreement? The minister mentioned Gander and Bermuda. I understand that there are United States air bases on other Caribbean and West Indies islands. Is it the intention to continue the service further south than Bermuda?

Mr. HOWE: It is our intention to continue farther south. We have agreements with Bermuda, Jamaica and Trinidad. Negotiations are continuing with Nassau, but no agreement has been reached; and it is our hope to extend the service beyond Trinidad toward Rio and perhaps farther into Latin America.

Mr. ADAMSON: I am very glad to hear that statement.

I have just one other question in regard to the North Star. This question was asked me by several people who have been in the R.A.F. on the technical side. I understand that the North Star is using the Merlin engine. Is that a specially designed engine for peacetime use? It is not the war type of Merlin engine?

Mr. HOWE: At the beginning of the mail operation with the Lancasters we attempted to use military type engines, with indifferent success. Modifications were brought about and a satisfactory engine was developed for that operation. The Merlin engines at present in use are a complete modification even of the engines used in the Lancasters. It is a highly developed engine with special characteristics for transport work, and I am happy to say that we are very well satisfied with the results of our operation.

Mr. ADAMSON: One more question and I am through. I am not a member of the railway committee, but hon. gentlemen who are on that committee said they thought some of this information was given there. Is there available a break-down showing the amount of freight carried on lines other than T.C.A.? Does the air transport board keep a record of the ton-miles of freight and the passenger-miles of other services? I know T.C.A. has such a record, but is there also a record in connection with C.P.A. and the other smaller air lines that are licensed at the present time?

Mr. HOWE: We have complete data on the freight carried on each separate route. That information is contained in the annual report of the air transport board. It is also contained in monthly bulletins that are issued. If my hon. friend is interested I shall be glad to send him the information.

[Mr. Howe.]

Mr. ADAMSON: Thank you very much.

Mr. McKAY: A few moments ago the minister refered to the loss of a trans-Canada air liner off the coast of British Columbia last April. Is he in a position to give the committee the result of the inquiry into the loss of that plane? Some time ago I asked the minister whether a board of inquiry would be set up, and at that time he indicated this would be done. Since then I have not heard the results of that inquiry.

Mr. HOWE: A board of inquiry was immediately established and a thorough investigation was carried out. The operation was checked from every possible angle, and no flaw could be found in the operation or the condition of the plane. The report of the board was published. It boiled down to this, that for no known reason the plane disappeared in the few minutes between its passage over the airport and its usual landing time. It reported in over the airport. Ten minutes later an attempt was made to reach it by radio, when it had not landed on schedule, but the attempt to make radio contact failed, and no trace of the plane was found thereafter. The consensus of all concerned seems to be that something occurred over the Pacific, and that the plane is at the bottom of the ocean.

Mr. McKAY: Is that evidence available to members of the house?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: I feel obligated to congratulate the minister on having maintained the Canadian Pacific air service in the northwestern part of Canada. I remember that when the bill was going through the house I vigorously opposed one proposal, but I am now very glad to congratulate the minister on having maintained that service. I have nothing but confidence in what is done by T.C.A.; as one other hon. member has said, it gives a splendid service, and its personnel are of the best. Since no one has spoken about the Canadian Pacific service, however, I am going to do so because they do render a splendid service in that north country. Everyone who travels on their planes speaks just as highly of the personnel of Canadian Pacific Air Lines, and of their courtesy to travellers, as we all speak of T.C.A. In my judgment Canada is well served by both these lines, and I hope the minister will maintain them both. He really fathered the T.C.A., and I hope he will continue to maintain Canadian Pacific Air Lines up in northwestern Canada. They are a private concern and are doing an excellent

job in opening up that part of the country. I wish them every success.

Mr. SKEY: What is delaying the arrangements to fly the Pacific from Vancouver to Australia and New Zealand?

Mr. HOWE: No particular delay, except that all the planes that we have immediately available are working on more profitable routes. When we get more equipment and trained crews we expect to undertake the Pacific run.

Mr. GREEN: A year ago the Canadian ambassador to Mexico announced that the T.C.A. was to fly from Canada to Mexico City, while a Mexican line would fly to Canada. Has that proposal been dropped?

Mr. HOWE: I think the announcement was that a Mexican line intended to fly from Mexico to Canada. Canada has never entertained a proposal to fly a service to Mexico City. No bilateral agreement has been signed between Mexico and Canada. There were discussions, but I understand they were dropped. I think the enthusiasm in Mexico City died down.

Mr. GREEN: In 1945 an amendment to the Trans-Canada Air Lines Act was passed, by which power was given to set up crown companies under Trans-Canada Air Lines. Have any such companies been set up and, if so, what are they?

Mr. HOWE: Trans-Canada Atlantic Air Lines is operating the north Altantic service.

Mr. GREEN: Is that the only one?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. SKEY: When does T.C.A. plan to inaugurate flights to Sweden to implement the joint agreement that was signed?

Mr. HOWE: T.C.A. has no present plans for operating a service from Canada to Sweden. We have the right to do so, but we know of no Canadian traffic between Canada and Sweden which would warrant a service between the two countries.

Mr. KNOWLES: Could the minister say something with regard to the private plane situation in Canada, the personal plane or the so-called flivver plane? Is any encouragement being given to the development of this kind of flying? What is the situation at the present time in Canada, as compared with that in the United States?

Mr. HOWE: Every encouragement short of subsidy has been given. We subsidized flying schools to teach our citizens to fly in private planes. We have worked out a system of charges at air ports which allows the small private plane to land without paying a landing fee. We have put in a scale of hangar rentals which permits the small plane to have accommodation at a lower cost than the large planes. We have made the air as free as possible to the private plane. As far as I know, anyone who desires to fly privately in Canada can have a very good time.

Mr. KNOWLES: Has the minister any figures of the number of private planes in Canada and in the United States? When he gives that answer, would he answer a question on the other side of the picture? What is the situation with regard to safety precautions in connection with private flying?

Mr. HOWE: The annual report of the department dated March 31, 1946, indicated that there were twenty-seven private aircraft licensed in Canada and 446 commercial aircraft as of that date.

Mr. KNOWLES: Has the minister the figure for the United States?

Mr. HOWE: No. The enthusiasm for private flying is not as great today as it was before the war. Commercial air lines services have been developed to a great extent since the war. It is much safer for a man who may wish to travel from point to point to go by the commercial air lines. Fifteen or twenty years ago I used to be very fond of flying about in anyone's private plane, but today I would not step into a private plane if I could avoid doing so. I prefer to travel on the air lines. I have had an opportunity of seeing the safety measures taken by the air lines, both in the air and on the ground, as well as the communications services and so on, which are not available to the private aeroplane. All I can say is that, if anybody wishes to fly a plane himself, he has my blessing, but I take no responsibility.

Mr. KNOWLES: I agree wholly with the minister. I was just asking for information.

Mr. ADAMSON: Many of those planes would be company-owned planes used in company operations?

Mr. HOWE: No. The planes my hon. friend speaks of would be listed as commercial planes. They would be owned and operated by companies.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I wish to echo much of what has been said about the service given by T.C.A. I have, however, a complaint to make which, while it is of a somewhat personal nature, will, I believe, be regarded as being reasonable. I

wish the seats could be placed farther apart. I think I will get support in this from the Minister of Fisheries. This would add greatly to my comfort and I hope the minister will take it into consideration.

Mr. HOWE: If the hon. member will patronize our North Star trans-Atlantic service he will find that we have put in only thirty-six seats in the space in which other competing air lines put forty-four seats. We hope that passengers of greater stature even than my hon. friend will find plenty of leg-room in the Atlantic crossing. I recommend the trip to him and I assure him that he will find it most comfortable.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I wish I could count on the minister complying with all my requests so quickly.

Mr. FRASER: When planes arrive in Canada from Great Britain or the United States Canadians are not allowed to pass through customs and immigration first. I know at LaGuardia and other fields in the United States, United States citizens are permitted to go through customs and immigration first.

Mr. HOWE: Several conferences have been held with customs and immigration officials in various countries. We are attempting to minimize the red tape now involved in a passenger from one country arriving in another country. No one resents more deeply than I being treated as an immigrant when entering the United States, but that happens to me and to every Canadian. The citizens of that country are taken first. We in Canada do not do that; we take them as they come. I think ours is the better method because we save the resentment which I always feel toward the other procedure.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at seven o'clock.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Air service—

440. Air transport board—salaries and office expenses, $150,000.

Mr. McLURE: I wish to bring to the attention of the minister the fact that in the maritimes we have the Maritime Central Airways servicing Prince Edward Island and part of the maritimes, connecting up with the T.C.A. at Moncton. One little disadvantage we have is in getting reservations through Charlottetown via Moncton to go to Montreal and such places. We have always felt that we should have a few seats reserved on each plane up until at least a few hours before it leaves Moncton. If we could have those seats it would be a great help to maritime travellers and to maritime airways.

The minister knows that the president of T.C.A. made a statement in the committee on several occasions that Maritime Central Airways was one of the best feeder lines that the T.C.A. had. If the minister would look into that little matter about which the people are complaining once in a while, I am sure that it would meet with their approval and perhaps he could adjust it.

Mr. HOWE: Perhaps I can say just a word. Maritime Central Airways is giving a fine service, not only to Prince Edward Island, but to such places as Pictou and the northern shore of Nova Scotia. It would be the intention of T.C.A. to give it the best of connecting service. I shall be glad to call the attention of the officials to the remarks made by my hon. friend. If any steps can be taken to improve the connection, I am sure they will be taken.

Mr. SKEY: Before six o'clock we had a fairly thorough discussion of the operations of T.C.A. and of some of the air policies in Canada. We could almost call it a probe. I should like to say a few words about it generally. I do not wish anything that I have to say to be construed as criticism of the Trans-Canada Air Lines because I think, under the circumstances and perhaps even under the direction in some cases, they have done an amazing job. As an airman, I would be the first to appreciate what they have done in carrying out their schedule of eleven return flights to England with the small number of aircraft they have.

However we have been informed that they are operating with six aircraft which were destined for the R.C.A.F.; that they are unable to operate their Pacific route; that they do not plan to operate to Sweden, and that they are in need of both aircraft and crews. To me that seems like a condemnation of the policy of the government which, in this competitive age, has led them into the position where they find themselves short of engines, short of crews and short of aircraft. It seems to me, that the government have a job of explaining to do, because, in competitive air line travel, the fact that

Canada should be placed in this position is quite deplorable. They had the aircraft. They had the aircraft in the United Kingdom the end of the war. They had lots of Lancasters with which to fly the north Atlantic to Sweden and to the West Indies if they chose. They had another kind of aircraft with which they could have flown the Pacific. They had the Sunderland, a flying boat which was capable of operating out of Vancouver in the warm waters of the Pacific through the winter.

We have recently seen in the newspapers that this wonderful new aircraft in the United States will carry eighty passengers, and there has been a great deal of publicity behind it. As one who has flown Sunderlands, I should like to tell the committee that one of these aircraft took eighty people out of Greece in the dark days of 1940. I should say, eighty people and the air officer commanding's parrot. They are without a doubt the finest type of flying boat that has been developed up to the present time, with all respect to Mr. Howard Hughes and his gigantic machine.

Canada paid for these aircraft with dollars, and it was this government's policy not to bring them back here, not to take this opportunity which was open to them, as everyone informed in the business knows. In fact, as the minister is probably aware, we have been criticized by our Australian and New Zealand partners in the commonwealth for not taking the opportunity to develop our Pacific air lines as we could have done.

We are in the air age in a civil as well as a military sense. I shall have more to say about the latter when the defence estimates are before us, but in the civil age we had an opportunity, and this government have probably thrown it away for all time unless they can pick up the threads of a mismanaged job. Trans-Canada Air Lines have done well with what they had. I for one will support them in everything they try to do. I would like to see them develop still further, develop by independent-minded airmen and not by niggardly government policies. As a Progressive Conservative, I criticize the conservative policy which Canada has followed in her air operations from the close of the last. war. I cannot say too strongly to the government in this house: You have lost an opportunity, a great opportunity. You had the crews; you had the men; you had the aircraft. You discouraged the men and threw away the machines.

It will be remembered that a year ago I spoke in this house about airmen trying to get a licence to service aircraft, to operate radios to fly in this country, but by some means or another the Department of Transport managed to discourage these men.

I will say, in closing, that the government will have to operate with great energy to pick up this lost opportunity. I feel that in one way this is a criticism of public enterprise versus private enterprise. If you had given the initiative to some of the men who knew what could be done in this country, which is so adaptable in every way to air development, you might be in a better position than you are in today.

Mr. HOWE: I should not allow these remarks to go unchallenged. I am fully aware of the splendid record my hon. friend has a military flier, but the remarks he has made indicate clearly the difference between military flying and commercial flying. My hon. friend obviously would proceed without any regard whatever to earning or to balance sheets. If the hon. member for Trinity could persuade—

Mr. SKEY: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HOWE: Just a minute. I did not interrupt you. Suppose you keep your seat until I have finished. If my hon. friend could persuade some of his colleagues who appear in the committee on railways and shipping to discuss the T.C.A. balance sheet, to adopt his view point, we might develop flying in this country on other lines, but we do try to keep on the basis of commercial operation.

My hon. friend says that we could have got plenty of Lancasters, and flown them across the Atlantic or the Pacific. Well, we have some Lancastrians the equal of anyone's Lancastrian planes. We used them for five years to cross the Atlantic. I would hardly wish to operate them under present conditions of competition. At the time we were operating our Lancastrians, the rates were double the present rates and we managed to break even in operating the service. To attempt to carry passengers at $325 from Montreal to London in a Lancastrian would not be profitable. I can assure my hon. friend that he could not possibly make fifty per cent of his operating expenses.

The hon. member speaks of lost opportunities to buy aircraft, and he speaks of the Sunderland.

Mr. SKEY: You owned them.

Mr. HOWE: No one would seriously attempt to operate a Sunderland flying boat commercially, especially from Canada. The

weight of the boat calls for a tremendously excessive amount of gasoline to be burned per passenger, and the icing conditions on both coasts—let us not forget that we have such conditions on the Pacific as well as the Atlantic—would make Sunderlands unsafe as a means of transportating passengers to and from Canada.

The hon. member mentions lack of equipment. I would point out that we are supposed to be in equal partnership with the United Kingdom in operating from Canada to the United Kingdom, and I believe that at the present time we are carrying at least seventy per cent of the traffic against their thirty per cent. Why? Because we have more equipment.

We underestimated, it is true, the potential traffic on the north Atlantic, or at least our share of it. Had we anticipated running in excess of eleven trips a week, which we never expected at this stage of our development, we would have had more trained crews. The bottle-neck in the Atlantic is not equipment but crews. We could make many more trips with the aeroplanes than we have crews available. We are building up our operating staff as rapidly as we can. I expect to be censured next year for having too much equipment. If anyone happened to ask me what I will do with all these planes T.C.A. has on order I could not tell him, but we have always been short of equipment. We had a chance to buy exceptionally fine planes at a reasonable price. We bought twenty. If we can keep twenty North Stars busy we shall be in international aviation in a big way.

As regards refusing licences to returned airmen, I have said we have ten times as many men in aviaiton today as in 1939, all with licences and all with suitable outlets for their energies, all making a bit of money, which I do not think was a bad achievement. I do not mind fair criticism and accurate criticism, but I have never heard a man talk about civil aviation who obviously knew so little about the problems to be encountered in that direction.

Mr. SKEY: The minister has challenged me on technical grounds and I am willing to reply to him on technical grounds. His first criticism was about the numbers of aircraft. If he will recall it, he himself this afternoon said that he could use on the north Atlantic run twice the number of aircraft he has at the present time.

Mr. HOWE: If I had the crews.

Mr. SKEY: I am saying to the minister that he had the crews, only he discouraged them since the war was over; he and some of his air people, afraid of the challenge of military men in that field, were parties to that discouragement. In case the minister does not know it, the Sunderland aircraft is the military version of the Imperial Airways aircraft which flies a comparable route from the United Kingdom to Australia. We would be merely starting in about the same latitude and flying over the same route across the Pacific to the other side.

Mr. HOWE: No. There are totally different weather conditions, and I think those aircraft are being discarded. I believe there are few in operation today.

Mr. SKEY: That may be. I am talking about getting on the job. The minister had the opportunity and the aircraft to be on the job, and he missed it. That is what is bothering him now. I do not blame him for being annoyed.

Mr. HOWE: I might mention that we are the second country in the world in civil aviation, in miles flown and passengers carried.

Mr. SKEY: I am saying that we should be the first. In case the minister does not think that I know anything about civil operation—

Mr. HOWE: I am sure the hon. member does not.

Mr. SKEY: We must disagree on that, because I am practically telling the minister that he does not know anything about it either. I should like him to know that in 1938 I was one of the pilots of the Sunderland aircraft which handled the royal mail deliveries from England to Singapore, and that the military version of the same aircraft which the Imperial Airways civil pilots were flying stacked up well against them and did a better job because we delivered spare parts and many other things to the United Kingdom. However I am not going to quibble about that, except to say this to the minister. He says that Canada is carrying seventy per cent of the north Atlantic traffic and that the United Kingdom is carrying only thirty per cent.

Mr. HOWE: Between Canada and the United Kingdom.

Mr. SKEY: Let me say that is practically the only overseas traffic that Canada is carrying, whereas Britain is supporting routes to the near east and to the far east—to Australia, to New Zealand and South Africa—at the same time.

Mr. McIVOR: I will just take a minute, but I will not allow this minute to pass without expressing a word of appreciation for the

efficiency of the Trans-Canada Air Lines and the department. At the lakehead we now have a terminal. The other day I was speaking to a young man, one of the officers. I said to him, "You seem to be extremely particular about having things just right." He said, "When you are dealing with human life, you have to be particular." I have not seen anything more particular and more efficient in Canada than the service rendered by Trans-Canada Air Lines. On behalf of the two cities at the lakehead, I should like to express appreciation for our being allowed to have a terminal there.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I wish to ask the minister a question or two with regard to a city such as Yorkton which finds itself directly on a Trans-Canada Air Lines route. In this case the route runs from Winnipeg to Edmonton, and I believe arrangements have been made for a stop-over in Saskatoon. Yorkton is a centre in which was located a service flying training school. The airfield is still there, as are the runways, the beacon meteorological service and the directional beam. The people are naturally interested in finding out what will be necessary in order to have their airport recognized as a regular stop-over for Trans-Canada Air Lines. What are the requirements?

An hon. MEMBER: Passengers and freight.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Yes, and passenger service. What are the actual requirements before a place of that size could be used as a stop-over place for Trans-Canada Air Lines? What are the passenger requirements? What about the length of the runway? I understand that the runway in Saskatoon had to be elongated. The people are interested in knowing what the requirements are. I am sure that the citizens and civic organizations are anxious to comply with these requirements as far as they can. Can the minister enlighten us as to what the requirements are, and what the present situation is with regard to the likelihood of having those requirements met?

Mr. HOWE: The only physical change which would be required woud be the addition of about another five hundred feet to the runways; I understand that they are about 2,700 or 2,800 feet long. The requirements are 3,300 feet. The other requirement would be sufficient potential traffic to pay for the cost of the stop and the delay in the schedule. That will be studied by the traffic people. As my hon. friend knows, we have just started in operation over the north route. Today Yorkton is an emergency stopping-place. I am sure the officials of Trans-Canada Air Lines will be studying the situation to determine when a stop at Yorkton is justified. As my hon. friend will know, after operating over Medicine Hat and Swift Current for some seven or eight years, it was just recently that a stop was introduced at those two points. I understand that it is the intention to introduce a stop at Brandon as soon as the necessary alterations are made in the field; and I would not doubt that Yorkton might be the next stop.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Would it require an application to be made by the city?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: They merely make the decision regarding a stop there, on their own.

Mr. ADAMSON: I wish to say one thing more on this vexed matter of Canadian Pacific Air Lines versus any government-operated scheme in the northern territories. This is no criticism of Trans-Canada Air Lines at all. It is merely an answer, and I think it should go on the record at the same time as the rest of this debate. Criticism has been levelled at Canadian Pacific Air Lines to the effect that they might not be developing the north country in the way that some socialist scheme might develop it. There is just one thing which shows the job they have been doing, and that is the ton-miles flown. The north country is developed by getting tons of equipment into it. These are the figures which the minister was good enough to let me have this afternoon. I think they are important at this juncture. The ton-miles flown by Canadian Pacific Air Lines in 1946 were 1,150,734 compared with Trans-Canada Air Lines ton miles flown of 513,493. That is no criticism of Trans-Canada Air Lines, but it does show what job is being done by private enterprise, by Canadian Pacific Air Lines in developing the northern part of this country today.

Mr. MASSEY: I have no desire to detain the committee for more than a moment in order to ask two or three questions of the minister. As he is well aware, the T.C.A. facilities in New York city are, from the passenger point of view, pretty grim. Actually that is the front door to Canada to the American who is boarding an aircraft in New York. Now that there is considerable flying from Europe to a New York port and thence on into Canada, it seems to me that the passenger who is entering Canada for the first time gets a rather perverted view of what we are like. This is no criticism of the personnel who have the usual Trans-Canada Air Lines courtesy; but the facilities in New York are far from desirable Can the minister

inform the committee what plans are in mind or in project for the improvement of those facilities?

Mr. HOWE: Does my hon. friend mean the T.C.A. facilities?

Mr. MASSEY: Yes.

Mr. HOWE: We were latecomers at LaGuardia field and took the only accommodation we could get, which was at the end of the ramp. Our traffic is handled at the field by American Air Lines. There is congestion at LaGuardia airport. As I understand it, there will be a reassignment of space when Idylwilde opens. The transcontinental and transocean lines will be moved to Idylwilde; the local lines will have more space at LaGuardia; certain other traffic will move to Newark, and I believe private flying will go to a fourth field in that area, so that after a while there should be some relief. In the meantime I think we are doing as well as we can with the space we are able to get.

Mr. MASSEY: I think the minister will agree that a little paint and a few bits of attractive furniture might add to the appearance of the space we now have.

Mr. HOWE: That is true.

Mr. MASSEY: It is very dirty. The personnel are perfectly clean and treat the passengers very well, as I have said, but the facilities are not good and I think they can be improved.

My second question is whether there is any idea in mind at all of the island airport at Toronto being used at any time by T.C.A., by extending the runway.

Mr. HOWE: No; T.C.A. has no plans for the island airport. There are too many obstructions in the area and too many difficulties as compared with Malton, which is almost an ideal airport from a flyer's point of view. No matter how long the runways were, the island airport would be unsatisfactory for T.C.A.

Mr. MASSEY: Are any plans projected for additional direct runs from Toronto to Montreal, without the Ottawa stop, and vice versa?

Mr. HOWE: One service runs direct now, leaving Montreal at 1.35 o'clock in the afternoon and arriving in Toronto at 3.55 o'clock, and there is a corresponding service the other way. It is just a matter of studying traffic requirements. We are a little underequipped in the Montreal-Winnipeg area at present, and I dare say there will be additional non-stop trips later.

Mr. MASSEY: Then, as perhaps the minister may have noted himself, if for any reason there is a delay in the take-off, I have observed at several different airports that you are told there will be a ten-minute delay; then it is a fifteen-minute delay, then thirty minutes, then forty minutes and fifty minutes. I quite realize there are times when it is quite impossible to forecast the length of a delay, but on one or two occasions I have taken the trouble to ascertain the reason for the delay, and certainly when the delay occurred it should have been know that it would amount to at least an hour. It is very unsatisfactory to passengers to have the departure time put back three or four times, and I think T.C.A. is a bit remiss in that direction.

When the aircraft were first put into service by T.C.A. they were of the Lodestar type, and accordingly the head room was somewhat limited and a restriction was placed upon the height of the stewardesses. Now the aircraft are of a very different type, and even the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario, who finds it difficult to sit down comfortably, can stand at full height in the passageway of the aircraft. Therefore it seems to me that stewardesses should not continue to be restricted to a height of five feet five inches, which I believe is the present limit. Has there been any idea of changing the specifications of the stewardesses?

Mr. HOWE: I have heard no complaints from the travelling public about our small stewardesses. It is some advantage not having to carry too much weight through the air, and probably we shall keep to the present standards.

Mr. MASSEY: Quite seriously, and I imagine many hon. members have been approached by graduate nurses who are anxious to become stewardesses on T.C.A., But who are five feet six inches or five feet seven inches in height, and as a result are not considered, it does seem to me it would be quite reasonable to consider a girl who is a little taller. I was not questioning the weight; I was thinking of height.

Item agreed to.

Air service—civil aviation division—
Operation and maintenance—
446. Radio aviation services, $1,231,580.

Mr. SKEY: What type of blind landing equipment is being considered by PICAO for standardization, and what type is the Canadian government recommending?

Mr. HOWE: Canada has standardized on the ILS; that is the instrument landing system operated by the pilot from the plane. Some eleven installations are now in process of construction at our principal airports from

Halifax to Victoria. We believe that from the practical point of view the ILS has advantages over any other system, and our pilots share that view. The pilot likes to be responsible for the plane, rather than depend upon a man on the ground telling him what to do. We believe the efficiency of the line will be greatly improved when these installations are completed and the necessary training has been done.

Mr. SKEY: I agree with the minister as to the efficiency of the installations. I was wondering if the department was considering installing the ground controlled landing equipment at overseas airports, to give the benefit of this equipment to aircraft of other lines which may be carrying it.

Mr. HOWE: No. The R.C.A.F. have installed that system at one or two points, notably at Rockcliffe near Ottawa, and we are studying their operations. If we find that any purpose can be served by having both systems we shall be glad to consider it.

Item agreed to.

Air service—civil aviation division—

447. Grants to organizations for the development of civil aviation, in the amounts detailed in the estimates, $30,500.

Mr. ADAMSON: I see there are three grants under this item, one to the university of Manitoba, one to the Canadian flying clubs association and the third to the national research council, which is by far the largest of the three. First, I want to ask, what qualifies a flying club for a grant? My second question is in relation to the national research council. Does this represent all that is being done to promote experimentation and research in civil aviation, or is that carried on in some other way as well? Despite our drive for economy, it seems to me that $25,000 is a very small sum, if that is the total.

Mr. HOWE: In the early days of flying clubs, grants were voted by parliament and paid to the clubs on a certain scale. I dare say there would have been no flying clubs today if that policy had not been followed. That was the practice up to the time war broke out. Then, as my hon. friend knows, the clubs were given contracts with the R.C.A.F. to train pilots, and they all became wealthy. Today we are not giving grants to flying clubs. The item of $5,000 is a grant to the association of flying clubs to pay for its secretariat, but the flying clubs are on their own and, I understand, are doing very well.

As far as the item of $25,000 goes, that is only to provide for special research ordered by the department. Aeronautical research at the laboratories of the national research council is paid for under an appropriation of the council itself, and is on a scale wholly out of proportion to this amount of $25,000.

Mr. ADAMSON: Does the minister know offhand how much it is?

Mr. HOWE: I do not know. The council maintains an airport of its own. It is working on frost and winter conditions in relation to aircraft. It has a wind tunnel, and it conducts experiments with models. They do work on jets particularly, and freezing, which is the main problem in connection with jets. I would say that a considerable part of its income must be devoted to studies of aviation.

Mr. ADAMSON: Is Professor Parkin still there?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. SKEY: In many of the smaller centres of Canada there are airdromes which may be described as the residue of the empire air training plan. As the minister knows, many of these communities want to keep these airports in operation, and I should like to know if the department has any policy by which these smaller airports can be assisted and kept in operation?

Mr. HOWE: If the airport is a key port on a transcontinental line it is maintained by the department, or an arrangement is made with the municipality to keep the airport up to departmental standards. If it is an off-line airport the city or municipality is given an opportunity to lease it for $1 a year. As long as they maintain it as an airport they are permitted to operate it in any way they like. Many smaller centres have taken advantage of the offer and have taken over local airports for local purposes.

Mr. SKEY: Has the minister any knowledge as to whether some of the smaller centres are able to stand the cost of operating these airports?

Mr. HOWE: The operating cost is what they wish to make it. They are not required to keep them up to any standard. As far as I know, no one is going into the red ink through operating a local airport.

Item agreed to.

Air service—radio division—

450. Administration of the Radio Act and regulations, $193,320.

Mr. FLEMING: This brings us to four items under the general heading, "Radio

Division." I should like to make a few remarks with regard to the chaotic system under which the administration and the control of radio and broadcasting are being continued under three departments and two ministers when common sense would dictate that the administration should be brought under one department and one minister. In saying what I am about to say I do not intend to enter into the subject matter of the final report which was tabled earlier this evening from the radio committee, or the earlier report which came from that committee and which was tabled in the house last Friday evening. I am informed that the government has given an undertaking that full opportunity will be afforded the house to discuss those reports on a suitable occasion this week. Therefore hon. members may be assured that in forgoing the opportunity to discuss more widely the question of radio broadcasting at this time, they are not forgoing that opportunity for the entire session. This matter is of such leading importance that this house has no right to prorogue without having discussed it fully. In view of that undertaking which I understand the government has given I shall confine my remarks to certain aspects of the situation created by the present system of administration and control by the government.

Radio and broadcasting at the present time are regulated under two statutes of this parliament, the Broadcasting Act of 1936 and the Radio Act of 1938. Under both of those acts certain functions were assigned to the minister named in each act, and it happens that in the case of both acts the minister named was the Minister of Transport. We have the amazing situation today that the hon. gentleman who holds the portfolio of Minister of Transport has nothing to do either with the functions assigned to the Minister of Transport under the Radio Act or with the functions assigned to the Minister of Transport under the Broadcasting Act.

The effect of the Broadcasting Act of 1936 was to give certain functions and powers to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and also to the Minister of Transport. The effect of the Radio Act of 1938 was to give the Minister of Transport the power to license radio stations. He alone is the fountain of licences for broadcasting in Canada. Under the present system he seeks the advice and recommendations of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; but, as I say, he is the sole fountain of licences. His radio division has been ordered by the government to carry on this form of administration.

The committee will recall that when these acts were passed the present Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe) was Minister of Transport. When the war came along and he was appointed Minister of Munitions and Supply he took with him certain functions of the Minister of Transport, even though he was relinquishing the portfolio of transport. He took with him the functions assigned under both these acts to the Minister of Transport.

There followed a series of orders in council under which jurisdiction which was vested by these two acts in the Minister of Transport was juggled, with this curious result. First, we had order in council 3076, dated July 8, 1940, which provided that the duties, powers and functions vested in the Minister of Transport under various acts, and the radio services of the Department of Transport under the Broadcasting Act of 1936, were transferred to the Minister of Munitions and Supply. The next order in council was 3435, dated July 25, 1940, which conferred upon the Minister of Munitions and Supply the duties, powers and functions vested in the Minister of Transport under the Radio Act of 1938. Then came order in council 8207, dated October 24, 1944, under which the duties, powers and functions in respect to the radio services, Department of Transport, and under the Radio Act of 1938 and other acts, were transferred to the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply. There was a further order in council, P.C. 6552, dated October 18, 1945, under which the functions of the Minister of Transport under the Broadcasting Act were conferred upon the minister who was Minister of National War Services and who is today the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. McCann). The portfolio of national war services being in course of liquidation, we can expect a further order in council vesting in the Minister of National Revenue the powers assigned to the Minister of Transport under the Broadcasting Act.

That situation is a hodgepodge. There are three departments involved and two ministers. We have the curious anomaly where the minister now holding the portfolio of transport has nothing to do with two important branches of the Department of Transport, the one which we discussed earlier this evening, namely, air services, including civil aviation and meteorological services, and, second, this radio division. It is anomalous also that the control of radio, including the licensing of stations for the purposes of broadcasting, should be vested in one minister. and then that other jurisdiction should be vested in still another minister by the act which establishes the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and gives it its sweeping

powers, including its powers over private broadcasting in Canada. I urge upon the committee that that anomaly should not be allowed to continue. If the right hon. gentleman who holds the portfolio of reconstruction and supply is, with the will of the government, to continue to hold and exercise the functions of Minister of Transport in respect of the Radio Act of 1938 and the functions of the Minister of Transport in respect of air service, it would certainly seem to be the part of common sense that the functions of the Minister of Transport under the Broadcasting Act of 1938 now exercised by the Minister of National War Services, who is now the Minister of National Revenue, should also be vested in the right hon. gentleman who holds the portfolio of reconstruction and supply. That anomaly and that puzzling situation constitute I submit, a source of constant confusion. The confusion is evident among hon. members in the questions they ask from time to time in the house. The situation is confusing also to members of the radio committee, and it is high time that the government take the matter in hand and take the sensible course of bringing both jurisdictions, namely jurisdiction under the Radio Act and under the Broadcasting Act, under the one minister.

Here is the situation that was recently before the radio committee in a very striking form. It is quite possible that government policy may lead in one direction in respect of the administration of the Broadcasting Act by one minister and that it may lead in quite a different direction through the other minister, the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply, in respect of the licensing functions he enjoys under the Radio Act.

In the radio committee quite recently we had this amazing situation. After extensive submissions had been made to the committee looking toward confiding in an independent tribunal both certain of the powers given under the Broadcasting Act to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the licensing powers of the minister under the Radio Act, a brief was introduced before the committee, presumably from the radio division of the Department of Transport, which had not been asked for by the committee—an amazing situation! But the controller of the radio division of the Department of Transport, an official who functions under the Minister of Reconstruction, introduced into the committee a brief in the minister's absence, which brief I repeat had not been asked for. That brief undertook to give statements of opinion in relation to policy, statements of opinion which were intended to answer opinions submitted to the committee by those who were seeking the establishment of an independent tribunal for the purposes I have mentioned. On further inquiry, it transpired that the Minister of Reconstruction, to whom the official was responsible, disclaimed all knowledge of the brief and disclaimed any responsibility for it. Here was a committee of the House of Commons receiving and considering a brief submitted on the letterhead of the Department of Transport, Ottawa, which was disclaimed by the minister who exercises the functions of the Minister of Transport in respect of radio under the Radio Act. That is a sample of the sort of thing that happens and is likely to continue to happen so long as we permit the condition to continue where we have two ministers and three departments all mixed up in the one matter.

The minister's disclaimer of any responsibility for this brief was not conveyed to the committee by himself, as I think ought to have been done, but second-hand by the chairman of the committee.

Now that the committee has submitted its final report and comment on the matter is permissible under the rules, let me say that I introduced a motion in the committee that the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply should be invited to come before the committee and state how things like this are permitted to happen, how a senior official of the radio division takes it upon himself to prepare a brief answering submissions which had been made to that committee with respect to a change in government policy. My motion was that the minister be invited to appear before the committee and explain how all that could happen without his authority. The Liberal and C.C.F. majority on that committee with one exception, the hon. member for New Westminster, whom I compliment on not being a party to that Liberal-C.C.F. majority on the committee, turned down the motion, and the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply accordingly was not invited to come before the committee to make a statement on this question.

I ask the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply not merely to take in hand this curious anomaly that has been permitted to continue in respect of three departments and two ministers, not merely to explain how this brief, dealing with far-reaching questions of policy, was permitted to be written by a senior official of his department and be presented to the committee, but also to say how he, the representative of the government in respect of the licensing functions of government under the Radio Act reacts to the submissions in this brief. To what extent does

this brief, which I am sure he must have seen and read by now, represent government policy? All that the members of the committee and the members of this house know is this, that this brief has been presented by the senior official of the radio division, that the minister, through the chairman of the committee, has disclaimed, second-hand, all knowledge of the preparation of the brief and of its contents and disclaimed any responsibility for it. Nevertheless the brief appears on the letterhead of the Department of Transport, and it unquestionably left on the minds of many members of that committee the firm impression that this brief bespoke government policy. I am prepared, Mr. Chairman, to give expression to more than a surmise that that brief had very much to do with shaping the terms of the final report which was read in this house tonight. I am not going to discuss that report now but shall reserve what I have to say on it for the opportunity which the government has promised us we shall have later this week to discuss it. But I say that that brief, in the form in which it was submitted and in the circumstances in which it appeared before the committee, could not fail to convey to the members of the committee, particularly the Liberal members, the firm impression that the brief represented government policy. It was evident to members of the committee from that point on that there was much less sympathy for the proposal which had seemed up to that time to have had a substantial measure of acceptance in the committee, namely, the proposal that the regulatory powers of the broadcasting corporation over private stations and the licensing functions of the minister under the Radio Act should be vested in some independent regulatory tribunal with powers and functions and jurisdiction similar to those exercised by the Board of Transport Commissioners in the field of transportation.

These are serious matters. The issue to which I have referred was undoubtedly the most important one confronting the radio committee this year. The circumstances to which I have referred have undoubtedly had a substantial effect in shaping the attitude of certain members on the radio committee, culminating in the issuance of the majority report which was read here tonight, and which was opposed by members of the Progressive Conservative party and also by the eminent member of the Social Credit party who sits on the radio committee. I think the committee is entitled to know from the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply whether this brief, now that he has had a full opportunity to peruse it, now that he knows, I trust, the effect it has had on the minds of the Liberals and C.C.F. majority in the committee, again with the exception of the hon. member for New Westminster, meets with his approval. He owes it to the committee to say where he stands with reference to this brief. Does this brief contain a true statement of government policy? If it does not, will the minister say that he not only disclaims any responsibility for the contents of the report but state emphatically that the report does not represent government policy but is an expression of what is not government policy.

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that my hon. friend is confused about the relationship of the various departments. After hearing him explain what I thought was a very simple relationship, I am almost confused myself. He speaks of three departments being involved and then he proceeds to eliminate one himself, thus leaving two. I thought the functions of each were quite distinct. Perhaps I might run over them once again. I have been over the ground before in the radio committee in other years and in the house. First, the Radio Act; the hon. member speaks about 1938. The Radio Act is about as old as confederation.

Mr. FLEMING: The Radio Act was passed in 1938.

Mr. HOWE: Amendments to the Radio Act.

Mr. FLEMING: The present act is the Radio Act, 1938.

Mr. HOWE: The Radio Act was passed in 1902. If my hon. friend will go back into the records of the Department of Marine, one of the predecessors of the Department of Transport, he will find the Radio Act very much as it is today. The functions of the—

Mr. FLEMING: If the minister will permit me; if he will look up the statutes of 1938 he will find the Radio Act of 1938. I have a copy in my hand, which is an act with respect to radio, assented to in 1938. It is always referred to as the Radio Act, 1938. I know there was another Radio Act before that.

Mr. HOWE: If my hon. friend will read the act of 1902 he will find that it is not very much different. The reason there is a Radio Act is that someone had to control the wave lengths of the spectrum. In the spectrum there are wave lengths that have to do with broadcasting; there are wave lengths that have to do with wireless tele-

graphy; there are other wave lengths that have to do with the control of radio beams; there are other wave lengths used for police broadcasting, and there are certain wave lengths reserved for ship to shore telegraph, safety of ships and so forth; but one important function is to make sure that, once a wave length is assigned, that particular wave length is the one used and that the signal does not stray over into another band or into another wave length. It is the duty of the administration of the Radio Act to be the policeman of the air.

At the present time a large part of the staff of the radio division is at Atlantic City, for what purpose? To reassign all the wave lengths of the spectrum and to work out the use of these wave lengths between all the countries of the world. It is true that broadcasting wave lengths are involved in that discussion, but it is only a minor part of the whole discussion. The policing and assignment of the wave lengths of the spectrum is an important duty of government, of this or any other government. It can be discharged only by government, and it is discharged only by government in any part of the world. So much for the radio. As I say, for many years the Radio Act was in the Department of Marine. When there was a consolidation of the Department of Railways and Canals and the Department of Marine the work of administration of the Radio Act was brought into the Department of Transport.

By act of parliament the Prime Minister is given the privilege of assigning the duties of government to any minister that he may decide to make the assignment to. In 1940 the Prime Minister assigned the work of the air branch of the Department of Transport to the Minister of Munitions and Supply and later to the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply. When my hon. friend becomes Prime Minister he will have the duty of making these assignments himself, but perhaps in the meantime he will let the duly authorized authority carry out that function which has been given to him by parliament. So much for the reason why the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply is at the moment administering the air service branch of the Department of Transport under which is the Radio Act.

Let us trace the broadcasting side. Broadcasting was another function of the Department of Marine. It was formerly carried out as a side issue of the air service administration of the Department of Marine. Along about 1930 the radio commission was set up and the duty of administering broadcasting was turned over to it. Then in 1936 the present Broadcasting Act, or something similar to it, was passed and the work of broadcasting was turned over to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. If my hon. friend will read that act he will find that all matters of policy affecting broadcasting are the function of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Therefore, if anyone has any question on broadcasting policy he does not need to look to the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply; he does not need to look to any other minister. His relations are confined solely to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

So far as the Radio Act is concerned, that part of the spectrum which is used for broadcasting is assigned only on the recommendation of the Department of Transport. Any hon. member who has been a member of the radio broadcasting committee is well aware of that fact, because testimony to that effect is given to that committee every year.

We shall now come down to the question that is exciting my hon. friend, namely, the brief submitted to the committee by Mr. Browne, director of radio. Mr. Browne was called before the committee, by whom I do not know. It was not through me. I presume that the committee clerk sent a message to Mr. Browne saying that he should appear before the committee. He has appeared before the committee every year. He appears in his capacity as director of radio and he appears because the committee sends for him. It does not send for the minister or ask him to delegate someone; it sends for Mr. Browne. In this case Mr. Browne is leading the delegation to Atlantic City which has been in session for some months and will be for some further months. Before going he felt that the work and the time that he had put in, in following the work of the committee should be capitalized on in some way. The result was that he wrote a report of his views on the evidence that had been submitted thus far. He did not refer it to the deputy minister; he did not refer it to the minister. He handed it over to the clerk or to the chairman, I am not sure which, of the radio committee. No one was more surprised than myself when I heard that there had been a report no one was more surprised than the deputy minister.

My hon. friend says that undoubtedly I have read it and considered it since then. I have not seen it since then. I was told by the chairman that there was some report. He gave me a summary of what was in it. He wanted to know if it was government policy. I said: "It is not government policy or my policy or anyone else's policy." There is no reason why I should have a policy because it is not a function of the Depart-

ment of Reconstruction and Supply to have a policy on radio. That is the responsibility of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Mr. Browne, as I say, was called as a witness before the committee by the committee. He felt it his duty, since as he was leaving the city for an extended period, to supply his views. If he had asked my opinion as to whether that was his duty, I would have said that his duty would have been to submit it through his senior officer. However, he did not take that view, and I made haste to say that the views contained in that brief were the views of Mr. Browne, who prepared it and submitted it on his own responsibility. I hope I have made the position clear. My hon. friend gets confused about three departments and two ministers, but I assure him that the work of one no more overlaps the work of the other than my work as Minister of Reconstruction overlaps with the work of external affairs.

Mr. FLEMING: The minister has indicated that he has not seen the brief since the issue arose in the committee and that it does not represent his views or government policy. Do I understand that there is no government policy opposed to vesting in an independent regulatory board or tribunal the regulatory functions of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation over private stations under the Broadcasting Act and licensing powers of the minister under the Radio Act, and that government policy is not opposed to vesting these powers in an independent regulatory board?

Mr. HOWE: I have been a member of the government for a considerable period and a fairly regular attendant at meetings of council, and I have never heard the government asked to express a policy on that, nor have I ever seen a report indicating why a policy should be expressed. The policy on broadcasting is a function of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Unless the government is asked for a decision by the corporation, it has been in the past, and, I think, will be in the future, quite satisfied to leave the matter of broadcasting policy to the corporation.

Mr. FLEMING: One further question arising out of the minister's answer. May I ask the minister whether he has any objection or sees any obstacle in the way of his taking over the functions of the minister under the Broadcasting Act. If he is to continue to exercise the functions of the minister under the Radio Act, is there any reason why he should not also exercise the functions of minister under the Broadcasting Act?

[Mr. Howe.]

Mr. HOWE: There is no reason why I should or should not. There is no relation between the two functions. There is no relation between the administration of the Radio Act and the administration of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. At one time I was administering both, when I was Minister of Transport and subsequently for a time. During the war it was considered wise—and I agreed with the decision—that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should report to another minister. There is absolutely no reason why it should report to the minister who administers the Radio Act.

Mr. HANSELL: I rise to say a word in the present discussion since I am on the radio committee and take a good deal of interest in my work there.

Mr. HOWE: Are you the distinguished member referred to by my hon. friend?

Mr. FLEMING: The answer is yes.

Mr. HANSELL: The hon. member has answered yes, and I thank him for the compliment.

Mr. HOWE: A very apt description.

Mr. HANSELL: It comes from him and not from me.

Mr. KNOWLES: What kind of marriage is this?

Mr. HANSELL: I will not discuss the radio committee's reports because we have had the courtesy extended to us by the minister that the opportunity will be given at a later time for the consideration of that report when a bill is to be brought down to the house. But there is some merit in what the hon. member for Eglinton has said with respect to three separate departments of government all having a finger in the radio pie. I have listened to the minister's explanation and I am sorry to say he did not tell us anything we did not already know.

Mr. HOWE: Hear, hear. I was trying to explain that to my hon. friend in this corner. He did not know.

Mr. HANSELL: The hon. member for Eglinton knew too. What I have been listening for is a justification for having three separate ministries looking after two acts with respect to radio. I could understand perhaps that there might be some justification for two ministers. I can quite understand that there is a difference between the functioning of a radio licensing authority, that is an authority that licenses radio stations for the purpose of broadcasting, because, as the minister has

already explained, there are various types of air channels, some of which are taken up by the different kinds of services in Canada requiring these channels. I can also quite understand how there could perhaps be another responsibility imposed upon the minister with respect to radio broadcasting as it is generally known in Canada for entertainment and commercial purposes. But why there should be a third, I am at a loss to understand.

Mr. HOWE: Can my hon. friend explain to me what the third minister does?

Mr. HANSELL: If he does not do anything, then I am more bewildered than ever, because we find here an item in connection with the radio division under the Department of Transport. If the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply wants to know what the Minister of Transport thinks, there is the Minister of Transport now. No, he is not there. He was there a moment ago but he has fled now.

An hon. MEMBER: He is there.

Mr. HANSELL: Oh, he has suddenly become a backbencher. Well, the very fact that the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply is now piloting through this estimate under the Department of Transport indicates that there cannot be any reason for three ministries looking after radio in Canada. I do not think I need to say any more and I do not know that it affects me so greatly, but it does seem strange to me. As an illustration, suppose we take the Department of Transport. Suppose we should discover suddenly that under the Minister of Transport there should come into existence another minister whose responsibility it is to determine where railway lines should run and where they should be built. If after a while, a third minister should suddenly appear upon the scene as a sort of connecting link between the government and the actual functioning of the railway business in Canada, we would think a divided ministry in respect of transportation would be a strange thing. Some of us are wondering why it is any the less strange for three ministers to be occupied with radio in Canada. As far as the public are concerned, I do not know whether it makes much difference. I suppose John Jones out in the street here does not know very much about whether it is under three ministers or one.

Mr. MacNICOL: And cares less.

Mr. HANSELL: But from the point of view of efficiency in government, it does seem that it could very well come under one ministry.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): The minister said that the two functions do not come together, the functions of one minister and the functions of the other. The question of licences comes under both ministers. Despite what the brief says—and it was written by Mr. Browne and fathered by none—I cannot for the life of me see why there cannot be a proper tribunal to license broadcasting in this country. It seems to me most necessary that it should be done, especially in view of all the controversy now going on.

I just wish to make one or two other observations. We had set before us in the radio committee some statistics in connection with licensing and licence fees collected. I will defy any member of the House of Commons to go through this thing and make any head or tail of it. For instance, we have here administration of radio, $189,000. I understand that some of that goes into the collection of fees, but I do not know. Then we have the issue of radio licences, $241,000 in the estimates. We have here in this brief which we received, that the total cost of administration, as a matter of fact, in connection with the collection of radio fees, was $237,000 last year, and yet this year they want $241,000. Let us look at another picture. We have here total licences issued, 4,406,964. Those are licences issued. Now we go over to another page and we find receiving licence fees, $4,099,795. Then we go back over to this first figure and we find the cost of collection of the $4,406,000—to work it out you take 12·36 per cent of $4,406,000—is $543,000. You go over to another place on this thing and it gives you what the total cost of collection was: $206,500, plus $237,388, or $413,888. Then we have net revenue of $3,905,000, when we first of all had licence fees issued, $4,406,000, and yet had costs of $543,000 to collect it. The difference between the amount collected, $4,406,000, and the net, $3,905,000, is only $501,000. There certainly must be some confusion in the department itself, with this document we have here, because the whole thing does not make sense. You can go through it from top to bottom and you cannot make anything balance. You cannot make anything jibe. The question I should like to ask is, what was the total amount of revenue collected from private broadcasting stations and how much was turned over to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation?

Mr. HOWE: For receiving licences, the amount of cash collected was $4,099,795.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I do not want the amount of cash collected. I want to know

what the total amount of fees was and I want to know how much it cost to collect them.

Mr. HOWE: The number of licences issued were: private receiving station licences at $2.50 each, 1,584,710.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Just while the minister is on that, might I ask—

Mr. HOWE: Just let me finish my statement, because it will upset the hon. member worse if he tries to add this.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): What was the amount given?

Mr. HOWE: It was 1,584,710 licences at $2.50 apiece. Then we sold 231,470 licences at $2 apiece. Transmitting stations were 111, which also paid fees.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I am not asking for that.

Mr. HOWE: The hon. member has them.

Mr. ROSS: I just want the receiving licences.

Mr. HOWE: The hon. member has those. There are two kinds, for the electric sets and for the battery sets. I gave the figures on those. If you multiply those by the appropriate figure you will get the gross collections. However I might point out that the department does not collect the gross, because commissions are allowed to post offices and various agencies. The gross amount received by the department in cash was $4,099,795.15, plus transmitting licences of $44,550, making a total gross paid to the department of $4,143,345.14.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): What did the broadcasting corporation receive?

Mr. HOWE: The net revenue to the Canadian broadcasting corporation was $3,905,841.17.

Mr. FLEMING: Can the minister give us the cost of collection which was deducted before the fees came into the hands of the Department of Transport? Has he that figure? In the same return I find the costs of the Department of Transport given as $206,388.40, and there were other costs of $31,115.57. The note states that the last item includes all costs additional to direct Department of Transport costs and involves salaries of staff of treasury branch engaged in licence work, rental of space occupied by the licensing organization, and so on; but the return does not give us the total of collection costs.

Mr. HOWE: I shall be glad to give a break-down of that. The total gross cost of collection was $544,672.85. The commissions deducted at the source amounted to $307,169.20; the cost of administration was $237,503.65. I think my hon. friend will find that accounts for everything.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Then it cost roughly $544,000 to collect $4,406,964.

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Does the minister think that is economical?

Mr. HOWE: Yes, I think so. That is about twelve per cent, or around thirty cents a licence. I think the hon. gentleman will find that other countries collecting licence fees in this way would consider that a reasonable cost of collection. I would remind my hon. friend that this involves the handling of some 2,000,000 pieces of paper, 2,000,000 separate transactions; and for that service I think the cost is reasonable.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): How large a staff is required to collect that amount of money?

Mr. HOWE: A salaried staff of sixty-four.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Then does the minister think a man with a radio should be penalized to the extent of $2.50 just because he has that radio? Does he not think each individual should be licensed, or does he think it should be the radio? Why not license washing-machines?

Mr. HOWE: Well, it seems to me the man who wants to use a radio should properly pay for the service. We pay for most services we get in this country. If my hon. friend wants a washing-machine he buys one. If he wants entertainment in his home I see no reason why he should not pay for it. The cost is very reasonable.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): To a certain extent I agree with the minister; but if you license one radio, why should you not license ten radios? You are licensing the radio; you are not licensing the man who listens to it. It is the man who should be licensed, the man who gets the benefit of the service. If a man has five radios he still buys only one license. A poor old pensioner who gets only $30 a month has to pay the same $2.50. That is the point; the principle of licensing is wrong. And I venture to say that it does not cost 12 per cent to collect money for the consolidated revenue fund of this country. I believe another method of collecting fees of this kind for the corporation might be looked into to great advantage.

Mr. HOWE: I once shared the view advanced by my hon. friend that each separate radio should pay a tax, and the law so

provided for two or three years. Several reasons were advanced against that point of view. A man might have a radio in every room in his house, but he can listen to only one at a time. The second reason was that we were making too many offenders out of the population of Canada. In other words, they had to report the number of radios they had, and we were not always sure they were accurate. So we came to the conclusion that for practical reasons we would license the place rather than the set.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I have only one more question and then I am through; it is in connection with the prosecutions which took place under the act. I find this matter very interesting. I notice that there were 11,624 prosecutions for not having licences, but the point which interests me is that in Ontario there were 7,572 prosecutions, while the next highest province had only 1,164, in Quebec. There were only 109 in New Brunswick, 191 in British Columbia, 734 in Alberta, and so on. Could the minister say why there should be over 7,000 prosecutions in Ontario and so few in the other provinces? That does not seem logical to me, because I do not believe the people of Ontario are any worse than the people of any other province in reference to evading the payment of these fees.

Mr. HOWE: All I can say is that the number of prosecutions conforms to the number of violations reported. It may be that our staff in Ontario is more efficient in spotting violations, but as far as the department is concerned we only prosecute when we have the report of a violation. When we receive such a report it is handed to the proper officers and the prosecution follows.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—
Air service—civil aviation division—
596. Radio aviation services, $1,948,455.

Mr. McLURE: On looking up the details of this item on page 281 of the estimates, I find what I have brought to the attention of several ministers in connection with other items, namely, that the provision for temporary assistance accounts for the greater part of this vote. In this case the amount for temporary assistance is $1,023,480. I have asked several of the ministers so far to explain this point, and I must say my question has not been answered very satisfactorily. Perhaps the minister might be able to give me something definite as to what this is for, and so on.

Mr. HOWE: I think I can do that. The purpose of this vote is to administer installations that are purely for war. The men involved, paid out of the vote, are temporary employees, and today their services are temporary. For instance, I will give my hon. friend a list of the services paid for out of this vote. There is the radio range at Yellowknife, at Graham, at Gore Bay, at Wiarton, at Sarnia, at Cape Ray, at Cape North, at New Waterford, at Sandspit and at Mount Hayes. There is the requirement of the point-to-point Atlantic stations. These are services which were war services and have not yet been incorporated into the civilian services of the department. My hon. friend will find that this vote is much smaller, although this particular item is somewhat larger than it was last year. However, this is a disappearing item. I suppose this is the last year there will be demobilization estimates. By that time we will sort out the services which require to be incorporated into our system, and the services which can be abandoned.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—
Air service—civil aviation division—
597. Care, operation and maintenance of Royal Canadian Air Force airfields transferred to the Department of Transport, $374,800.
Mackenzie river route—operation, maintenance, and acquisition of equipment—now included in normal estimates.

Mr. MacNICOL: I would direct the attention of the minister to the last four lines in the estimate. Where, in the normal estimates, are the votes pertaining to the Mackenzie river route?

Mr. HOWE: They are in vote 445, for civil aviation services.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—
Air service—civil aviation division—
598. North East (Crimson) staging route—maintenance of airfields, $25,000.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the reduction in this item mean that the amount is being transferred somewhere else, or that the maintenance of this route is being abandoned?

Mr. HOWE: That was never really a route, so far as war operations were concerned. Churchill is now to be taken over by the army. The Pas airfield will continue to be operated on a civilian basis. Southampton island is on a maintenance basis, with just a watchman in charge.

Mr. ADAMSON: These are airports built by the Americans during the war, are they?

Mr. HOWE: Not necessarily by the Americans. The Pas was built by Canada, and I believe Churchill was largely built by Canada. The Americans built Southampton island.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—
Air service—civil aviation division—
Alaska communications system—
599. Additions and betterments, including transport equipment, capital, $216,000.

Mr. KNOWLES: This is a new item. Would the minister give the details of it?

Mr. HOWE: The funds are required for the continued operation and maintenance of the Canadian portion of the so-called Alaska communications system from Edmonton to Fairbanks. This system was formerly operated by the United States army. This is a capital vote. It is capital which it is estimated will be required in operating telegraph and telephone lines between Edmonton and Alaska.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is, the lines over which Canadian Pacific Air Lines operates in part on its own and in part on behalf of Trans-Canada Air Lines.

Mr. HOWE: Part of it is through service and relates to American operations in Alaska.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—
Air service—civil aviation division—
Alaska communications system—
600. To provide for the difference between the expenditures for operation and maintenance and revenue accruing from operations during the year ending March 31, 1948, not exceeding $682,000.

Mr. JACKMAN: Would the minister give a break-down of this item?

Mr. HOWE: It is as follows:

Revenues		
Lease of lines to U.S. government	$271,000	
Lease of lines to Department of Transport	103,000	
Lease of lines to airline operator	35,000	
Commercial traffic and other leases	191,000	
		$600,000
Expenses		
(Canadian National Telegraphs)		
Salaries and wages—Permanent	$690,920	
Salaries and Wages—Temporary	1,080	
Salaries and wages—Casual	20,000	
Allowances—Board	71,200	
Travelling expenses	64,475	
Teletype rental	470	
Printing and stationery	2,126	
Materials, supplies and equipment	331,663	
Freight, express and cartage	24,000	
Management fee—3 per cent	37,337	
Allowances—Living	10,000	
Pension charges	24,925	
Sundries	3,804	
		$1,282,000
Estimated operating deficit 1947-1948		$ 682,000

[Mr. Howe.]

Mr. FRASER: This is a loss being taken on the operations in that section?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. FRASER: And it is a new operation?

Mr. HOWE: It was operating throughout the period of the war. It was built by the United States government and was purchased by the Canadian government. For a time it was operated by the Royal Canadian Air Force. For reasons of economy it was turned over to the Department of Transport for operation. That department made an operating agreement with the Canadian National Telegraphs. The statement I have just given is the expected revenue and expected cost of operation by Canadian National Telegraphs.

Mr. FRASER: Will this be in next year?

Mr. HOWE: I should think so.

Mr. GREEN: Why is this not shown in the ordinary estimates? I understand that it has to do with the Alaska communications system. The Department of Transport will be handling that each year. Why is it shown as a demobilization and reconversion vote rather than in the ordinary estimates?

Mr. HOWE: We are demobilizing at the present time. We took it over only last spring, and we are changing it from war to peacetime operations. By next year we shall know what to include in the permanent estimate, and shall include it accordingly.

Mr. GREEN: But it is to be kept by the Department of Transport?

Mr. HOWE: That is the present intention.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—
Radio division—
601. Administration of the Radio Act and regulations, $252,520.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Why is this not in the main estimates? While I am on my feet, I should like to make it clear that I am not in favour of licensing every radio in every house, just in case I might be misunderstood. Why does this not come under the other estimates for the Department of Transport?

Mr. HOWE: This has not anything to do with radio. There is some misunderstanding in this respect. Some people seem to think the radio branch has nothing to do but look after radio broadcasting. I suppose radio broadcasting takes about two per cent of the time and attention of the administration of the Radio Act. This has to do with the real functions of the radio branch of the Department of Transport, and is in connection with

the acquisition of two transmitters for the radio ionospherics stations at St. John's, Newfoundland, and Clyde River, Northwest Territories, in replacement of obsolete and uneconomical present equipment, to the cost of $30,000. This is an appropriation for the technical and clerical staff at Ottawa headquarters and district offices engaged in administering services which were developed during the war and which are necessary functions in the normal peace-time administration of the act. Provision is also made for the full operating expenses of radio monitoring stations at Hartlen Point, Nova Scotia; Winnipeg and Vancouver, and for a portion of the expense of the Ottawa and Strathburn stations, and for two ionospherics stations at St. John's and Clyde River in Arctic bay.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Is vote 450 for the administration of the Radio Act and regulations not for the same purpose as this vote?

Mr. HOWE: That other item refers to normal peace-time activities. This item has to do with the operation of certain war-time equipment which has not yet been converted into peace-time equipment or abandoned. I dare say part of it will be abandoned.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

75. Departmental administration, $184,000.

Mr. REID: There is one important and, I believe, serious matter which I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Fisheries with respect to which I am going to ask him that between now and next session every possible investigation be made and steps be taken to prevent what I claim is a menace to the fisheries of the Fraser river. But before dealing with that one specific question which I have in mind tonight, may I draw to the minister's attention some of the communications which I received following a speech I made in this house a short time ago when the Fisheries Research Board Act was under review.

Mr. MacNICOL: It was a good speech.

Mr. REID: Thank you. At that time I dealt particularly with the quality of fish, amongst other matters. Following a report of my speech which appeared in many newspapers, I received, in all, thirty-five to forty letters; and invariably the writers, whilst reminding me that quality was essential to the consumption of more fish, pointed out, each and every one of them, that price was just as important a factor, if not more so, in increasing the consumption of fish. I wish to put one of those letters on record tonight, and I do so because I think the minister will agree that, while we must go after quality, nevertheless something more must be done than has been done to make fish cheaper and more readily available, particularly to those living in the interior provinces. This is one of the many letters that came to me:

Dear Sir:

In the Saskatoon *Star* issue of April 23, you are wondering why the public does not eat more seafood. Perhaps a few price quotations will help you.

		cents
Shrimp	per tin	85
Lobster	per tin	95
Crab	per tin	69
Salmon	per half tin	35
Sole fillets	per lb.	45
Salmon	per lb.	45
White fish	per lb.	43

and so on down the line to the once so cheap Canadian sardine, which has doubled in price. Who with a family can afford such prices?

At least one can buy a cheaper cut of meat. Hamburger, for instance, at 25 cents per pound, and shoulder cuts at much less than any of the above fish quotations.

There is really no object in spending a great deal of money in an educational campaign unless prices come down or purses are better filled. Then you won't need a campaign of any sort. The eating of fish will take care of itself. The price of whole fresh fish is much higher than the cheaper cuts of meat.

I like fish and would rather eat it than meat, but my budget won't allow it too often.

That was the gist of the majority of the letters I received, following the debate in this house on the Fisheries Research Board Act. I am bringing them to the minister's attention to emphasize that some steps will have to be taken by his department, and the industry as well will have to be reminded that fish must be distributed more abundantly and more cheaply than is the case at the present time.

My particular reason for rising at this time is to bring to the minister's attention what I claim is a serious menace to the salmon industry of the Fraser river. In fact, if no steps are taken in the matter it is my opinion that we face in the near future the depletion of the salmon industry on the Fraser river.

It may interest the members of the committee to know that the great Columbia river to the south of us in British Columbia, which has its head waters in that province but its outlet in the United States, was once the great salmon river of the Pacific coast. But dams were built on that river in the state of Washington to develop hydro-electric power, and on three occasions I raised my voice in this house drawing to the attention of the government, both Conservative and Liberal, that by simply closing our eyes and

remaining silent we had lost a great fisheries heritage through the building of dams on the Columbia river by the United States. Away back in 1845 there had been entered into between Great Britain and the United States an agreement which contained a clause stipulating that the Columbia river, which rises in British Columbia, was to be free of access to all British and Canadian citizens. But when the United States started to build dams on the Columbia river for hydro-electric power no voice was raised at that time by the government of Canada to maintain the rights which were given to us by that treaty. I may inform the minister, although it is too late to tell him now, that when the hearings were being held in the state of Washington at the time these dams were projected, those who had to do with the fisheries in the state of Washington firmly believed that the voice of Canada would be heard in protest against the building of these dams for power development.

What has been the effect? I had the pleasure of visiting one of these dams where there is a fishway or ladder which cost seven and a half million dollars to build. That fishway, it is true, takes the salmon up over the dam. Ever since, the United States authorities have been trying to bolster up the whole project with figures and statistics. They have men engaged in what they call a counting-house where machines are used to count the fish and classify the various species or varieties. The machines operate very much like a typewriter. The fish travel over a white table and the men who are sitting above the table can easily see the fish through a glass floor, and they know the varieties, and hence can make a fairly accurate count of the fish passing up the river. Every year they can show the great numbers of salmon that go up over the dam. For many years they have been endeavouring to put across the idea that this fishway was a success, owing to the numbers of salmon which were able to go up the river and which previously could not go over the hydro-electric dams. I can tell hon. members, and I want the minister to remember this—

Mr. MacNICOL: Will the hon. member please tell us which hydro-electric dam?

Mr. REID: I am speaking particularly of the one at Bonneville in the state of Washington. They constructed there a $7,500,000 fishway to take the salmon up around the dam; but in all the dams that they have built to take the fish up, that is, but one aspect of the situation, for they have never been able to find a way to bring the little fingerlings down successfully, and those who know tell us that the Columbia river is doomed. It is doomed because, after ten years of research, they have never been able to discover how to bring the fry or little fish down over the dams or through the turbines without great mortality. The result is that the fishway in the Columbia river will in time be of no use in that regard. It will be only a matter of time until there will be no fish left in the Columbia river.

Mr. MacNICOL: The fish would have to come up over the Grand Coulee dam and come down through the turbines.

Mr. REID: The Grand Coulee dam is too high.

Mr. MacNICOL: How do they get them through?

Mr. REID: They do not go through; it stops them. The dam blocks them; but on the Bonneville farther down the river they built a fishway at the cost which I have just mentioned, which is able to take the fish up over the dam; but as I said a moment ago—and I wish to repeat it—they have never been able to bring the small fry down successfully. It is estimated that every year the small fry die by the millions; consequently, in spite of the fish going up to spawn, the fishery actually is decreasing.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is it a fact that the fish do not get up to British Columbia to spawn at all?

Mr. REID: The hon. member is right. Since the dams were built on the Columbia, no fish are now going up in British Columbia. We lost the entire fishery in the interior of British Columbia by the building of dams, and no protest was made by any Canadian government, although we had a right to protest under the treaty of 1845.

I shall now deal with what I particularly wanted to say, namely, the menace to the Fraser river. In 1938, the province of British Columbia had a survey made of the potential water power of the Fraser river. I shall quote what was said:

> When the demand arises, the waters of the Fraser river are capable of furnishing over six million horse-power.

They put out a little booklet—hon. members from British Columbia may have seen it—called "Water Powers, Fraser River, British Columbia." In this report of the power commission of British Columbia there is outlined all the potential hydro-electric development of the Fraser river watershed. Almost each page shows the spot where hydro-

electric power could be developed. Those having to do with fisheries view with alarm the building of dams on the Fraser river. Let me say that, speaking as a member of the international salmon fisheries commission, we realize, as a commission, that dams will have to be built on the river for the development of electric power. We are not entirely against the construction of dams. Our engineers have also made a survey of the waters of the Fraser river,—and we have discovered that there are great areas to which no fish go. There are other areas to which the fish go, and therein, we believe, lies the danger.

Beginning a year or two ago, the British Columbia Electric Company started with a project on the Bridge river which I think is to be completed this year. Most hon. members from British Columbia have received a copy of the "Construction World". In that booklet is outlined the great project of hydro-electric development on Bridge river. An 800-foot reservoir dam is being constructed. They are raising the level of one lake forty feet and taking the water through a penstock many miles, thereby developing power for electricity. No intimation has been given by the company to the fisheries department of what the effect might be. May I point out to the committee that when the British Columbia Electric constructed a dam at Stave lake some years ago, certain streams were completely dried out and the salmon that used to go up these streams disappeared. The report now is that they may now abandon this dam after the Bridge river project is completed. But may I point out to the committee that when they built the Stave lake dam and put in the project there, no protest of any kind was made either by the provincial or dominion government or by their officials against the building of the dam.

Mr. BRIDGES: What year was that?

Mr. REID: I am not sure. If my memory serves me correctly it was back in 1925 or 1926. I think it was around that time. No protest of any kind was made, and I claim there was a great loss to the salmon industry.

If the sockeye salmon comes back to its once great value on the Fraser river, as we hope and expect it will—I mean to the extent which it was in 1913 at the time the slide occurred, and which it is the duty of the commission of which I have the honour to be a member to endeavour to bring about, and we are working to that end—it will mean an annual return of between $35 million and $40 million. In 1913 two and a half million cases of sockeye salmon were canned from the salmon that went up the Fraser river to the headwaters of that river in the interior. After the disaster of 1913-14, of course the decline took place; but we are hopeful that, before long, we shall be able to bring back that great fishing industry.

Mr. MacNICOL: To what does the hon. member refer?

Mr. REID: I refer to the disaster that took place when the contractors were building the Canadian National Railways through the mountains to Vancouver. They blasted hundreds of thousands of tons of rock into a place on the Fraser river called Hell's Gate canyon. In the spring of 1914 a slide also took place. In the year that they blasted the rock into the canyon millions of sockeye salmon were unable to pass up the gorge and so died without spawning. Since 1913 the industry has gone down and down. In 1937 the commission was set up to overcome the difficulty. That, however, is a story all by itself and would take an entire evening to tell.

I am dealing particularly with the menace of the water-power development, and I suggest to the minister that he look at what is now being done in the United States. It is true they are doing this in the United States after some disaster has befallen the fishing industry. I shall read to the minister the laws of the state of Washington. I realize that he may probably have to consult with the province of British Columbia. Someone in the dominion government should, however, approach the province and have a law something like this put into effect. I quote from the "Annotated Laws relating to Food and Shell Fish 1945" of the state of Washington.

In the event that any person, firm, corporation or government agency desires to construct any form of hydraulic project or other project that will use, divert, obstruct or change the natural flow or bed of any river or stream or that will utilize any of the waters of the state or materials from the stream beds, such person, firm, corporation or government agency shall submit to the department of fisheries and the department of game full plans and specifications of their proposed construction or work, complete plans and specifications for the proper protection of fish life in connection therewith.

I want to compare that with what we have in our law today. We have nothing like that to prevent the building of dams, but we have something which many years ago might have acted, I presume fairly well, although some of us have doubted it. If you take the revised statutes of Canada and refer to the Fisheries Act you will find that section 31 merely states this:

Every slide, dam or other obstruction across or in any stream where the minister determines it to be necessary for the public interest that a fish-pass should exist, shall be provided by

the owner or occupier with a durable and efficient fishway or canal around the slide, dam or other obstruction which shall be maintained in a good and effective condition by said owner or occupier in such place and of such form and capacity as will in the opinion of the minister satisfactorily permit the free passage of fish through the same.

That was in 1927. I claim that that law is antiquated and is useless in the face of the potential dangers confronting us on the Fraser river. The present section will come into operation only after the dam has been built, and if, in the opinion of the minister, a fish-pass is required he can then order the company to build one. That is hardly good enough because, once the dam is up, the damage may well have been done, as it may take only one year to wipe out a fishery valued at many thousands of dollars.

Let me point out another danger on the Fraser river and, I suppose, on other rivers as well, and that is the dredging which is taking place. There was dredging for gold at a place called Quesnel many years ago. On the Quesnel system we estimate that we have one of the greatest potential sockeye salmon streams in the entire Fraser river watershed. In 1912 or 1913 some four million sockeye salmon went into that area, and last year, by actual count, there were only around 685, or a drop from four million to 685. In other words, that area has been practically wiped out. In consequence of the gold mining company going there with a mammoth dredge and expending many millions of dollars in dredging, they have blocked rivers and lakes. No steps were taken to have them remove the gravel. The damage has been done and now it is our duty as a commission to endeavour to bring that area back to what is was in 1912. If the department of the day had been fairly active or had had some power such as I have cited from the laws of the state of Washington, steps could have been taken immediately against such an operation or company.

I contend that our laws will have to be amended and brought up to date, because we stand in grave danger, on the Fraser river at least, of the entire fishery being wiped out.

Let me bring another instance to the attention of the minister, and this one is nearer home. A certain project is being carried out by the dominion at Pemberton Meadows. They started work early in March of this year. If that work had been carried out as intended, they were going to dig a canal and divert the river. If they had proceeded with that we would have lost one of the finest spawning beds in that area, one that usually harbours some thirty thousand sockeye salmon. By good luck we were able to get hold of the engineer, and when the matter was drawn to his attention he was good enough to order that the work be discontinued until a complete survey could be made as to its effect.

I mention this particularly to the minister in order to bring it forcibly to his attention that there is no protection at present against digging canals, gold mine dredging or the construction of hydraulic dams. There is some protection, seemingly, in the act, that if a dam is built and it is found to be to the detriment of the fishing industry the minister can take certain steps.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am very much interested in what the hon. member is saying, because he is perhaps the best-posted member in the house on this subject. According to what he now says, if they are to build dams on the Fraser river, I believe the whole fishing industry there will go to pieces, because on the Columbia the Grand Coulee is 550 feet high and fish cannot go up that dam, and the same will happen on the Fraser river.

Mr. REID: Everyone knows the high pressure sort of propaganda campaign that can be put on by a company that wishes to construct a dam across a stream for the development of electrical power, especially if the people in the area are not receiving any benefit from the salmon on the river. It can be pointed out that there would be cheap electricity for the farms and industrial power for those who wish to go into industry. A beautiful picture can be painted to the people generally and I fear that in a campaign of that kind the fishing industry may suffer and become the victim of such propaganda. I am calling this matter to the attention of the minister in time, as I believe, and I submit that it is time steps were taken before any great development or building of dams takes place. I doubt whether one of his officers has been up to see what effect the Bridge river project may have on the salmon industry on the Fraser river.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: May I ask the hon. member whether his commission has registered any complaint to the minister?

Mr. REID: We have protested for the past five years to the provincial government. We have asked the provincial government on every occasion if they would be good enough to consult with us, to present their plans to us and give us a chance to look at them before going ahead with the work. But although we have requested that, and had an assurance from the premier that that would be done, so far it has not been done Fortunately or

unfortunately, these works are carried out by officials, and since the province of British Columbia, like certain other provinces, do not control their fisheries, perhaps they are not as much interested as they might be if they had the control, as the province of Quebec and some other provinces have. I believe the province of Saskatchewan controls its fisheries, but we in British Columbia do not control ours. The fisheries come exclusively under the dominion, and therefore the province may not be so much concerned. There is sitting in Victoria a little group of men who are power-minded—I say that advisedly—their thoughts being for the development of hydro-electric power on the Fraser river, and they have no thought whatsoever of what effect the building of these dams may have on the fishing industry.

The fishing industry is so valuable to British Columbia that we cannot sit idly by without taking proper steps and putting in the proper safeguards now. What I suggest to the minister is that every department, both provincial and federal, before proceeding with projects of that kind, and private industry as well, should be required to place their plans before the fisheries department and so give them a chance to find out what effect these projects will have on the fishing industry.

There is a principle or, at any rate, a precedent that we can act upon. Neither a provincial government nor a private individual can construct a bridge over a navigable river unless, first of all, the project is approved by the Department of Public Works. There you have a precedent, and if that safeguard is provided to take care of shipping, surely we should be more concerned or, at any rate, as much concerned about an industry that gives employment to thousands of men and is worth many millions of dollars.

I am asking the minister to give serious thought to the matter between now and the next session of parliament, and to take steps to see what can be done so that in future we shall not witness on the Fraser river what has taken place on the Columbia.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Am I to understand that the provincial government would permit the damming of the Fraser river, which I believe is a navigable water, without consultation with the government?

Mr. REID: There is issued by the provincial government a booklet in which the entire Fraser river is outlined, giving the places they recommend should be used for the development of hydro-electric power, and Bridge river is named in this booklet. That is the first one that is being proceeded with.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I am merely asking the question for information. My understanding is that the Fraser river is navigable. Surely the federal government has control of that, has it not? The famous beaver we hear so much about went up there and the whole development of Canada other than Ontario was through the Fraser river. If it is not navigable, I do not know what it is.

Hon. H. F. G. BRIDGES (Minister of Fisheries): We all certainly have enjoyed listening to the remarks of the hon. member for New Westminster in connection with the damage which may be caused to the fisheries of the Fraser river and in British Columbia by virtue of the possible development of hydro-electric power. I have not had an opportunity to make a full and complete study of the legislation which now exists in regard to the construction of fishways and dams for this purpose. I would point out, however, to the hon. member the fact that the present act under which we are now functioning is the Fisheries Act of 1932. It is quite possible that in section 20 of the Fisheries Act of 1932, which contains some ten sections, there may be some powers which the minister now has, but which he did not have under the old revised statutes of Canada which were passed in 1927. I would, however, assure the hon. member most sincerely that, so far as I am concerned, if the legislation as it now exists is deficient, having regard to the proper protection of the salmon fisheries, I and the officials of my department will certainly make a careful study of the matter between now and the next session and see what can be done.

Mr. WINTERS: I should like to invite the attention of the committee for a few minutes to the fisheries problems on the east coast. At this late stage I hesitate to take up the time of the committee, but when one realizes the proportions which the fisheries are assuming in our economic life, I feel that the subject merits all the consideration we can direct to it from the people of Canada generally. The solution to the immediate problems facing the fishing industry lies with the people of Canada themselves in the way of increased consumption, as was brought out in a recent debate. Therefore, I feel it is a problem which is of great concern to each and every person in Canada. For that reason I feel we are justified in asking the committee to bear with us for a short time even at this late date.

At the outset I should like to say that, from the point of view of the industry on the east coast, the past year has been one of development as far as the relationships

between the industry and the department go. We feel that, in the dying days of the last session, we had in this house a good debate and one which was constructive. Since that time the department has embarked on a wide programme of reorganization which has certainly benefited the department and the industry. We feel that a great deal of credit is due the minister who has applied himself with such great vigour and constructiveness to the problems facing the industry. We are now looking hopefully to the new deputy minister who has shown, by his ability in such matters as assisting the industry through the recent support announcement made by the minister, that the department is certainly on the right track.

The first problem I should like to draw to the attention of the committee tonight is an international one, and it has to do with the general problem of depletion. The hon. member for New Westminster ably brought to the attention of the committee tonight the matter of the depletion of salmon from the great salmon rivers of British Columbia. I am concerned with the depletion of deep sea fish on the Grand Bank and other banks off the coast of Nova Scotia, involving principally the fishing industries in the United States and Canada. The minister is well aware of the situation. It has been brought to his attention a number of times, both through his own departmental channels and through the industry. I know he has a sympathetic feeling toward the problem. Recently, on July 4, the question was brought to the attention of the government by the hon. member for St. John-Albert, and the Secretary of State for External Affairs at page 5080 of *Hansard* indicated that he is fully aware of the scope and difficulty of the problem and its solution. The problem arises out of the fact that the modern way of deep-sea fishing is by means of dragging or trawling, whereby draggers tow behind them a net which scoops up fish more or less indiscriminately. It is a method which is directly opposed in that respect to the old-fashioned and still existing method of dory fishing, which is a hook-and-line propostion and is, therefore, more selective. There is no doubt that this dragging method does destroy a wide variety of types and sizes of fish. At the present time one difficulty is associated with the fact that there is sufficient codfish on the market. The inventories are high. Some countries, particularly the United States, have little or no demand for fresh codfish. The accent and emphasis is on fresh haddock. The result is that many of the draggers, which catch cod in greater quantities than they catch haddock, are forced to dispose of their cod whilst still at sea. The United States has always adopted a reasonable attitude toward this problem. It is the nature of the industry that it is destructive. There is no intent on their part to deplete the banks. I would, however, again urge this government to do whatever they can by way of negotiation with the United States to see if some reasonable understanding cannot be arrived at to avoid the depletion which will so greatly affect the industry in the future.

Then there is the matter of the continental shelf, which was raised last year by the hon. member for New Westminster and emphasized during the debate on the fisheries estimates in the last session of this parliament. That problem has not been solved. Our fishermen are still encountering destruction of their gear and running the hazard of having their ships destroyed, with the attendant loss of life, on what we have always considered to be our very own banks off the coast of Nova Scotia. I refer particularly to the Banquereau or, as it is otherwise called, the Quero bank. I would again ask the minister if he would seek some avenue for approaching the other nations involved in this fishing problem on the coast of Nova Scotia and try to come to some understanding and create regulations which will circumvent this hazard to our own fisheries.

Before proceeding farther, I should like to say that we feel there is a need for a further extension of the protective service we have off the coast of Nova Scotia. In my particular part of the province, the constituency of Queens-Lunenburg, the only protective craft we have immediately available is one known as the *Gilbert*, which is entirely inadequate. The accommodation in this boat is poor. It would certainly be well worth the department's while to look into the matter of providing a replacement craft for the outmoded *Gilbert*.

There is the new air-sea rescue service which we feel fits nicely into the programme of protective service, and so far there are good indications that it is performing the function it was intended to perform. There have been one or two instances, however, where the service was slow in going to the rescue of craft which it deemed to be not in immediate danger. The craft in one instance, and I believe in two, was drifting helplessly, and the protective service, when it was got in touch with, is reported to have said the craft was in no immediate danger. The craft in question were rudderless and had no radios. It is pretty difficult to convince seamen at the height of a storm, on small craft, that they are in no immediate danger. If the

obstacle is towage; if the matter of competing with private enterprise for towage is the consideration, then I feel that at least the protective service should stand by in case of danger, to see that there is no loss of life.

I should like also to repeat our oft-presented demands that further consideration be given the question of breakwaters and wharves, which are such an important feature of any fishing community. There is a great economy drive on now, and we know that government expenditure is to be cut to the minimum; but I think the minister must urge that discretion be exercised and see that the wrong emphasis is not applied to cut down the number of wharves and breakwaters. I would urge also that more dredging be done, because inshore fishermen simply cannot operate without dredging and the dredges available on the coasts of Nova Scotia are entirely inadequate.

As various hon. members informed this house during the debate on the Fisheries Research Board Act, the industry is in a difficult position brought about by the conversion from a wartime to a peacetime economy. Without going into this matter fully again I desire merely to state that war-produced changes in the markets for our fish placed more emphasis on frozen fish than had been the case up to that time. In addition, heavy demands for food occasioned by the war made it necessary to produce fish in larger quantities than ever before. Now reconversion to a peacetime economy means that we must revert to our old markets, which in many cases are no longer available to us because of increased competition. We may also be obliged to place more emphasis on salt and pickled fish, as was the case prior to the war, rather than on fresh fish. This was thoroughly covered in the minister's statement on June 24, in which he announced that up to $8,000,000 would be made available to support the fishing industry for the remainder of this year. The industry was very grateful for the programme of relief feeding outlined in the minister's report. Under the Fisheries Prices Support Act, funds will be made available for engaging in an extensive programme of education which should increase the consumption of fish in Canada. When we realize that the fishing industry in the United States has been trying for some time to raise a fund of half a million dollars to embark upon a programme of education within that country, the industry realizes how fortunate it is to have the government come forward with this offer of assistance.

An analysis of the minister's statement will clearly indicate where the difficulty lies in our industry at the present time. For relief feeding the government is prepared to buy sizeable quantities of dried, pickled and canned fish, but for various reasons it cannot see its way clear to purchase frozen fish for the same purpose. To deal with the east coast, this boils down to the fact that the government's programme of relief feeding, with the exception of the canning industry, provides support for that phase of the industry which could best get along without it, and makes it necessary to find other means of supporting the fresh fish industry, which is the only part of the industry left in real difficulty after the relief feeding programme is implemented. The minister's solution of this problem is to implement the Fisheries Prices Support Act to permit the government to buy frozen fillets, and to recommend that the industry divert as much raw codfish as possible to salting rather than freezing. I wish to emphasize that on the east coast the codfishing involving fresh fillets is the only phase of the industry in real difficulty. That is the only item which is giving us any concern; our other problems in the fishing industry are considerably in the future.

The minister's statement presents several outstanding difficulties with which the department is fully familiar. As in the past the industry will adjust its own production to suit outstanding demands, and there will be some diversion of cod into the salt fish industry. But too much should not be expected in this direction, because refrigeration and other facilities were built during the war at great cost to accommodate an expanded demand for fresh fish, and it would seem to many a retrograde step to leave these facilities idle to any great extent if it is possible to find other solutions. A second outstanding difficulty would be encountered by the government in selling domestically the frozen fish it would buy under the Fisheries Prices Support Act. At the present time, speaking very approximately, there are two and a half million pounds of frozen cod fillets in existing inventories, and it is estimated that, under normal circumstances of production and in the light of present markets, this surplus will rise to approximately ten million pounds over the next eight to ten months. This means that the government will be faced with the necessity of purchasing and disposing of approximately ten million pounds of frozen cod fillets. This programme will involve all the difficulties of storage, transportation, financing, merchandizing and so on. However, it is assumed that by the end of the period I have mentioned, from eight to ten months, this reconversion phase will be completed and

the industry will know what its markets are, so that it will be able to gauge its production accordingly.

There would appear to be a much more direct solution to this problem than government purchasing, a solution which the industry on the east coast would much prefer. However, in view of the international monetary situation the solution I have in mind is dependent upon the availability of Canadian funds in foreign fish-consuming countries. The invoking of the Fisheries Prices Support Act naturally gives the impression that there is no export demand for frozen cod fillets, but this is not the case. There are known to be demands in England, France and Italy, and it may be that there are demands elsewhere. We know that inquiries have been received from representatives of these three countries seeking to work out an arrangement to buy cod fillets. The obstacle is that these countries lack Canadian dollars. The industry itself is confident that it can find the markets and can readily circumvent such problems as transportation, storage and distribution, because it has well-established channels. The quantity of fish involved is approximately ten million pounds, and this quantity can be absorbed in these three countries where people are ready and able to pay for it in the currency of their own country. This would not be a programme of relief feeding. The cost of the amount of fish involved would certainly not be more than $1,500,000. There is no certainty that the countries concerned, England, France and Italy, would accept loans to buy fish, but we in the maritimes feel that this is an approach to the problem that should be fully explored.

It seems clear to the industry and to all in the maritimes that the direct solution to this problem would be to make loans available to these three countries in the amount required to purchase the approximately ten million pounds of fish that are likely to be surplus over the next eight to ten months, rather than to have the government use the same amount of money to purchase those fish and attempt to have them consumed domestically in a market which at the present time must be considered somewhat doubtful. When I say that I do not mean in any sense that I believe the consuming capacity of the Canadian public is doubtful, because I am strongly of the opinion that, with an intensive programme of education and inspection to ensure a good quality being on the market, the per capita consumption in Canada will increase sufficiently to take care of our present surpluses.

[Mr. Winters.]

The government may take the stand that it has gone as far as it proposes to go in the matter of making loans available to foreign countries, but we in the maritimes do not see the justification for that stand. In the first place, the government is making the money available anyhow. In the second place, as has been pointed out previously in this house, the maritimes have benefited from the government's heavy loan programme less than any region in Canada to date. The returns to the maritime provinces from the hundreds of millions of dollars lent to foreign countries have been infinitesimal when compared with the returns to Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia; and when one considers the contracts for wheat, beef, and other farm products which bring good returns to the western provinces, it must be conceded that the maritime provinces have not fared at all well in this programme of external trade.

In a speech in the house at an earlier date I showed that, of the total amount of $330,872,575 in contracts awarded against these loans by the Canadian Commercial Corporation and the Canadian export board as of March of this year, Nova Scotia benefited to the extent of only $2,151,351 or ·65 per cent. The three maritime provinces together benefited to the extent of only ·76 per cent, whereas they comprise ten per cent of the total population. In this particular instance, we are not asking for additional funds; the funds are there anyhow; we are asking, however, that the funds be rediverted to be made available as a further loan rather than for the purpose of government purchase of fish for domestic use. There are many advantages accruing from the foreign loans approach to the problem which are self-evident, the most obvious being that this programme would permit the industry to stand on its own feet rather than lean on the government, and this is all to the good. It would also serve the important purpose of letting it maintain valuable contacts and markets abroad, which it already has. Furthermore, it would save the government all the difficulties involved in purchasing large quantities of fresh fish and disposing of them domestically.

I feel quite certain that the other maritime members feel the same as I do in this respect. My colleague the hon. member for Vancouver North says that the British Columbia members feel that way, too. I did not wish to give the impression that the industry is not appreciative of the government's splendid offer of assistance. I am sure the industry fully appreciates that offer, and every fisherman in the industry on the east coast will appreciate

this government's willingness to come to the industry's assistance when trouble arises.

We have no criticism of the government's action at all; we are merely trying to suggest how funds already available may be used to the best possible advantage of the industry and with the least difficulty to the department.

I would say, in conclusion, that this fund of $8 million to be made available by the government for relief feeding is a great boost or "shot in the arm" for the fishing industry on the east coast. The industry, as we are aware, is facing problems which are growing more difficult. Fish prices took a small slump, and there was some indication that they would take a further slide because of mounting inventories. This offer of assistance through the channels of relief feeding and the Fisheries Prices Support Act is the impetus the industry needs at the present time.

Mr. McLURE: Mr. Chairman, I know how anxious the minister is to have his estimates passed, and for that reason I am not going to make any extended remarks. I shall discuss the different items in which I am interested when they are reached. We have listened to two excellent speeches, one from the west and one from the maritime provinces. I was, however, disappointed that the Minister of Fisheries did not, as usual, give his excellent address respecting the policy and the organization of his department. Probably he was in a hurry to have his estimates passed and did not make those observations this year, as has been his custom.

On this item I should like to ask him about the allocation in connection with the $8 million which will be spent on relief feeding and for the fishermen of the maritime provinces. Then, perhaps he would give us a statement with reference to the prices board, as to whether they are operating and whether definite floor prices or ceiling prices have been put on lobsters for the season.

I would ask from him a report respecting the fishing season on lobsters, which is now, at least in part, closed for the maritime provinces. I shall not speak at length because I realize that all hon. members are anxious to have the estimates passed, and I realize that under the different items I shall have an opportunity to say what I have in mind.

Mr. BRYCE: This seems to be fish day in the House of Commons.

Mr. McLURE: I should like to have an answer.

Mr. BRIDGES: I can answer the questions on the different items as they come up.

Mr. BRYCE: I have listened attentively to the hon. member for New Westminster, who told us a wonderful story about sockeye salmon. I listened to the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg tell us about cod and haddock, and the hon. member for Queens tell us about fish in the waters of Prince Edward Island.

I would remind the committee, however, that we have some excellent fish in the prairie provinces. I would refer to the Winnipeg goldeye and the lake Winnipeg whitefish. We do not trouble the dominion government so far as the care of these fish is concerned. The provincial government looks after the matter. Would the minister be good enough to do as his predecessor did, namely, to give me a report respecting the work done in connection with the whitefish in lake Winnipeg so that I may use that information when I return to my constituency.

Mr. BRIDGES: We have reports from the national research board. They are not confined to lake Winnipeg alone, but deal with research work in all the prairie lakes.

Mr. BRYCE: This is research carried out by the minister's department with respect to whitefish. He will know what I mean.

Mr. BRIDGES: I shall be glad to give that information.

Mr. LANGLOIS: Mr. Chairman, may I offer my sincere congratulations to the Minister of Fisheries upon his timely statement of June 24 when he announced the new policy of the government with respect to purchases of fish and the proclamation of the Fisheries Prices Support Act.

However, I fully concur in the remarks of the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg. This policy of the government is indeed a step in the right direction, but we feel that this policy does not bring a complete solution to the most important problem of fish marketing in eastern Canada and more especially for the Gaspe region, which I have the honour to represent in this house. In his statement the hon. minister said:

> The act gives the board powers to buy and sell fish and to prescribe prices. The board will be established without delay. It will confine its operations during the present fiscal year to fish produced during the remainder of the 1947 season. It will be asked to prepare in collaboration with industry a general distributional programme, including advertising, designed to increase domestic sales of fish of all species and kinds, and particularly packaged fish, and in particular to consider the specific species of the east, prairies and British Columbia in which the prices received by fishermen

from the freezers are unduly low in 1947, and to devise means of maintaining these prices at or near their current levels.

This programme of support of the prices of fish for sale on the Canadian market does not, as I said a moment ago, solve the problem in my part of the country. Indeed, if the government tries to sell our fish on the domestic market our fishermen will be at a great disadvantage in comparison and in competition with the fishermen of British Columbia and of the maritime provinces. The fishing season in Gaspe lasts normally from three to four months a year, and by early December or January our frozen fish cannot compete with the fresh catches from other parts of the country. Therefore our products are not as easy to sell on the domestic market as fresh caught fish coming from other parts of Canada. What our fishermen are interested in is to regain former markets in world trade. At the beginning of hostilities, and more especially at the beginning of the Ethiopian war, the Gaspe area lost its main market, which was then Italy, through the sanctions which were imposed against that country. During the last great war we sold most of our fish to UNRRA, and today, since the foreign market demand has fallen, our fishermen are faced with the fact that if they do not regain their market in Italy they will soon have either to stop fishing completely or to go into it on a part-time basis only. I am told that recently offers were received by my fishermen for quite a considerable order of fish from Italy and France; but, unfortunately, since these two countries cannot afford to pay in either Canadian or United States dollars, we cannot sell to them. In agreement with my hon. friend, the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg, I hope that the government will, without delay, study this problem, which is more of a financial nature, and try to find a solution to it.

While I am speaking on these estimates, I wish to bring to the attention of the minister some of the resolutions which were adopted at the last meeting of the organized fishermen of my county, held at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière on January 9, 10 and 11, 1947. The first of these resolutions reads as follows:

That a request be made to the Hon. H. F. G. Bridges, federal Minister of Fisheries, to appoint a superior officer of the United Fishermen of Quebec, a member of the national research office on fisheries, to represent the fishing industry of the province of Quebec.

In this connection I wish to mention that our industry in Quebec is not represented on the board. The second resolution reads as follows:

That a request be made to federal Department of Fisheries to assume entire responsibility of the fish inspection service in the province of Quebec as provided by the federal-provincial agreement of 1922 and this in order to relieve a part of the provincial budget that could be used for other urgent needs of the industry.

This resolution is most important to our industry on the Gaspe coast. In that part of the country our fishermen cannot benefit from the many advantages of having dominion inspection, since this inspection is done by officials of the provincial government. I hope, now that our organized fishermen are asking to revert to dominion inspection that the autonomists of Quebec will not come out and say that this is an attack on the autonomy of the province, because those who are mainly interested in this dominion inspection and are asking for it are the fishermen of the province of Quebec themselves.

The third resolution reads as follows:

That the united fishermen of Quebec accept to actively collaborate with the International Bureau of Salt Fish to be organized in London, under the following conditions:

(a) No engagement shall be taken for a period of over one year;

(b) the provincial department of fisheries shall pay a strong proportion of the contribution required from the producers of the province;

(c) that Canada be represented on the executive office at London through the intermediary of a distinct section for the salt fish industry at the National Council of Fisheries but with the same secretary.

I do not think I need comment on that resolution. I know the minister has a copy of it and is giving it his active consideration.

Before closing my remarks, I wish again to impress on the government the urgent need for more suitable fishing harbours along the Gaspe coast.

On several occasions I have made representations, both in this house and out of it, to the departments concerned especially the Department of Public Works, on the urgent need for such harbours. I hope that our urgent plea will be heard this time and that action will soon be taken.

I think we must realize that the fishing industry of Canada is an important one. As I said at the beginning of these remarks I was informed a short time ago that we received favourable orders for fish from Italy. I am told that the shipments for which Italy is now asking are just sample shipments, but these orders will amount annually to some thirty million pounds of dried fish and some ten million pounds of frozen fish. These figures will, I believe, convince the committee that this industry is not to be neglected and must be given every opportunity to increase its

production and should also be given all the advantages that the government has the power to give to our fishermen for the expansion of their industry.

As I intimated at the opening of my remarks, I have congratulations to offer to the minister on the efficient manner in which he is heading his department. I also wish to add my congratulations to his able assistant, the deputy minister of fisheries, who is new in the department but who is also doing a very good job indeed.

Mr. HAZEN: It is not my intention to make any extended address, but I should like to ask the minister one or two questions. Are any investigations being made at present with a view to conserving and increasing the salmon fisheries in the bay of Fundy? The Atlantic salmon is one of our best fish. The supply by no means meets the demand. I do not believe these fish are increasing in number; in fact I have reason to believe that they are decreasing. During the present season in the port of Saint John and along the shores of the bay of Fundy at Lorneville and at other fishing villages the catch is, I understand, very poor indeed. Study should be made to ascertain ways and means of conserving and increasing these fish in the bay of Fundy and also in other waters of the maritime provinces. It would help to conserve these fish if certain dams which serve no useful purpose at the present time were removed to permit the fish to get to their spawning bed. I have in mind dams at the mouth of the Mispec river in the county of Saint John, a great salmon river which enters the bay of Fundy about the village of St. Martin's. The Nashwaak river, as the minister knows, flows into the Saint John river almost opposite the city of Fredericton. On January 14, 1946, a delegation from the Saint John branch of the New Brunswick Fish and Game Protective Association interviewed the minister at the Admiral Beatty hotel in the city of Saint John. This delegation, which was headed by Gerald H. Cox, president of the association, asked for the construction of a new fishway on the Big Salmon river at St. Martin's in order that the river might be developed into a first-class salmon angling stream. The report that appeared in the papers stated:

> . . . pointed out to the minister that the present fishway is not only poorly constructed but it is on the wrong side of the river, where the water is oftentimes too shallow for the fish to take advantage of this means of getting upstream.

The report goes on to say:

> Mr. Cox stated that Mr. Bridges had promised to have the matter investigated, and it was indicated that a survey would be made of the present fishway and conditions existing there.

Mr. BRIDGES: What is the date of that?

Mr. HAZEN: I am reading a dispatch from the *Telegraph-Journal* of January 15, 1946. Has the survey been made? Has the investigation been completed and a report made to the minister's department? If an investigation has been completed and a report made, what action, if any, has been taken?

I read in the press not long ago that the minister was interviewed by a delegation from the city of Fredericton about the dam in the Nashwaak river. Has an investigation been held into the possibilities of improving the salmon fishing in that river? If a report has been made, what action, if any, is contemplated?

There is also a dam in the Mispec river near Saint John which the Saint John branch of the fish and game protective association has been endeavouring for a long time to have opened to enable the salmon to get upstream, but so far no arrangement has been entered into to permit that to be done. I should like to bring that dam, which obstructs the fish from getting up the river, to the minister's attention. There was another dam in the province of New Brunswick about which I should like to ask the minister a question and about which complaints have been made by some associations in Chipman or in Queens or Sunbury county. I refer to the dam at Newcastle near Newcastle bridge. Have the conditions of that dam been examined with a view to having a fishway put in it to enable the fish to get up the stream? I should appreciate it if the minister will give us a statement as to the conditions at that place.

There are one or two other questions I should like to ask the minister. A year or two ago the Department of National Health and Welfare and the Department of Fisheries issued an order preventing the sale of clams in certain areas along the shores of the bay of Fundy, in Saint John and in Charlotte county. I protested at the time. I had some correspondence with both departments about that order. I knew of no person who had suffered from eating these clams. I ate them regularly myself. However, the order was made. What steps are being taken to ascertain what causes the toxic condition in these clams? Has the biological branch of the minister's department or of any other department of government made a study of the matter for the purpose of ascertaining what causes the toxic condition? Certain areas which were closed have been opened at differ-

ent times. This evening the minister kindly furnished me with a statement of the dates when certain areas which have been closed were opened, but certain areas are still closed. It has been a cause of great loss to the people who made a living digging these clams and selling them, and I think it is important for us to see that steps are taken, if they have not already been taken, to ascertain what has caused the toxic condition in these clams. So far as I know, there is no difference in these clams today, compared with what they were twenty or thirty years ago. However, if there is a difference, a thorough investigation should be made to find out what causes that toxic condition.

There is one other matter to which I would refer. I would draw the minister's attention to these figures with regard to the lobster catch in the state of Maine. In 1939, 7,570,800 pounds of lobster were caught in the waters of Maine. In 1943, that had increased to 11,468,025 pounds. In 1944, there was a further increase to 13,300,000 pounds and, in 1945, another increase to 19,130,000 pounds. While the total catch of lobsters in Canada in 1939 was 31,466,000 pounds, in 1943 it was 30,000,000 pounds. It had dropped, and in 1944 it was 33,350,000 pounds. There had been a slight increase over a period of five years, but if you go back over a longer period of time you will find that there has been little variation in the figures. There has been no increase and, in some years, a decrease.

What I should like the minister to ask his officials is this. Will they explain why there has been such a large increase in the lobster catch in the state of Maine, a steady increase in the amount of lobsters caught in Maine, while in the whole of Canada, which is really the Atlantic coast, the lobster catch has remained stationary or has decreased?

Can it be said that the fact that in Maine they have established lobster hatcheries has nothing to do with the results shown by these figures? I should also like to ask the officials this question. If, as some of the officials state in their report, these lobster hatcheries do not produce results, why was it that only last year the state of Massachusetts, after, I presume, a most careful investigation, built a fish hatchery?

Mr. BRIDGES: Was it a hatchery or a rearing pond?

Mr. HAZEN: I understand that it was a hatchery. As I read the dispatch, it was a hatchery. There must be some reason why the lobster fisheries along the Maine coast have increased. In six years they have more than doubled, while our lobster fisheries remain stationary. There must be a reason for that. If it is not due to the hatcheries it must be due to something else, and we should discover why it is that our lobster fisheries remain stationary or only hold their own, while under the method they have adopted in Maine, their lobster fisheries have increased to such a great extent.

I will not delay the committee. There are one or two other matters I wish to speak about, but these are essential points I wanted to bring to the minister's attention, and I hope that in the course of his estimates he will give us as complete an answer as he can.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: In contributing to this discussion I wish to thank the minister for the courteous way in which he meets the fishermen on the Pacific coast. It does not go unnoticed by them, nor does the courtesy of his officials. It is not often that I rise to compliment a minister of the government, but in this case I believe it is his due.

I know I am taking my life in my hands in rising at this time because the hon. member for Comox-Alberni will be right on my heels. However I will do the best I can.

There are two points I would raise at this time. First, I would ask the minister to press upon the British Columbia government the need of a loan board for the fishermen. In the debate in the provincial legislature the Minister of Finance, Mr. Anscomb, turned it down on the ground that it would interfere with dominion-provincial relations. How this could possibly be so, I do not know, inasmuch as they have a loan board on the east coast. This is becoming absolutely necessary on the west coast because during the fishing season in area 2, many of the boats just made two trips. Some of the luckier ones made three, their boats are equipped to fish in area 2, and they are quite suitable for that purpose, but are not large enough to fish in area 3 continuously. If a loan board were established a greater proportion of the Canadian fleet would be enabled to compete in area 3. At the present time, to a large extent, it is a private hunting ground for Americans with their modern equipment.

I should like to see this loan board put through so that we could maintain our independently owned fleet on the Pacific coast, and this has particular reference of course to halibut. I should not like to see the fishing fleet fall back into large company-owned boats because these men do appreciate their freedom.

Another point I wish to bring up is the question of the fisheries prices support board. I should like to mention some of the fears that are bothering the men on the coast at the

present time. There is an embargo on the export of salmon, frozen and fresh. There is a premium price in the United States. The independently owned fleet sell their own fish through their own cooperative and are mainly interested in frozen and fresh fish, and they would like to enjoy that premium market which now exists in the United States.

It was pointed out to me that in certain cases on the east coast the fishermen of Gaspe are exporting their Gaspe salmon to the United States and enjoying that high price and at the same time eating British Columbia salmon.

An hon. MEMBER: Better food.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Yes. It may be better food, but let us not take it out on the west coast fishermen. In the past, certain laws have been put through that have been a detriment to west coast fishermen. First, during the war they had their income tax ten per cent deducted at the source. Dogfish livers also were up against the embargo, inasmuch as certain amounts were put into chicken feeds for Canadian use, whereas east coast cod livers had the right of the export market. We do not wish to see that condition arise owing to the setting up of this board, which is essentially a good piece of legislation; but it could be detrimental to the west coast fishermen, and they are rather sceptical of it in many cases, inasmuch as the prices support board will apply only to cod, which is a small item, taken in general, on the Pacific coast. So that in the condition in which we find ourselves in this country, being short of United States dollars, we could very well allow these fishermen to export their salmon and enjoy the premium price. At the same time it would bring in United States dollars to this country. I am sure that the members from British Columbia, such as the hon. member for Fraser Valley and the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, could enjoy eating goldeye or east coast cod.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Never.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: They could sacrifice their ability to consume high quality fish in the meantime so that the fishermen could enjoy those high prices. I outline this programme to the minister because I have no doubt it will become a burning issue in the not far distant future.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): Far be it from me to throw any rocks at the hon. member for Skeena. I want to congratulate him on what is probably the most reasonable speech I ever heard him make in the house.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Just one of the last twenty.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): With respect to Gaspe salmon enjoying the privilege of export to the United States, I wish to point out that it is comparable with our own spring salmon which we market fresh. I am sure the minister will tell him that if they wish this privilege, all they have to do is ask for a permit and they will receive it; and they can export all the spring salmon they have. There has been quite a high level of speeches in the house tonight. I am sure the minister has received some valuable suggestions. I, too, wish to congratulate him on the provision of this fund he was speaking of for relief purposes for European feeding. I do not want the committee to feel either that when the fish industry undertakes to deliver $8,000,000 worth of high-class fish products to the government, it is in any sense receiving a dole or subsidy. I think the government has looked around and has found no other source of high protein food available to it at the present time.

Mr. MacNICOL: Good fish produce brains.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): Yes.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: That is the reason we all have them in British Columbia.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): On the setting up of the fisheries prices support board —and that, as I said, was a particularly good job—we are going to face a big problem. I should not like the board, or even members of parliament who are very often fond of talking the government out of money, ever to get the idea that this $25,000,000 is for the support of an industry which has not taken every means in its power to pull itself up by its own effort. We certainly do not want to use this money to create any surplus stocks of fish in this country. I just have the feeling that if certain fish is in surplus supply, the government should come to the conclusion that it would be an excellent plan for them to discontinue heavy fishing of that particular species.

It is getting late, and I sincerely trust that the minister will be able to get through with his estimates tonight; I will do everything I can to facilitate the progress. What I wished to place before the minister is the problem facing the pilchard industry on the west coast, in fish reduction, the making of meal and oil out of pilchards. That is the most hazardous business I know of in Canada. When I was first associated with it in 1926 there were twenty-six plants on the west coast, but through business failures and mortality in

the industry, they are now down to six operations. I might say that the industry is even more hazardous than the by-election, as far as I can see. It has always struck me that the fishing industry has never had from the government anything like the support the agricultural industry has had. Probably there are not enough members from the maritimes. I certainly do not begrudge the farmers any of the legislative measures they have been able to get through this house in order to support that great industry of theirs. However, as far as the pilchard industry is concerned, I feel that in the particular instance where the wartime prices and trade board has undertaken to place an embargo on the export of pilchard meal until we produce ten thousand tons—after that we are allowed to export fifty per cent—there is a measure of unfairness. I might point out that there is a difference in price of approximately $40 a ton in the United States, which is actually our traditional market, and the domestic price which we shall be able to receive. When you speak of ten thousand tons of pilchard meal—and I do not think the industry has any possibility this year of producing anything like that amount—it does seem to me that the minister—and I hesitate to advise him—ought to take a strong stand. When the wartime prices and trade board has undertaken to dictate to the fishing industry what they shall do in a matter of this kind, I feel that we are not being fairly treated. I would suggest to the minister that the industry be allowed to export fifty per cent of its production. I am quite sure that the Minister of Finance will support that measure because we would be able to get a large quantity of United States dollars in that way. I might also point out that if there is small production in the industry, that is certainly the time when we shall need higher prices; and, as the minister knows, there has been a substantial increase this year in the cost of production. I also think this is an appropriate time to call to the attention of the public generally in Canada that the production of fishmeal, rather than being a waste of a high-class fishery product, is actually an important contribution to our agricultural industry, because now we can produce far more beef and poultry by the mixtures of fishmeal with the ordinary grain feed.

Mr. FRASER: Through this $8,000,000 which is being spent, is the fisherman to be guaranteed the present price for his fish? Is that indicated in the agreement or whatever there is when you buy? At the present time I understand that the fisherman gets about two cents a pound.

[Mr. J. L. Gibson.]

Mr. BRIDGES: In the statement which I made the hon. member will note that in the purchase of $8 million worth of fish, prices will be paid which will be regarded as fair to the fishermen at this time.

Mr. MacNICOL: Will the fishermen working in lake Athabaska, Great Slave lake and Great Bear lake profit by the arrangement the minister has announced?

Mr. BRIDGES: What I am referring to there is this $8,000,000 of post-war UNRRA relief. Unfortunately that type of fish does not come from lake Athabaska or Great Slave lake.

Mr. MacNICOL: Where are we getting it from?

Mr. BRIDGES: It has to be of the salted or canned variety, and there is no salted or canned fish coming from lake Athabaska.

Mr. FRASER: There has been quite a controversy across the country in regard to the use of luminous bait for fishing. I understand that comes under the minister's department. It is not provincial; it is federal. I just wondered if the minister had any remark to make with regard to that, because I know it has been taken up in all the provinces across the country, and they all disclaim any responsibility. They say it is purely federal.

Mr. BRIDGES: In reply to the hon. member may I say I will look into the matter. This is the first time it has been brought to my attention by anyone.

Before the item carries, Mr. Chairman, I should like to answer some of the questions that have been asked. Certainly I shall be very brief, because I am most anxious to get as many of these items through as possible. First, I wish to thank the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg for the constructive suggestions he has made. All I can say at the moment is that, of course, they will receive careful consideration. In connection with his remarks concerning the conservation of fisheries on the high seas I would point out that sometime in August a meeting of the food and agriculture organization of the united nations is to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, at which it is hoped that conservation regions will be established or at least considered.

In reply to the question by the hon. member for Queens I would say that the possible or probable break-down—it is really only an approximate break-down—of the $8,000,000 he mentioned is as follows: on the east coast, dried and salted fish, 10,000,000 pounds amounting to approximately $1,800,000; pickled fish, 40,000 barrels amounting to approximately $520,000; bloaters, 50,000 boxes

amounting to $100,000, and canned fish, 100,000 cases amounting to $900,000, making a total of $3,320,000 for the east coast. On the west coast the possible order is for canned herring up to 900,000 cases, which would amount to approximately $4,680,000. Of course these figures are only approximate and they may be varied as time goes on. The hon. member also asked for some comments regarding the existing lobster season on the Atlantic coast. I cannot give him any break-down or special information at the moment with regard to Prince Edward Island, since I did not anticipate that this question would be asked. The final figures are not yet available, since some seasons are still open in the maritime provinces, but it is estimated that the catch is down about thirty per cent and the value down about twenty-five per cent. It is suggested that this is due, first of all, to the unsuitable fishing conditions, and especially to the weather during the early spring season; also, of course, to the scarcity of lobsters; and the price is down because of the less favourable market conditions for both fresh and canned lobster as compared with the brisk markets we had in the past few years in that connection. I think the hon. member also asked whether anything would be done under the prices support act as far as lobsters were concerned. No definite, permanent policy has been announced as yet as far as the board is concerned, and all I can say at the moment is that for the time being it is not the intention of the department to recommend to the board that lobsters come under that act.

The hon. member for Gaspe offered some remarks and referred especially to the fact that the Quebec united fishermen were not represented on the fisheries research board. If it were possible to give them representation on that board I should be only too happy to do so, but unfortunately at the present time all the positions on the board are filled. There are three representatives from the province of Quebec, but they happen to be scientists from McGill university, the university of Montreal, and Laval university. It does happen that, as far as Quebec is concerned, there is no representative on the board of the industry, either cooperative or what one might call private enterprise.

The hon. member for St. John-Albert asked quite a long series of questions. I am afraid I shall not be able to answer them all this evening. As far as Atlantic salmon are concerned, however, I would point out that investigations have been carried on in the bay of Fundy area for the past three years. If the hon. member will refer to the annual report of the fisheries research board for 1946, he will see in it some reference to this matter.

In regard to reports and investigations made with respect to certain dams on certain rivers I would advise the hon. member that a report was made in respect of the dam on the Great Salmon river. That report is in the department, and I shall be only too happy to let him have it. In addition, an engineering investigation is being made to devise ways and means of improving the situation there.

As to the investigations mentioned in the press concerning the Nashwaak river, I would advise the hon. member that the water in that river is still too high to permit those investigations to be carried on. I believe the water is still nine or ten feet above the ordinary summer level.

As to the dam at Newcastle Bridge, I am afraid that is something I shall have to look into; at the moment I cannot seem to remember it.

Then I should like to point out with regard to the regulations concerning clams in the bay of Fundy area that all we do in this connection is impose the prohibition on the digging of clams after we have been so advised by the Department of National Health and Welfare. A careful investigation is being made by the St. Andrew's biological station of the fisheries research board in conjunction with the officials of the Department of National Health and Welfare, and every effort is being made to find a solution to this most difficult and unfortunate problem in that area.

In regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for Skeena, I wish to thank the hon. member for his compliments as far as I am concerned. I would point out that this question of an embargo or export control on raw salmon in British Columbia, frozen and fresh, is not new this year, but is the continuation of a policy which has been in existence for some years. Not only is there an embargo on the export of the raw salmon; there is also an embargo on the export of canned salmon. It is quite possible that certain persons would like to obtain the benefit of the higher prices in the United States market, just as I have no doubt persons engaged in agriculture would like the benefit of higher United States prices, but there are similar regulations against the export of certain agricultural products as well. However I believe the export of red spring salmon to the United States market will not be too difficult, and I understand that permits will be freely issued by the representatives of the

Department of Trade and Commerce. It is intended to have the whole policy as flexible as possible.

I do not think there is any need of going into these matters in greater detail at the moment. To revert to the remarks of the hon. member for St. John-Albert concerning lobster hatcheries and lobster rearing ponds, I know a report was made on this matter, of which report I think I sent the hon. member a copy. It dealt with the advisability of reestablishing either or both hatcheries and rearing ponds, but our scientists have not come to the conclusion that they have been of the great benefit so many people think they are in Maine and Massachusetts. I am frank to admit that I am insisting that the matter be further studied, because of the arguments which have been advanced over the years, and because the fact that these hatcheries and rearing ponds have been maintained in those states undoubtedly indicates that they must have made some contribution to an increase in the take of lobsters in those areas. At any rate I assure the hon. member, as I would also assure the hon. member for Charlotte if he were here, that the matter is still being carefully considered.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): Before we pass this main item, may I say I was interested in the minister's figure of $4,680,000 with which he purchased 900,000 cases of fish on the Pacific coast. It works out at $5.20 a case. Is that the correct figure?

Mr. BRIDGES: It is only an approximation.

Item agreed to.

77. Building fishways and clearing rivers, $25,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): This item is much too low. The amount mentioned could be spent on any one of a dozen streams in British Columbia in connection with the clearance of obstructions. How much of this $25,000 is to be spent on the project which the minister and his department know is so dear to the hearts of the fishermen along the south coast of British Columbia, namely the building of the fishway dam at Saginaw lake.

Mr. BRIDGES: I told my hon. friend some time ago that investigations are being made about this.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): They have not yet been completed?

Mr. BRIDGES: No.

Item agreed to.

79. Fish culture, $306,000.

Mr. McLURE: Are the millponds in different parts of the maritime provinces, and particularly Prince Edward Island, now being used as breeding ponds for fish, or as fish culture ponds? I know that in Prince Edward Island several of these old mill dams and millponds have gone out of use as mill property, and the government took over some of them for purposes of reconstruction, with a view to making them ponds for fish culture and fish breeding.

Mr. BRIDGES: I am told that we are working out a joint scheme with the Prince Edward Island government; that we are cooperating with them and using the properties for that purpose.

Item agreed to.

80. Oyster culture, $37,580.

Mr. McLURE: What is the revenue from royalties and from leases in the maritimes? What is the value in dollars and cents of oysters imported from the United States into Canada? What amounts of oysters, either dried or in barrels, are imported from other places?

Mr. BRIDGES: The revenue to December 31, 1946, was $8,235.23 as compared with $6,116.53 for the fiscal year 1945-46, or a gain of approximately $2,100. I have no figures with respect to importations of oysters from the United States.

Item agreed to.

Fisheries Research Board of Canada—

81. Operation and maintenance, $789,000.

Mr. MacNICOL: I note that $407,000 is for temporary wages and salaries and only $86,000 for permanent. Why is there so much for temporary assistance?

Mr. BRIDGES: Employees of the research board are not regarded as civil servants, and are taken on as temporary employees.

Mr. HODGSON: Does the fisheries research board or the federal department contribute in any way toward research with respect to the freshwater fisheries on the great lakes? I know it is mainly under provincial jurisdiction. Is there any federal contribution at all?

Mr. BRIDGES: In so far as the great lakes are concerned, and the inland fisheries of Ontario, the fisheries research board has not been making any studies in those waters.

Item agreed to.

85. To provide for Canadian share of expenses of the international Pacific salmon fisheries commission to overcome obstructions to the ascent of sockeye salmon at Hell's Gate canyon and for investigating and overcoming obstructions to such salmon at other points on the Fraser river watershed (revote), $300,000.

Mr. MacNICOL: This refers to a large sum of money which, I know, is to be put to good use by the international board for the conservation of fisheries in connection with the Pacific coast salmon industry. The minister heard the hon. member for New Westminster, perhaps the best-posted member in the house on fisheries problems, and his statements respecting the effect of dams on the Columbia river. Was the hon. member's statement correct with respect to preventing the salmon coming up the Columbia river into British Columbia?

Mr. BRIDGES: What the hon. member was referring to actually occurred many years ago, before my time in the department. I did not know until I heard about it this evening, to be perfectly frank.

Mr. MacNICOL: There are two very large dams not far south of the boundary. One at Grand Coulee is a dam 550 feet high, and then there is another dam almost as high, fifty miles down the river. The hon. member's statement sounded serious to me, if the whole of the Columbia river in British Columbia is no longer to be the spawning ground for salmon. It will certainly have a marked effect on the salmon industry of British Columbia.

Mr. BRIDGES: Both the dams on the Columbia river are in the United States. I am sorry I cannot give more information.

Mr. MacNICOL: Do I understand that the salmon do not any longer ascend the Columbia river into British Columbia?

Mr. BRIDGES: I do not know.

Item agreed to.

87. To provide for transportation, dressing and dyeing, and other expenses incidental to receiving and disposing of fur seal skins accruing to Canada pursuant to provisional fur seal agreement between Canada and the United States by exchange of notes dated December 8 and 19, 1942, $400,000.

Mr. McLURE: On item 87—

Mr. GREEN: Eleven o'clock.

Mr. MacNICOL: Call it eleven o'clock. I did not receive an answer to my question. It is incredible that the Columbia river is no longer a salmon spawning river in British Columbia.

Mr. BRIDGES: My information is that the Columbia river never did produce salmon commercially for Canadian interests. I do not know very much about it, to be perfectly frank.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): And it never did.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, July 9, 1947

The house met at ten o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. With what provinces have agreements been reached for the provincial department to handle family allowance investigation work?

2. What are the financial arrangements with each province in the carrying out of this work?

Mr. MARTIN: Stand.

Mr. WRIGHT: May I ask a question of the Minister of National Health and Welfare? When can I expect an answer to part 1 of this question—before the conclusion of the session?

Mr. MARTIN: I cannot add anything to what I have already said. I hope to be in a position later to deal with the matter more definitely. I cannot say when.

CANADIAN ARMY—CAPT. H. E. GILBERT

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. At what date was Captain Harry Edward Gilbert discharged from the Canadian army?

2. What was the reason for his discharge?

3. What was his age?

4. Did he make application to be retained in the Canadian forces?

5. How many years of service did he have in the Canadian army?

6. What is the rate of pension he is to be paid for his services?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. March 8, 1947.

2. He was considered for service in the interim force and Canadian army (Active force) but the officers selection committee did not select him from among the large number of applicants and he was retired under the provisions of KR (Can) 267 (c).

3. At date of retirement he was 33 years of age.

4. Yes.

5. Permanent force and Canadian army (active), 11 years 233 days; Non-permanent active militia, 4 years 194 days. Total service, 16 years 62 days.

6. He will receive a retiring allowance under the provisions of the Militia Pension Act Part V as follows—

(a) Until he is 65 years of age, $677.91 per annum.

(b) After that age, $1,016.86 per annum.

TRANS-CANADA AIR LINES—SWIFT CURRENT AND MEDICINE HAT

Mr. THATCHER:

1. Have the cities of Swift Current and Medicine Hat been made stop-over points on one of the trans-continental main line flights of T.C.A.?

2. Has it been decided to make Moose Jaw a similar stop-over point?

3. If not, for what reason?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Yes, as of July 1, 1947.

2. No.

3. A regular stop is made on all T.C.A.'s transcontinental flights at the city of Regina, which is approximately 40 miles from the City of Moose Jaw. Frequent stops on a transcontinental mainline flight and considerably to the scheduled time of the through service. Local service is provided to the City of Moose Jaw by Canadian Pacific Air Lines with connections to T.C.A.'s through transcontinental service at Regina and Saskatoon.

MATADOR RANCH

Mr. MENARY:

1. Has the government purchased the Matador ranch, situated in Alberta and Saskatchewan?

2. If so, how many acres did it contain and how much per acre was paid therefor?

3. What was the total purchase price?

4. For what purpose was the ranch purchased?

5. Who is now the owner?

6. Has the area thereof been subdivided by the government? If so, how and why?

7. For what purposes has the area been used since acquired by the government?

8. Has any part of it been leased? If so, to whom and on what terms?

9. Have any buildings been built thereon by the government? If so, how many and what is the outlay for each?

10. Has the government employed any person to manage directly or work on the ranch? If so, what is his name and at what salary or wage is he paid?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier):

1. No.

2 to 10. See answer No. 1.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

DESIGN FOR CANADIAN FARM HOUSE

Mr. WINKLER:

1. Has the national research council or any other department of government done any research toward plans for the construction of a suitable and distinctive Canadian farm house?

2. If so, when and by whom?

3. Have any provincial governments offered to cooperate in the production of plans for a farm house? If so, which?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Yes, Central Mortage and Housing Corporation.

2. Since February last, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has been actively promoting the organization of an extensive research programme, having as its object the development of a number of house plans and designs particularly suited to the needs of farm families, and improved modern equipment for farm homes.

3. As a result of discussions which Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has held during the last few months with the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, a prairie rural housing committee has been established representing the three prairie governments, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and the Dominion Department of Agriculture, to plan a programme of rural housing research. This committee held a special meeting in Saskatoon on May 20, 1947 and as a result, seven specific rural housing research projects were recommended. The recommendation in respect of each project also suggested at what prairie research institution the particular project should be conducted.

The research projects to be investigated are improved farm house plans, more economical methods of wall construction using materials available locally, the development of improved running water and sewage disposal systems for farm homes, farm house electric lighting and electrical appliances, better methods of heating farm houses, a special study of farm kitchen planning and equipment, and the development of a few suitable designs for the construction of rural community centres. The individual projects are now being considered by the governments concerned, and it is expected an early start will be made on most of the projects, particularly the study of farm house plans. The research programme will be financed jointly by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the three prairie governments.

There has also been established in British Columbia a rural housing committee through which the British Columbia government and

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation will carry on research and promotional activities in an effort to improve the standard of rural housing in that province.

ALEXANDER GRAHAM BELL COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMPS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many of the Alexander Graham Bell commemorative postage stamps were (a) issued; (b) distributed?
2. Are the plates destroyed?
3. Is it intended to issue any more?
4. How many sheets were unperforated and retained by the Postmaster General or his department?
5. Was this stamp issue made available to the postmasters in the smaller post offices?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): In answer to the first question, generally we do not give this information until six months after the stamp has been issued and distributed; but since the newspapers have already given the information today I have no objection to answering it. The answers are as follows:

1. (a) 25,000,000 (b) 25,000,000.
2. No.
3. No.
4. None.
5. Yes.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

EXTENDED SITTINGS—HOURS OF DUTY OF PAGE BOYS AND OTHERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): In view of the long hours that we are now making it necessary for the page boys and others to be on duty, may I ask the Prime Minister whether consideration might be given either to staggering their hours or providing overtime, or both?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would say to my hon. friend that I am sure His Honour the Speaker will take all necessary care of the officials of the house.

Mr. REID: What about the stenographers?

Mr. KNOWLES: Hear, hear.

IMMIGRATION

DISPLACED PERSONS—INQUIRY AS TO EXTENSION OF REGULATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. W. SKEY (Trinity): May I ask the acting Minister of Mines and Resources if he can elucidate on the order published yesterday that displaced persons to the number of five thousand will be admitted to Canada? I want to know whether this new extension of the immigration regulation covers people in Europe other than displaced persons.

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Acting Minister of Mines and Resources): The order which was tabled in the house some days ago provides only for displaced persons. Immigration of other types of persons is moving to Canada steadily, and has no reference to this particular order.

Mr. SKEY: It applies only to those in camps?

Mr. HOWE: That is right.

TRADE AND COMMERCE

INQUIRY AS TO EFFECT ON CANADA OF 25 PER CENT CUT IN BRITISH IMPORTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): May I direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce? I am sorry that I did not give more notice than I have, but I did send him the newspaper clipping this morning as soon as I saw him. My question has to do with a statement made by Mr. Herbert Morrison in the British House of Commons yesterday as to the possibility very shortly of a twenty-five per cent cut in imports to the United Kingdom. I should like the minister to comment upon that statement and to indicate whether any consultation has taken place between this government and the United Kingdom government, and also how it may affect our economy.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The hon. member for Peel spoke to me as we were coming into the chamber. The matter to which he refers is receiving the earnest attention of the officials of Trade and Commerce, of myself and also of my colleagues, the Minister of Finance and the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It would appear that the United Kingdom government feels that it has to restrict imports, and this will affect Canada. Among other things, newsprint will likely be affected. It happens that newsprint is in scarce supply in parts of Canada, particularly in Alberta and British Columbia, as far as our own newspapers are concerned. On the other hand, there is of course a great market for Canadian newsprint for which we can get American dollars not only in the United States but in other countries in this hemisphere. However, the producers of Canada are very anxious about this matter, inasmuch as it may affect the traditional market we have enjoyed in the United Kingdom, and that is being watched very closely.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

ANNUAL REPORT FOR YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 1947

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I wish to ask the Minister of Labour a question. I believe he tabled the unemployment insurance report for the year ended March 31, 1947. Has this report been printed, and will it be available when we deal with the estimates of his department?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I do not think so but I will inquire. As soon as it is printed I will see that a copy is forwarded, in English and French, to every member of the house.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS

ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCE TO GOVERNMENT AND OPPOSITION LEADERS IN SENATE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a measure to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act to provide an additional annual allowance to the member of the senate occupying the recognized position of leader of the government in the senate and the member occupying the recognized position of leader of the opposition in the senate.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

Mr. KNOWLES: We are definitely opposed to this resolution and to the bill which it is proposed to base upon it. As a matter of fact, had I realized that it was this item that was being called a moment ago when the Speaker was in the chair we would have opposed the motion for the Speaker to leave the chair. It so happens that last night the Minister of Veterans Affairs told us that this morning there would be nothing but third readings and supply. We did not expect this until this afternoon.

Mr. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend will find that I envisioned the possibility of this bill being called any time today.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister envisioned the possibility of its being called this afternoon, but that is neither here nor there, though it is the reason I did not realize that this was the item that was being called. However, now that we are in committee I want to state our definite opposition to this measure and to indicate

to the Prime Minister that if it is the intention of the government to proceed with it and to bring in a bill based upon it, we shall oppose it at all succeeding stages.

To us this seems a strange expression of the promise of the Liberal party down through the years to reform the senate. To us the function played by the senate in our Canadian life is a useless one, and to be strengthening its position in this way just does not come very well from a Liberal government.

I want to make this one point very clear, Mr. Chairman, that in our opposition to this measure we are not expressing any criticism of the two hon. senators immediately affected by the proposal. I personally have a great deal of regard for both these hon. gentlemen. Though I do not know personally the government leader in the other place, I have had occasion a number of times to read speeches he has made and I have been impressed with his attitude towards both domestic and international affairs. I recognize him as a distinguished public servant. I may say also, as regards the opposition leader in the senate, that I have known him personally a good many years and in the province from which we both come, despite any differences of ideas or political opinions that may be held, he is held in high regard in every quarter. I say that in the hope that in this discussion no one will introduce any personalities at all.

To us, however, the principle of strengthening and rendering still more vested the interest in the other place is contrary to the whole principle of representative democracy. It is contrary to the promises of the Liberal party down through the years to reform the senate, and we believe it is contrary to the wishes of the Canadian people.

Further, I might point out that there is a definite incongruity in this session between the kind of measures we seem to find time to pass, such as this one, and the fact that we have not time to pass or to deal with an important measure such as the labour code. Therefore I wish to make it known that we in this group are definitely opposed to this measure.

Resolution reported and read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the resolution be read a second time?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Now.

Mr. KNOWLES: On division.

Resolution read the second time on division and concurred in. Mr. Mackenzie King, thereupon, moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 443, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. KNOWLES: On division.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Speak louder.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the said bill be read a second time?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Now.

Mr. KNOWLES: Next sitting.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Now.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Next sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would ask hon. members to moderate their voices. It is impossible to proceed with the business of the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I realize that it would require the unanimous consent of the house to proceed with the second reading at this moment, but seeing that there is only one clause in the measure and that it is so readily understood, I thought that at this stage of the session the house would permit the second reading this morning. However, if hon. gentlemen of the C.C.F. group are opposed to the second reading taking place this morning, perhaps they would permit it to take place later on today. I ask that simply because I am anxious to expedite the business of the session and there are some other matters to which I have to give a great deal of attention in these closing days.

Mr. MacINNIS: It seems to be the practice of the government to hold contentious measures back until the end of the session and then try to force them through because of lack of time. We are not opposed to the sections of this bill; we are opposed to the principle of it and do not intend to facilitate its passage.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As I understand it, the C.C.F. do not give their consent to proceeding with second reading today?

Mr. KNOWLES: That is right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then, we shall proceed with second reading tomorrow.

An hon. MEMBER: The government will railroad it through tomorrow.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Demobilization and reconversion—

551. To provide for the orderly establishment and organization of the defence forces of the army, navy and air services on a peacetime basis and to authorize commitments against future years in the amount of $29,833,648—$226,709,331.

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Chairman, the practice has been for ministers of the defence departments in introducing their estimates to make a general statement covering the work done in the previous year as well as plans for the future.

On June 17, 1947, P.C. 2372 was adopted providing that the members of the armed forces shall cease to be on active service as at September 30, 1947. At that time the formal change from a war to a peace footing for the armed services will be related to the inauguration of a campaign to obtain recruits for the active and reserve forces. In the meantime, however, now that our wartime forces have in fact ended the work to which they had set their hands, it will, I believe, be the wish of hon. members that a brief summary of the facts and figures of their accomplishments should be set down in *Hansard* as a permanent record of a magnificent achievement.

Canada's war record in reminding us of the nature of modern war will inspire and strengthen us to work with other nations to create the conditions for enduring peace. Canada's part in two wars will lead us, until progress is made in ensuring peace through collective action, to establish our own forces on a post-war basis which will be related to the defence needs of the country as these may change from time to time. Our policy must be informed by war time experience just as it is inspired by war time achievements.

In the statement which follows, after reviewing the achievements in war I propose to set out what I take to be the defence needs of Canada, to indicate some of the matters which must receive the most immediate attention and to describe long-term objectives with regard to the department and the armed forces.

The war of liberation started on September 1, 1939. Germany's brutal attack on Poland was followed by the so-called "phony war", when Germany was growing in strength to

make the sweep through Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium and France. From the fall of France in June, 1940, until Russia was brought into the war a year later, Britain and the countries of the commonwealth stood almost alone. The will to be free was for a time the main armour that stood against the evil thrust to make Germany supreme and everyone else slaves.

Canadian territory was not attacked but from the outset we recognized that this was a fight in which our vital interests were involved, and, by act of our own government on the all but unanimous support of our own parliament, we entered the war on September 10, 1939. Our contribution mounted steadily.

At sea, our main job was to keep the bridge of ships open to Britain. The submarine menace was a major threat. Our young navy carried out a major part of the work of escort across the Atlantic. At the start of the war our navy had 1,769 full-time officers and men. Before its end, 100,000 men had passed through its ranks and we had a total of 780 ships.

The first division left Canada in December, 1939, and was joined by the second division early in 1940. These two divisions were among the few bodies of trained troops ready to withstand a German assault on Britain and some of them at Dieppe paved the way for future landings. The first Canadian infantry division landed at Sicily in July, 1943 and was followed soon by the fifth Canadian armoured division and other units. These comprised the first Canadian corps and fought up the whole long length of Italy to the finishing battles on the river Po.

The third Canadian infantry division landed on D-Day, June 6, 1944 followed by the second Canadian infantry division and the fourth Canadian armoured division. The Canadian Army was formed in July, 1944, comprising the second Canadian corps and the first British corps. The Canadian Army took a foremost part in the fighting in Normandy and up the channel ports through Holland, and Germany beyond the Rhine. Forming part of the Canadian army at one time or another were all but two of the British divisions, as well as a number of American divisions, a Polish armoured division, a Belgian brigade and a Czech brigade. The Canadian army was an effective international force and its components got on well together under Canadian leadership, of our own General H. D. G. Crerar, Companion of Honour. Early in 1945 more than half a million men of half a dozen countries formed the Canadian army which stretched over 250 miles of front and being at this time probably the largest single army formation on the western front. From the beaches through Caen, Falaise, by the channel ports, over the Scheldt and Rhine, the Canadians lived up to the reputation they had made in world war I.

Our peacetime permanent force of 4,492 officers and men was multiplied more than a hundred and sixty times. Before the war was over 709,007 men had served in the Canadian army, in addition to 21,618 members of the Canadian Women's Army Corps.

The British commonwealth air training plan from its start in December, 1939, was a spectacular undertaking. Soon we had nearly 200 training schools across Canada. By the time the plan was finished it had trained 42,110 young flyers from the United Kingdom (including 5,293 Royal Air Force and Fleet Air Arm pilots trained in Canada at R.A.F. schools prior to July, 1942 when these schools became part of B.C.A.T.P.) 9,606 from Australia, and 7,002 from New Zealand. In addition we trained 72,835 Canadian air crew, and altogether a total of 131,553 air crew. It is believed that Canada had the highest per capita number of air crew of any nation fighting in the war.

The first Canadian flyers to reach the other side were members of auxiliary squadrons. These were soon followed by a steady flow of pilots, navigators, air gunners, radar operators and the all-important ground crew. At the outbreak of war there were 2,948 officers and men in the R.C.A.F. During the war a total of 249,624 Canadians served in the Royal Canadian Air Force in addition to another 4,000 serving with the Royal Air Force.

Canadians came to play their part, to offer their lives, from the farms, the woods, the mines, the city streets, the workshops and the schools. Here is a summary of their numbers and of the losses suffered.

Served During the War	Men	Women	Total
Navy	99,479	7,043	106,522
Army	709,007*	21,618	730,625
Air Force	232,594	17,030	249,624
Totals	1,041,080	45,691	1,086,771

Casualties	Killed	Wounded	Total
Navy	1,981	319	2,300
Army	22,964	51,410	74,374
Air Force	17,047	1,416	18,463
Totals	41,992	53,145	95,137

*This includes 3,633 women members of the R.C.A.M.C.

Twelve lists of the Canadians who were awarded operational or foreign decorations

were placed on *Hansard* by my predecessors taking the fine record up to October, 1945. I believe it would be the wish of the house that the gallant story of those who were decorated should be completed by placing on *Hansard* those names which have not previously been recorded here. The list is long and, with the consent of the committee, I suggest that it be printed as an appendix to *Hansard* when the sessional flood of printing has somewhat abated.

A summary of all awards from the commencement of the War in September, 1939 to March 31, 1947 follows:—

	Navy	Army	Air Force	Total
British Awards.	1,677	11,932	8,735	22,344
Foreign Awards.	54	1,475	213	1,742
Totals	1,731	13,407	8,948	24,086

Included in this final list are four more Canadians who were awarded the Victoria Cross. The citations for these awards have always previously been placed on *Hansard*, and with the consent of the committee I will have these citations printed in the appendix to which I have referred. The additional Canadians to whom the Victoria Cross was awarded are: Lieutenant Robert Hampton Gray, RCNVR, (deceased); Honorary Captain John Weir Foote, Canadian chaplain services; Company Sergeant Major John Robert Osborn, Winnipeg Grenadiers, (deceased); Pilot Officer Andrew Charles Mynarski, RCAF, (deceased).

Canada made notable contributions to the war in the supply of munitions, food and financial assistance to the allied cause. Canada produced finished munitions of war to a total of about $10 billion. Despite the fact that 25 per cent of our younger farmers joined the armed forces or worked in munitions, the farmers of Canada produced more than 40 per cent more food than in 1939 and by making our surpluses available to Britain and other countries prevented starvation succeeding where the enemy had failed.

The total cost of the war to Canada and its immediate aftermath to March 31, 1947 is estimated at $20·25 billions. Of this $6·43 billions was spent in mutual aid or other financial assistance to our allies.

At the peak of war production 1,166,000 men and women worked directly in the production of munitions and, with the 1,086,771 in the armed forces, made a total of more than two and a quarter million Canadians who served either in the fighting forces or in the direct production of munitions.

These figures give the measure of the problem of demobilization, rehabilitation, and reconversion. At the peak, which may be taken to be V-E day, May 8, 1945, there were 349,159 Canadians in England and Europe, including R.C.N. who moved under their own steam. Before they had all been brought home, there were 37,016 wives and 14,630 children, making a total repatriation job for about 400,000 persons. In addition to this total some 10,000 dependents, wives and children had been brought to Canada prior to V-E day. This was proceeded with more expeditiously, more smoothly and with less discomfort than anyone could have hoped for. There are 127 members of the armed forces still in the United Kingdom and Europe, doing work in connection with graves and records, including our military mission to Berlin and liaison staff in the United Kingdom. That work will have to continue for some time. There are some 1,000 dependents who have long ago been offered transportation which for one reason or another they have so far been unable to take advantage of but who still want to come to Canada.

The repatriation and demobilization of the armed forces ranked first in priority and the way this was organized and pressed through to completion by both my immediate predecessors earned the gratitude of the hundreds of thousands concerned and of their families, indeed of all Canadians.

From time to time suitable tributes have been paid to the ministers and deputies, to the generals and privates, to the workers and the farmers who did their utmost. Canada's national effort in the war was a great national partnership.

We have tried to ensure for our sailors, soldiers, and airmen that they should not be any worse off because they had served. Consequently parliament authorized the introduction of what is regarded everywhere as the most comprehensive and generous plan of rehabilitation in effect in any country. That work and the work of hospitalization and treatment will go on.

The liquidation of surplus war stores proceeded alongside the demobilization of men. At the close of the war in September, 1945 in Canada we had more than a billion and a half dollars worth of military equipment and munitions. At one time or another in Canada there were some 6,000 different military establishments, all of which have had to be examined to decide which should be kept and which should be disposed of.

We have kept the munitions necessary to equip the Canadian active and reserve forces on a scale never before known. We have also quantities of stores for replacement and a large quantity of stores for mobilization reserves. But more than a billion dollars worth was declared surplus, and the operation of putting all this material in condition for dis-

tribution, storage or disposal made the Canadian armed forces and War Assets Corporation the greatest warehousing and merchandising concerns in the history of the country.

As men were demobilized from the armed forces, civilians were taken on to replace them in the work of demobilization and liquidation, with the result that the civilian personnel reached almost to its wartime peak in December, 1946 with a total of 33,000. As the work of warehousing and disposal was being pressed forward with all possible speed, we were able to reduce the numbers of civilian personnel and at 31st March, 1947 the figure was 20,131 or a reduction of 13,131 representing 37 per cent in four months.

Mr. STIRLING: That is for the three services?

Mr. CLAXTON: That is right, and the three departments until their unification. As the work of consolidation and disposal is proceeded with, there will be further reductions from time to time. Every possible care will be taken to see that these reductions are effected with the least possible hardship to individuals. The small amount of disturbance or complaint in consequence of reductions already made reflects on the capacity of our national economy to absorb these people and also on the good sense of the Canadian people to recognize that there is no justification for keeping them on any longer than they are needed.

The civilians now on strength of the department total 19,783. Of these 9,249 are civil servants, or do work similar to that done by civil servants, the remainder are prevailing rate employees engaged in the dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, in the construction or conversion of married quarters, in the handling of stores, in various duties, like watchmen, caretakers, firefighters and so on. Our plan is to have as much of this type of work done by civilians as possible, so as to have as many as we can of our armed forces engaged on planning, training and operations.

This brings me to a consideration of the defence needs of Canada, the organization of our defence forces and the progress made to date.

Taking up first the question of the defence needs of Canada, Canada's defence forces may be required,—

1. to defend Canada against aggression;

2. to assist the civil power in maintaining law and order within the country;

3. to carry out any undertakings which by our own voluntary act we may assume in co-operation with friendly nations or under any effective plan of collective action under the united nations.

Obviously our needs must be considered in the light of circumstances as they change from time to time. The factors bearing on this are numerous. Among them, the following are particularly important:

(a) the geographical position of Canada;
(b) the capacity of any possible aggressor to make an attack;
(c) the disposition of friendly nations;
(d) what may be called "the international climate."

Developments in warlike materials, particularly new weapons, have an important bearing on the whole position. As the war neared its end, four new weapons had been introduced and were in process of development. These were the atomic bomb, jet-propelled planes, rockets and higher speed submarines.

Sufficient quantities of any one of these four new weapons probably would have been sufficient to win the war for the side which had them first. These new weapons and the chemical and bacteriological agents now known are so much more devastating than anything previously used that of themselves they may make major changes in the nature of war, should war come again to scourge the earth.

These new powerful weapons reinforce the powerful appeal of those who work to make war impossible. What we have seen of destruction and devastation in world wars I and II would be small in character or extent when compared with the appalling destructiveness of any further large-scale war. For this reason our first line of defence and the object of all our policy must be to work with other nations to prevent war.

This is just as true today in Canada as it is in every other country. Distance and space still combine to give us great natural advantages for which we cannot be too grateful, but distance and space have been drastically reduced and are still shrinking; and the shaping of world events and the changing centres of power have put Canada in a more important strategical position than she has ever been before.

Let us set down here that we believe that it is possible for nations to live in peace—perhaps the fate of humanity depends on this belief becoming an eternal fact. We also believe that in the united nations there is the beginning of an organization which may be developed progressivly into a great instrument for peaceful cooperation. But that progress depends on the way in which powers, and particularly the great powers, work with each other. While the proceedings of the assembly

last December gave some ground for encouragement, it is still too early for this or any nation to rest on its arms with the assurance that there will be no aggression.

As the first aim of our foreign policy is peace, so the first aim of our defence policy is defence against aggression.

Having set out what I take to be the defence needs of Canada, it is quite evident that the need for defence forces at any given time must be considered with regard to the proportion of the national budget which we are prepared to spend for that purpose. The business of government involves the balancing of means and ends. No government department would be worth its salt if it was ever satisfied with the functions it was exercising. No defence force will ever be satisfied.

But quite apart from budgetary considerations, I doubt if more than the sum sought of $240,000,000 could be wisely spent in Canada on defence during the current fiscal year. While much progress has been made no one appreciates more than myself that there is still a lot of work to be done in reorganization before we can provide a proper organizational and administrative basis for any defence forces that we may have in the future.

The sum of $240,000,000 will represent about 12 per cent of our national budget. It compares with $35 millions spent in 1938-39 or the low figure of $13 millions for 1932-33. Last year the appropriations voted for the three departments totalled $486,849,141 millions and the expenditures for the year totalled $383,325,686. The amount underspent is partly accounted for by the very much more rapid rate at which our forces were repatriated and demobilized than anticipated. The estimates for 1946-47 were prepared on the assumption that the strength of the three services would total throughout the year 98,360 whereas halfway through the year by October 1, the actual strength had been reduced by demobilization to 55,132. Another reason contributing to the difference between appropriations and expenditures was the postponement of defence purchasing and construction in favour of civilian purchasing and construction.

The work of repatriation and demobilization is to all intents and purposes complete. The work of overhauling and liquidating stores is rather more than 75 per cent complete. We still have, however, large numbers of civilian and service personnel engaged in this work and some of them will be engaged on this for a year or more longer.

In addition, we have a very large number of civilian and service personnel engaged in making necessary conversions in camps and air stations so as to fit in with the post-war plan. The biggest job being undertaken is to provide married quarters for married personnel. This is the most urgent single need in all three services. We have personnel at work endeavouring to convert into married quarters every available convertible hutment. Our target is to create more than a thousand new dwelling units in Canada this year, but whether or not we can do it depends on the availability of materials and labour. We have largely removed the limitations on what used to be called the married establishments so that anyone in one of the three services who saw active service, and officers over 25 years, and soldiers over 23, who have completed initial training, who are married are entitled to the relevant marriage allowances. Because a large proportion of the officers and men in the armed forces saw service overseas, many of them from the start of the war to the close, a very much larger percentage, probably 65 per cent are married.

At Shilo Camp in Manitoba which I visited during the Easter recess, the military hospital provided assistance at the birth of eleven children in June. Under the regimental institute committees of officers and men and their wives run on a cooperative basis, modern well-equipped butcher and grocery shops, a hairdresser's, a shoemaker's, wet and dry canteens, a moving picture theatre, all kinds of recreations, concerts and dances, as well as a nursery school. In addition to the usual facilities, the army provides a library and a two-room elementary school where sixty children are taught by army-hired instructors and this and similar arrangements elsewhere for the education of the children of our men in the armed forces who are in isolated communities are being geared into the provincial school system.

Despite all our efforts, we are still short of married quarters in almost every establishment, but efforts are being made to remedy this just as soon as possible. I mention this because it shows the changed nature of Canada's post-war armed forces. We aim to create conditions which will attract the best of our young men and enable them to live useful lives as respected citizens of the community.

As in other countries, this is still a year of reorganization. Without excluding other objects of activity, I might mention particularly five matters which have a very high priority in all our activities today

1. Organization.
2. Training of officers.

3. Reserve training.

4. Research.

5. Industrial organization.

As all these matters have been touched upon in speeches before this house and elsewhere, it will shorten the proceedings if I do not develop them here, but I will, of course, be only too glad to answer questions on these or any other matters arising in connection with the department.

Since my appointment in December I have taken advantage of every possible opportunity to visit units of the navy, army and air force in many parts of Canada. The total strength of the active forces today is 32,610. They represent a fine body of fit and highly qualified Canadians, well worthy of taking up the record made for them in world war I and which so many of them helped to make in world war II.

Mr. IRVINE: Is that the total active force in the three services?

Mr. CLAXTON: That is right, active only. I have taken advantage of every possible opportunity to meet representatives of reserve associations, cooperating organizations like the Navy League of Canada and the Air Cadet League, as well as representatives of industry and experts from other countries. All these have extended the most helpful cooperation. In this new world of supersonic talk and saucers flying in formation, it is important that there should be a wide measure of informed and interested support of adequate defence measures by people who have a sense of responsibility and who are willing to accept the responsibility. We can never express too warmly the appreciation this country owes to the officers, N.C.O.'s and men and their civilian friends who, by their voluntary support, maintained our reserve forces through the difficult period of the years between the wars. I must say I am most grateful to them and to their successors who are carrying on now and to all those who have been of such great assistance in this work of national importance.

In closing, I enumerate the long-term objects of the department and services:

1. Progressively closer coordination of armed services and unification of the department so as to form a single defence force, with the three armed services working together as a team.

2. Joint intelligence and planning groups to review defence appreciations and plans.

3. Clothing, food, quarters, pay, pensions and working conditions suitable for young Canadians of high physical and educational standards.

[Mr. Claxton.]

4. Means to provide the active and reserve forces of the three services with adequate numbers of highly qualified officers.

5. Development of reserve forces of an age and with educational and physical standards and training approximating those of the active forces competent to go to sea, take the field or fly in action.

6. Provision for reserve forces of training syllabuses, administration and training officers, and equipment on a larger scale than before the war.

7. Maintaining adequate reserves of equipment and weapons.

8. Close integration of the armed forces, the defence purchasing agency, government arsenals and civilian industry, looking towards standardization and industrial organization to permit of the speedy and complete utilization of our industrial resources.

9. Cooperation between the armed forces the defence research board and private industry regarding defence research so that we keep up to date with regard to the design and planning of weapons.

10. Support for Canadian Arsenals Limited and a limited number of Canadian industries to maintain and increase skills in the design and manufacture of munitions and aircraft.

11. Organization of government departments and civilian agencies capable of putting into immediate effect a plan for civil defence.

12. Government leadership to obtain civilian support of the armed forces.

13. Armed forces to form an integral part of the life of the community.

14. Cooperation with the countries of the commonwealth, the United States and other like-minded countries in working out common standards, planning and training.

These objectives will not be achieved at once but we are working towards them. I hope we shall have the support of all parties and members of this house, of members of the active and reserve armed forces, of industry, indeed of the whole community of Canada. The measures to be taken for the defence of our country are matters of individual interest as well as national responsibility.

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): The statement to which we have just listened from the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Claxton) was in the nature of a rapid synopsis of past, present and the future. I want to add a few words with regard to one portion of this matter, namely, the Royal Canadian Navy. Before I do so I should like to ascertain from the minister what his ideas are with regard to the discussion which should

take place. The trend of his remarks this year all led one to suppose that he desires to look upon the defence forces as one service.

Mr. CLAXTON: No.

Mr. STIRLING: That was the idea I got from the minister's remarks.

Mr. CLAXTON: One team of service forming one armed force.

Mr. STIRLING: The figures which he gave on various occasions in his statement were of the three services combined, and I am glad if, as the minister says, he is ready to receive discussion of the three services separately; for in the past, both before the war and during the war, that was the custom of this committee and I think that it tended to better discussion than if it browsed around amongst the three services.

His remarks, of course, of necessity were brief. In consequence he could not deal as fully as I am sure he would have wished with the services rendered to this country and to the allied cause by the Royal Canadian Navy. He referred to a good part of its duties having been the retention of the bridge between Canada and Europe, but he did not refer to any of the fighting services which they rendered in the far north, in the channel, and in the Mediterranean. One of the things which I should like the minister to deal with later on is the extent to which our ships have been winterized. It is only after hearing accounts of those who served, either in convoy work or in actual fighting in the far north, that we realize the hardships which the sailor has to put up with in that climate. Now that more consideration than ever is given to defence problems in the far north it is necessary, if we expect our ships to serve within the Arctic circle, that we do everything we possibly can to render the ships adequate living quarters.

The minister did not, I think, go into details with regard to the present strength of the navy. I want to draw his attention to the figures of a year ago and to the figures which he gave in answer to certain questions which I put on the order paper in June. It is the duty of the government to devise the strength of the three fighting services. I am not disposed to criticize the government in this regard, for they are in possession of information which is not available to us. They have had the benefit of the discussions of the permanent joint board of defence. Canada and the United States sit together to discuss the problems. I do not know at what levels discussions take place between Canada and the United Kingdom. Perhaps the minister will give us a little information with regard to that; but a year ago the minister's predecessor gave the actual strength of the navy on July 31 as 8,216. He said the permanent force was then 6,005, and he tacked on to that the interim force of 1,137; and hostilities only, approximately 1,000. We have to endeavour to compare with that the figures given in June in reply to my questions. He gave the figure 7,386—I do not know whether to relate that to the 8,216 actual strength last year or to the 6,005 given as the permanent force. I do not know whether the interim force is still a considered unit which was supposed to carry until September 30 of this year. The minister made no reference to that portion of the Canadian navy figures in June; consequently I want some explanation of that.

Of the 7,386 which the minister gave, 3,590 served afloat, which leaves 3,796 on shore establishments. This more than bears out my contention last year that for every seaman afloat there was necessarily a seaman ashore, and it enters into the consideration of the strength in ships. Last year the minister's predecessor gave these figures as two fleet aircraft, two cruisers, twelve destroyers, eighteen frigates and twelve escort mine sweepers, referring to the fact that only certain of these were in commission; and he finished that statement with the following: "there would be a certain proportion of the fleet always in reserve". I presume that that covers the ships which we now own but which are tied up. The minister explained that we have one aircraft carrier which Canada does not own but whose services we benefit from; one cruiser, five destroyers, one frigate, and four minesweepers. But that does not quite tally with the statement attributed to the minister when he met the press on board H.M.C.S. *Nootka,* in which he said he hoped very shortly that there would be an air fleet carrier and four destroyers on one coast and a cruiser and three destroyers on the other. Perhaps the minister would enlarge on that matter of strength. Then he dealt at short length with the civilians now in the employe of the three services, but he did not separate those into their various establishments. I wonder whether he would be good enough to give us the total of the civilians employed for naval purposes, and if possible divide them up into their locations and the work which they are carrying out in the various parts of Canada.

He indicated that up until, I believe, March 31 the numbers were drooping, but I should like to know, whether, in view of the

enormous amount of work he described as being still necessary outside of the fighting people, that figure has risen again or has continued to droop.

Then with regard to the reserve, Canada's plan for her navy has for many years been the retention of a highly trained, efficient, small force which could be readily expanded when the need arose, and the success of that plan was undoubtedly proved during this recent war as it was in the previous one. Now we are sliding back again into the condition of a highly trained but small navy which can again be expanded if unfortunately it should need expansion, and supporting that highly trained force there would be a reserve. The last information I have seen from the minister with regard to that reserve force is that there would be eighteen, possibly twenty divisions, across Canada, and the figures which I have for June 9, 1947, spoke of a force of 2,693, which is a notable increase from a year ago. But it does not come very close to the figure which I think the minister gave as the number which he expected to be able to raise.

That leads me to the point of recruiting. Recruiting in that term is not used with regard to the reserve. What efforts is the minister making to induce the gradual expansion of that reserve in the various divisions across Canada, and where do we stand today with regard to actual recruiting for the navy? A little while ago in the press I read that certain classes of trained personnel were required, but there was no reference at that time to anything in the nature of general recruiting, and I should like the minister to give us an explanation in that regard.

There are two other matters I want to touch on shortly One is that which the minister, both today and two or three weeks ago, referred to,—the question of housing for personnel. It is my information, whether it be correct or not, that the navy has not come off as well as the other two services in the question of providing roofs for married personnel. I do not need to emphasize to the minister the fact that you cannot have a happy service if you are not able to provide reasonably adequate quarters for that portion of the personnel who are married.

The other point that I want to take up is the question whether it would not be possible to give recognition in the way of assistance in transportation at time of leave. I did take this matter up with the minister some weeks ago and he told me that a great deal of consideration had been given to that point when the new rates of pay and allowances were arrived at. He pointed out that it was the opinion of the department that further assistance for transportation on leave for the permanent service was scarcely advisable because the new rates of pay had taken care of it.

The illustration which he gave did not impress me very strongly. He said that the new rates of pay and allowances were such that they brought the men into fair relationship with their brothers in industry. I do not follow that illustration, for this reason. When a man goes into industry he picks and chooses where he will go and decides whether it would be desirable for him to stay there or to move on somewhere else. That is not the case of a man in the service. He is directed to go to a certain place. He is directed to remain there until he is directed to go somewhere else. It would be but reasonable, in a country of the extent of Canada, that our sailors, drawn from every province, and a great many of them from the central provinces, should have some assistance that they may travel to their homes at the times of their leave—assistance in the payment of a certain portion of the cost of that transportation. In many cases when the distance is great they could not afford to do it out of their pay.

We have had a not very good advertisement in the form of "H.M.C.S. Poverty", where eighteen naval ratings purchased a truck because they could not afford to travel otherwise from coast to coast. They pooled their initiative and energy in what the public called "H.M.C.S. Poverty" and drove to the Pacific coast, dropping off en route their members who belonged to other places, and very ably arranging the return journey so that they could pick them up. It does not seem to me that is a very good advertisement of the way we are treating our permanent force employees, and I should like the minister to give further consideration to something in the nature of what, in my railway days in the old country, used to be called privilege tickets.

I understand that the United Kingdom does give assistance to its personnel at the time of their leave. Because they do it is no warrant in itself that we should do it, but when one remembers that the United Kingdom is a tiny country, involving journeys of a few miles comparatively, it makes one recognize the necessity of assisting service people in this country where journeys run into thousands of miles. Surely there is necessity for helping them here.

I should like to understand from the minister before I sit down how he proposes to proceed with this discussion. Item 551 has been called, which covers all three services. I do not know whether he will consider it wise to let the

discussion range over the three services at this time or whether we can discuss naval matters first and then proceed to the other services.

Mr. CLAXTON: The hon. member has raised a question which I must say gives me some difficulty, but perhaps during the adjournment which is about to take place I may have a word with him and the chairman of the committee and representatives of other parties to see what would be the best order. We can proceed to have a general discussion on all the services and the department together, following this with consideration of the details which appear on page 275 under eight items; or we could as the hon. member has just suggested, deal first with general discussion service by service. It is quite immaterial to me and I am completely in the hands of the committee as to which method we should adopt. I certainly feel, with the hon. member for Yale, that we should adopt one course or the other so that we shall know what we are doing.

Mr. STIRLING: May I point out that the details on page 275 do not help us in this regard—

Mr. CLAXTON: That is right.

Mr. STIRLING: —because they are common to all three services.

Mr. CLAXTON: On that account I think it might be better to do it subject by subject after the general discussion. But if there is any disposition or feeling that it is preferable to treat it service by service, I would be quite prepared to meet the wishes of hon. members with regard to that. If the course is acceptable to my hon. friend, during the adjournment I can meet with him and representatives of the other parties and the chairman of the committee, to decide on a course of action. I might now take up some of the other points he raised.

I want to make it quite clear that when I referred to one set of armed forces, I had in mind the continuation of the three services. In our plans for consolidation and cooperation we want to ensure that they work together as a team in one department and under one national defence headquarters, so that they carry into peace time the reality of combined operations which was an essential ingredient of victory in time of war. As has already been pointed out in this house, the reason why one minister of defence was appointed instead of three, was to bring about that result. But it would be quite wrong to suggest that we have in mind anything in the nature of a complete wiping-out of the differences which result from the different functions and are useful in maintaining the traditions of the armed forces.

The hon. member has had an interest in the Royal Canadian Navy which we all know and appreciate. No doubt it began because his father had a distinguished career in the Royal Navy. That interest grew because he himself was once minister of national defence, and now it has flowered because as hon members know, he has a son who is serving in the Royal Canadian Navy. It was my great pleasure and privilege to take the first trip I had on a Canadian naval vessel in H.M.C.S. *Nootka,* which was under the command of Lieut.-Commander Michael Stirling, who was captain of that fine and happy Canadian ship. As to the adequacy of the living quarters, all I can say is that the captain was good enough, while he was occupying his deck cabin, to give up to me his day cabin, and those quarters were adequate indeed.

The plan is to have all Canadian vessels equipped so that they can operate in our northern waters. That is one of the main reasons why the *Warrior* is being exchanged for the *Magnificent.* The *Magnificent* will be winterized. The *Warrior* was not. All the Canadian-built tribal destroyers are winterized; and the *Ontario,* when it puts to sea, will also be winterized. The hope is that our ships will all be winterized and made as comfortable as possible for the fine young officers and men in our Canadian navy, of whom we are exceedingly proud. Conditions will be found to be very different from those at the time when the father of the hon. member for Yale served in the Royal Navy—served I believe as a captain in that splendid service.

With regard to the part played by the navy during the war, its major part of course was in the work of escort. As hon. members will recall, that was referred to in an editorial in the *Saturday Evening Post* as a miracle of the war. But reference could be made to the fact that ships and crew of the Royal Canadian Navy were in every one of the seven seas, and that no less than 10,000 took part in the landings in Normandy, when they supplied over 100 ships.

As the time for the recess has come, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Mr. BRACKEN: May I ask if we shall continue with this business when we come back at two o'clock?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As you will perhaps notice, Mr. Speaker, it is now 11.30, but the motion, as it is worded in the *Votes and Proceedings,* refers to 11.45. However, I moved that 11.30 would be the time for adjournment and that motion was carried; so perhaps you could see that it is now 11.45 by the clock.

At 11.45 a.m. the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at two o'clock.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Demobilization and reconversion—

551. To provide for the orderly establishment and organization of the defence forces of the army, navy and air services on a peace-time basis and to authorize commitments against future years in the amount of $29,833,648, $226,709,331.

Mr. CLAXTON: When the committee adjourned I was endeavouring to answer some of the questions asked by the hon. member for Yale, and particularly to deal with his inquiry as to the order that should be followed in this discussion. I have not had an opportunity of discussing the matter with other hon. members but I think it would meet the convenience of the committee if on the general discussion of these estimates we followed as well as we could the order of navy, army and air force; then later, when we come to details, we might follow the order of those details on page 275 of the estimates. It is recognized, however, that some hon. members may wish to speak on more than one aspect of these matters and of course they should have full opportunity to do so as well as to deal with the work of the department in general. I would suggest that probably the work of the committee would be expedited and the discussion more orderly if as far as possible we followed the order I have indicated in the general discussion, and took up the details under the eight heads listed on page 275. If that is agreeable I shall proceed now to deal with the rest of the questions raised by the hon. member for Yale.

Mr. LENNARD: If one wished to discuss the matter of the cadet corps, would he have to deal with naval cadets under the navy, with army cadets under the army and air force cadets under the air force, or where should one discuss the cadet questions?

[Mr. Mackenzie.]

Mr. CLAXTON: If the hon. member chooses to discuss navy cadets exclusively then I should think it might be convenient to do so in the early part of the discussion. However, I am sure the committee will accommodate itself to the discussion as we go along. If that is the general understanding I shall proceed to answer the rest of the questions put by the hon. member for Yale.

The CHAIRMAN: Then do I understand it is agreeable to the committee to proceed in accordance with the suggestion of the minister?

Mr. GREEN: I do not think we should be bound. If the minister goes ahead with his discussion we will see how it works out.

Mr. CLAXTON: The next question put by the hon. member for Yale was with regard to the strength of the navy. As at June 15 the strength of the active navy was 6,621 officers and men, which figure is included in the total of 32,610 for the three active forces which I mentioned this morning. In addition there is on the strength of the navy at the present time, until September 30, in interim and "hostilities only" personnel some 820, making a total strength of 7,441 for the naval forces of Canada, active, interim and "hostilities only".

The hon. member asked about recruiting, and what measures were being taken to obtain recruits. I should say the recruits have been coming in at a satisfactory rate. In toto the navy is nearly up to the ceiling of 75 per cent of the ceiling as announced last year. As has been announced from time to time in the press, there have been vacancies for various trades and ratings, and men have been responding to those announcements. We would like to see more men coming in as tradesmen. We would like to see a steady flow to replace the men who are going out of the navy as ratings in practically all groups; and it is proposed that at the end of the summer, possibly in the months of August and September, a campaign will be conducted to enlist recruits for the active and reserve forces of all three services. Our belief is that when the advantages and opportunities are presented to the young men of Canada we should be able to secure through the instrumentality of a campaign, not on a very large scale, sufficient recruits not only to fill up the vacancies but to provide a fairly steady flow to offset the wastage which always occurs.

Then the hon. member referred to his own remarks last year in regard to the proportions of men at sea and on land. I think it is still

too early in the organization of our post-war forces to say exactly what that proportion is likely to settle down at, because it depends to a large extent upon what proportion of the armed forces is fully trained. If there is a rapid flow of men in and out of the armed forces then the number undergoing training at the outset of their service career will be high, and that will reduce the number at sea. However, I would not be surprised if the proportion stated by the hon. member is not far off the mark, and it may settle down to something like that figure.

He also asked about ships in the navy at the present time. I do not think hon. members would wish us on all occasions and in every year to give the strength in ships commissioned and in reserve, but at the present time I certainly have no objection to doing that. Based on the east coast there will be the *Warrior,* and when she is replaced by the *Magnificent,* the *Magnificent,* an aircraft carrier. There will also be the destroyers: the *Nootka,* the *Micmac,* the *Haida,* plus two destroyers in reserve; the algerine, the *New Liskeard;* three frigates and four algerines in reserve. On the west coast in addition to the *Ontario* there would be the other cruiser, the *Uganda,* in reserve when she is decommissioned this month; also three destroyers, the *Crescent,* the *Cayuga* and the *Athabaskan* in commission, as well as three destroyers, two frigates and four algerines in reserve.

He asked next with respect to the distribution of civilians in the navy. The present distribution is as follows: On the east coast at H.M.C. Dockyard, Halifax and Dartmouth, 1,718; at the armament depot at Renous, 192, and at Sydney 143. On the west coast at H.M.C. Dockyard, Esquimalt, 1,285; armament depot, Kamloops, 143; Vancouver, 110. At headquarters, including the joint liaison officers at London and the joint staff at Washington, 776; armament depot, St. Hubert, 61; Montreal, 83; attached to the sea cadets, 4; attached to the royal naval military college at Royal Roads, 84; or a total of 4,602.

The next question was with regard to the reserve force. That is organized in twenty divisions. At the time of the last return that was made in the house it had a strength of 2,693. It is expected that there will be no great difficulty in bringing that number up to the present ceiling of 4,300 by the beginning of the autumn and winter training period.

I have had the opportunity of visiting eleven out of the twenty naval reserve divisions and I must say that with very few exceptions they are in an advanced state of organization, with their establishments of officers and petty officers well up to what one would expect at a period like this, and with a nucleus of some very good men as ratings. All the divisions are being equipped with the most modern equipment, and with the exception of two or three they have admirable buildings well suited for the purpose, located in twenty of the principal cities of Canada. At this time after the first great war the number of officers and men in the royal Canadian volunteer reserve was about 500.

With regard to housing the hon. member said that he had heard that the navy was not doing as well relatively as the other armed services. I think the only principal places where the navy requires married quarters are at Halifax and Esquimalt.

At Esquimalt the situation is generally speaking better than it is in comparison with the army and air force at most establishments, and even at Halifax it compares favourably with the other two services. There is I think a very acute need for additional married quarters, particularly for the members of the naval air arm centred at Dartmouth. Steps are being taken to convert all possible houses there so as to meet this need as well as we can as soon as possible.

The final suggestion made by the hon. member was with regard to some allowance for transportation on leave. As he said, when the rates of pay were established in 1946 at the new scale it was the feeling of the inter-departmental and inter-service committee that dealt with them, as well as of the departments and the government, that the rates of pay had been fixed sufficiently high to put the officers and men of the armed forces on an equivalent basis with that of civilians. Since then, however, there have been a considerable number of movements of officers and men between the two coasts, which I think put a considerable amount of hardship on them, and the question of its being possible to arrive at some allowance for transportation, at least for this interim period of organization, is being very carefully examined. My information is that neither in the United States nor now in the United Kingdom is any allowance made for transportation on leave. That is my information and I am verifying that. However in view of the very special circumstances in connection with this period of organization the matter is being very carefully considered.

Mr. KIDD: I listened attentively to the remarks of the minister but I heard him make no mention whatsoever of the Royal Military College at Kingston. Can he inform the

committee of the disposition of the department at this time as to the Royal Military College, why it was closed, when it is to be opened, and the type of personnel that will be permitted to enter the college? I would like the last question answered first.

Mr. CLAXTON: The Royal Military College was closed as a cadet college in 1940, long before I had anything to do with this department. I think the answer to the hon. member's question was given in the discussion on the estimates in 1945-46, if I recall correctly. At that time the need was for very large numbers of officers who would not be trained on the same basis as officer candidates were being trained at the Royal Military College before the war but who would be trained to meet particularly the urgent demands of war, and for that purpose a school was established at Brockville. I think the graduates of Royal Military College would have been the first to object had the college being used in the same way as before the war, as exclusively a college for training officer candidates. It was not possible to devote three years to that process, and totally different methods and a totally different curriculum were applied. Consequently special cadet colleges were established at Brockville, on the west coast and at St. Jerome. That was the reason why it was not continued as a cadet college. As hon. members know, it was continued to give company officers' courses, senior and junior staff courses and courses in allied military government.

Since the end of the war we have been looking into the question whether Royal Military College should be reopened and, if so, upon what basis. Hon. members know that a committee was set up under the able chairmanship of Brigadier Lett and a report was made. Since that time we have been looking into ways and means whereby the college might be reopened. I have announced on more than one occasion that the present proposal is to have Royal Roads operate as a joint Royal Canadian Navy and Royal Canadian Air Force college, beginning in September, 1947. In September, 1948, Royal Roads may be extended to include army cadets as well. R.M.C. would be reopened in September, 1948, as a cadet college on a tri-service basis. The curriculum, entrance requirements, conditions of service, pay, clothing and so on have not yet been worked out. It is not an easy programme, as I think hon. members will appreciate when they examine developments in other countries.

Our aim is to do everything possible to see that as far as it can be managed officer cadets of the three services are subject to the same training and environment and achieve much the same educational standards during their formative years. Our belief is that we must have the highest standards possible. Senior matriculation or the equivalent will be required for entrance, and the curriculum will be such that as far as possible year by year the course will be equivalent to that of the Canadian universities. I have been in close communication of the R.M.C. clubs of Canada who have been most constructive and cooperative. They also have been regarding this problem from the standpoint of the development in Canada of the best possible type of officer. We put that almost first in the priorities for our three services.

I should not close without mentioning the other two plans, namely, the university officers' training corps and the university naval training division, and the university flying cadet arrangements under which undergraduates of the 22 universities of Canada, with all of which we have made satisfactory arrangements, will during their four year courses at the universities take work in addition to the regular academic work and probably sixteen weeks during each of three summer vacations at practical work with pay. Our belief is that in this way we will develop a large group of highly qualified, well educated officers who will have had at the end of their university courses additional military and practical work. We have some 2,700 officer candidates at the universities under this plan.

Finally, there is the third means of becoming an officer, through the lower decks or from the ranks. We are working on a plan whereby other ranks showing the required educational qualifications, promise and capacity for leadership will be fitted into one of these three plans. In that way we believe that we will have a group of officers second to none.

Mr. KIDD: I should like to thank the minister for the information he has given with regard to the Royal Military College at Kingston. I am not placing any onus on him, but I do place it on his predecessor. I think I am speaking the mind of a great many people across Canada, ex-cadets and others, when I say that the Royal Military College should never have been closed. West Point was not closed, nor were the schools in the old country. Royal Roads was kept open, and at that time there was nothing in Canada for the training of R.C.A.F. officers. I hope nothing will be left undone to see the Royal Military College is opened in 1948. It should have been opened in 1947. The minister has not told the house the number of cadets who enter the college, whether it will

be 50 or 250. I say that advisedly because usually about 50 or 60 enter each year. It is only my judgment, but I say that if you let 1946 and 1947 go by you are losing the opportunity of getting many young men into the service at the ages of seventeen, eighteen and nineteen years. If you wait until 1948 you will have lost this opportunity. There are many young boys who would like to enter the service and who have just received their senior matriculation. You cannot have young men of nineteen, twenty or twenty-one years enter the Royal Military College.

I want to say as forcefully as I can that the department made a mistake and it is making a mistake today. I thank the minister for the information he has given the committee. This is the first time we have been able to get information of this kind. I tried to get it last year from the Minister of National Defence but I could not accomplish anything. I think I am justified in offering a little constructive criticism. I tried last year and also in 1945, but what did the minister's predecessor do? He journeyed off to Cornwall and addressed a service club there and made more or less a public statement in order to get the reaction of the press across Canada. He got it. I asked him to make the same speech the following afternoon at three o'clock but he said jokingly that members of the house would not want to hear a political speech.

I want to thank the minister and I hope that nothing will be left undone to see that the college is opened in 1948. Since 1916 and world war I, I have seen many cadets graduate from the college. Whoever advised the minister's predecessor erred in his judgment in having the Royal Military College closed. It is part of the life of Canada and we cannot get along without it. The sooner it is opened, the better.

The minister has placed on *Hansard* a carefully prepared brief on what Canada has done as far as the war is concerned, but I think that statement is two years late. Last year we tried to get the Minister of National Defence to make a similar statement when his estimates were brought down, but he said, "There are the estimates; shoot your questions at me and I will do my best when the questions come along." As compliments are in order, I must compliment the minister upon his statement. He paid a compliment to nearly every branch of the service, but there is one branch to which he did not refer. He did not refer to the boys who went overseas and joined the R.A.F. before war was declared in 1939. He paid a compliment to nearly everyone else. There is hardly a constituency represented in the house that did not have in it some boys who went over at that time. Everyone knew in 1939 that war was coming. Some of them went over in 1938. These boys offered their services to various branches of the Department of National Defence, and what happened? They did not want them; they had no place for them. Establishments were made up to a certain size. What did these men do? They were the best flyers in Canada. They were mixed up with the civilian airfields. They went over in cattle boats to the old country. They paid their own transportation and joined the R.A.F. I wish to pay a compliment to them. They fought for Canada and made a name for Canada. Most of them joined the R.A.F. before Canada was organized for war. Many of them paid the supreme sacrifice. They should not be forgotten.

There is one further comment I should like to make. The minister referred to the permanent force quarters. I brought it to the attention of the minister last year, and what did I get from him? He said: We are paying them well; they can find their own quarters. I appeal to the minister, who is the employer of the permanent force. I should like to see him throw back his shoulders so far as the permanent force is concerned, whether it is army, navy or air, and to say that everything will be done as far as possible for these men. I appealed to the minister last year to find married quarters for these men. He did not do it. He said that we were paying these men and that they were getting separation allowance. I know that at Barriefield and in every district across Canada there were huts which these men could use for married quarters.

I wish to refer to one other thing. A man may be in the army one day and out the next. I notice that the Minister of Veterans Affairs is just leaving the chamber. The Minister of Reconstruction and Supply was here some time ago. There are men in Canada who are discharged soldiers and who bought homes for themselves but cannot get possession of them. I shall give an instance. I know of a young man who was a junior civil servant.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. KIDD: Just a minute.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. KIDD: All right.

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. member that we are discussing the estimates

of the Department of National Defence. A discussion of veterans affairs or of men who have been discharged from either of the three branches of the service is not permitted at this time.

Mr. KIDD: I quite agree with your ruling, sir. I will put it this way. I am going to appeal to you and to the minister because I think it is the minister's job to fight for the man who has been employed by him. Here is the case of a young man who in 1939 enlisted and served overseas for five years. He came back after five years' service. Do not forget that there was an election in 1940 and another one in 1945.

Mr. MACKENZIE: We won them both.

Mr. KIDD: Yes. Election promises were made which are not being lived up to.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I am sure it is the desire of the committee that we should discuss only the estimates of the Department of National Defence.

Mr. KIDD: I agree with that. I want to appeal to the minister to fight for the men who served under him and who are still serving. This young man served overseas for five years. He saved up and came home, and like every other man he wanted to buy a home. The Minister of National Defence is his former employer. This young man came back and what happened? He bought a house—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. If the hon. member is discussing a former member of the armed forces he is out of order. I would ask him to discuss the estimates before the committee.

Mr. KIDD: All right.

Mr. FRASER: He is out of order and the man is out of a home.

Mr. KIDD: I may be out of order, but the man is out of his home; he cannot occupy his house. I am appealing to you, sir, to use your influence on the Minister of Veterans Affairs and the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply to see that a man who served under you gets a fair deal, which he is not getting at the present time. I have a concrete case. I will bow to the ruling of the chair, but I still think that I am in order. I want to appeal to the former employer of this young man—

The CHAIRMAN: When the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs are before the committee the hon. member will be in order to discuss this subject.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. KIDD: I quite agree with your ruling, sir, but at the same time this young veteran is receiving nothing. I do not like to say this, but the Minister of National Defence is falling down on the job. This young man served under the Minister of National Defence and went overseas.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member said that he agreed with my ruling. I would ask him to abide by it.

Mr. KIDD: I quite agree with your ruling. I know I shall have ample opportunity to bring this matter up again. I want to thank the minister for his reference to the Royal Military College at Kingston.

Mr. PROBE: I wish to make a few general remarks at this stage before we get into the details of the particular items in the estimates of the Department of National Defence. This morning the minister reminded the committee that last year there was a vote of $486 million for the department which he now heads, of which some $383 million was spent. Last year that estimate represented approximately one-quarter of the Canadian budget for all purposes. The amount spent was some $100 million less than the estimate, due to a speeded-up demobilization, for which some credit is due to the government with all the difficulties they had in that connection. This year I notice that about one-eighth of the entire budget is devoted to this department, roughly $240 million. As near as I can gather that is to be spent almost entirely on Canadian peace-time military expenses.

In his opening remarks the minister referred to certain general considerations of the organization of the peace-time forces. At the moment I am not concerned with the details. They can well be left to the staffs concerned, with whatever criticisms we may have here and there. I just wish to refer to the remarks of the minister in connection with the organization policy which he said it was the intention of the government to establish. He said the primary purpose was to defend Canada; the second purpose was to maintain law and order in Canada, and the third—and I am not too sure that I got him correctly in this, because I am a little concerned about it in part—was cooperation with friendly nations or to meet the demand of the united nations.

In my view and in that of the party to which I belong, the C.C.F., the armed forces of Canada are not needed to maintain law and order in this country. As a matter of fact if hon. members go over the estimates of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for the past number of years they will see that there has been an enormous expansion in that field.

There are other civilian police groups which have to attend to the enforcement of the laws of this country and of the provinces and of the municipalities. It seems to me that law enforcement in Canada should not be the primary role of the Canadian army. We are not a lawless nation. To put ahead of the objective, as I see it, of the Canadian armed forces—that of playing its part in the peace of the world in cooperation with the united nations organization—the maintenance of law and order among our civilians at home as an ideal for the organization, seems to me to indicate improper emphasis.

To refer to the first point that the minister raised in this connection, that the chief consideration of this large expenditure was the defence of Canada, I would point out that if the implementation of the present policy in the defence of Canada is, as it is now, in this interim force, using procedures which to me look very much like those of the old professional service days, then there are some terrific gaps still left to be taken care of. If we take the minister at his word and consider only the defence of Canada, the defence of the shores of this country, the methods he has outlined today are utterly inadequate.

If the minister thinks his department is laying the groundwork for the defence of Canada against attack by an outside aggressor, and that it is doing so by means of what he outlined this morning, I would ask him this question. Does he not believe that if this country is due for an attack at any time we would have a general civilian participation in its defence? And that includes men, women and children. If that is so, has the minister indicated to the house, anywhere in his statement this morning, to what extent he is preparing the civilian population of the country for the defence of our home land?

Anyone who has the most elementary knowledge of military attack and defence knows that the brunt of defence is nowadays borne by civilians and not by trained troops, that is, by uniformed troops. If we are thinking in terms of air attack we must have our fire-fighting defences and our first aid equipment. We are undoubtedly going to have anti-aircraft gunners and they will be drawn largely from the civilian ranks. The minister has made no reference at all to that form of training, and there is no evidence in his statement that he is making a realistic approach to defence against invasion from any source.

We have our troops employed after a fashion. We again have the procedure we had during the war, mentioned by the minister a few moments ago in answer to a question by the hon. member for Yale, in which we are moving troops back and forth from one end of the country to the other over the C.P.R. and the C.N.R. To give added travel revenues to the railway companies because of a change in the decision of some officer on the national defence staff is not my idea of training troops for the defence of this country. What other means have we in this country, or has the minister indicated he intends to use in this country, for the rapid deployment of the forces that are being trained or that are about to be trained?

If the minister is really sincere in talking defence, he should tell us about some auxiliary transportation facilities other than the railways of the country. Not one word is mentioned in his report about highways, for example. I take that back in part, because I believe there is an item of some $10 million for the northwest staging route. We cannot possibly defend Canada by maintaining no other than that highway built during the last war by the United States. The government of this country, if it is going to follow realistically the policy which it has itself expressed, must envisage a highway system in Canada such as we are not likely to see for many decades if the government of the day does not do any more about highways than it has done in the past.

We cannot move troops and equipment by these two ribbons that run across this country, the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian National railway. Where are our highways? Where are our feeder highways? If we are going to move troops and move them rapidly, if we are going to move ordnance supplies and other equipment, we cannot rely on railways or airborne transportation. The minister might have mentioned the Hudson Bay route. We have troops training in the north, but there is no indication that the military staff is realistic in its professed intention to defend Canada by using some of the avenues that nature has provided.

I maintain that the minister's department is still making an easy living for a military caste in so far as present defence plans in Canada are concerned, and, further than that, that it is going back to the old laissez-faire ideal which I had hoped was outmoded for war purposes, in which monopoly munitions makers or equipment purveyors are being cut in on the melon if and when a war should take place.

It seems to me that the minister is trying to build up a modern fighting machine. I will give him credit for good intentions, but he is using horse and buggy tactics that are

definitely in disrepute. It seems to me that if we are sincere in defence procedure in this country there is a major field for the Department of National Defence, and that is in the utmost utilization of the research facilities of this country and the extension of these research facilities far beyond what is envisaged in the amount of money authorized for military research purposes.

I want for a moment to refer to what I think are still a number of hangovers from the demobilization period. The minister referred to the fact that some three-quarters of the military stocks, buildings and so on, had been disposed of. Surplus stores and establishments, to the extent of some two-thirds or three-quarters, had been disposed of through War Assets Corporation. Have we not a ridiculous picture here again? On the one hand the minister and his department are declaring stores and equipment surplus to War Assets Corporation, which will be sold or given away to the trade, and we immediately ask for some $200 million odd. Of course, I realize that some of this is for salaries, but there are large commitments again for additional equipment and I would like the minister to assure the committee that the stores that have been disposed of and the establishments that the Department of National Defence has declared surplus, particularly buildings, are such that in no sense are they duplicated by new contracts or new purchases by his department. We certainly do not want that continuous building and handing over and building that seems to go on so planlessly for the defence needs of the country.

An hon. MEMBER: It is well planned.

Mr. PROBE: It is well planned, but for whom? Not for the Canadian people but for a few individuals who will make easy money out of the suckers, the Canadian government and the Canadian people. This group, the C.C.F., emphasizes the fact that interested groups can again hang like leeches to the governmen'ts skirts, and can again make a profit from the weapons of destruction in whatever form they may be, and that this policy is one of the contributing factors to war fever.

I was pleased that the minister this morning made a rather laughing reference to the so-called flying discs which for some days now have disturbed many of the good citizens of this country, because the hysteria as a result of which we can get into a war panic is so easily aroused. We must prevent such rumour spreading; we must make it unprofitable for anyone, whether it be the military caste in the seats of the Department of National Defence or whether it be in the commercial organizations which profit when there is a war on. We want to still their voices, their gossip and their propaganda so that we can have a chance for this world to establish the peace in which every hon. member in this house is sincerely interested.

I was pleased to hear the minister state that his department is now willing to assume responsibility for living quarters for the married members of the interim and permanent force. After all, with our housing situation in this country as acute as it is, the department is best fitted to make accommodation available for those whom it employs in the forces of the country. I think that is a matter with regard to which either the minister's department owes this committee an explanation, or perhaps he can tell us that he has made the utmost use of the buildings which were in possession of the Department of National Defence for conversion into suites and quarters for the members of the forces. I want to compliment the minister for his humanity in taking the role of a benevolent employer and assuming the responsibility for providing the quarters in which the married members of the armed forces live.

Before the dependents' allowance board is closed off with respect to the last war, there are still quite a number of cases which the minister should investigate with respect to improper cutting off of the dependents' allowance paid. As hon. members will note from the wording of the regulations of the dependents' allowances board, it is not the right of a dependent of a soldier, airman or naval rating to receive the allowance permitted by the regulations. That is, it depends on the whim, if you like, or the good wishes of the dependents' allowance board. To my mind that is a vicious principle. If in the future allowances are to be paid to members of families of serving personnel, those allowances should be theirs as of right once they are established as members of such families.

The minister referred to the fact that going wages were being paid to civilian employees of his department. To my knowledge, and by admission of the minister's own department, employees of the Department of National Defence in the city of Regina—at the Regina ordnance depot, to be specific—have not only not been receiving the going wage but in some cases have been receiving less than the minimum wage of $18.50 a week provided by the laws of Saskatchewan. I know the government of Canada is not bound by the labour laws of any of the provinces; that is, it is sovereign in that respect. But if we can

throw away thousands and millions of dollars on pensions for the brass hats of the service—and I do not say that in the sense in which the hon. member for Temiscouata sometimes uses the term—and the higher officials of the professional services can receive pensions as high as $8,900 a year, surely the man whose sole income is the wages he earns, working for the Department of National Defence, is worth more than $18.50 a week.

In closing I would once more remind the minister that, if he is sincere in his suggestion that his department is intent on the defence of Canada, he should organize Canada so that it is a defensive unit. But, above all, while he is doing that—because we have not yet made the united nations function as those of us who are its well-wishers hope it will function—I hope he will exert every effort of the Canadian government and the Canadian people to the end that the military set-up of the united nations be implemented at the earliest opportunity. Once again I should like to thank the Secretary of State for External Affairs for the excellent contribution he made last winter when, on behalf of Canada, he spoke first before the united nations asking that the enforcement of the peace of the world be assured by a rapid and early setting up of defensive forces on a global basis, not on a bloc basis.

Mr. HANSELL: I rise at this time not to discuss defence in general but to get down to a little matter of detail, one which concerns part of our national defence which my small community might have to do with. The minister will know what I am talking about the very moment I mention that the community of Vulcan, Alberta, requires a drill hall.

Mr. CLAXTON: That is right.

Mr. HANSELL: We have been working on this matter for at least a couple of years. I have had several interviews with officials respecting the matter, and some with a previous minister of national defence. As I understood the situation we thought a drill hall was already in sight. Then about a month ago I was informed that perhaps a change would have to be made because there was no appropriation for that small project in this year's estimates. I interviewed the Minister of National Defence, who was very kind and courteous, and promised to look into the matter. I do not know whether he has a report as yet, but by this time perhaps he has and will be able to say something about it.

The amount included in last year's estimates for this undertaking was approximately $32,000. It was my understanding that a drill hall had been secured somewhere in the northern section of the province and that tenders were being called for its removal to Vulcan. Following that I understood something went awry but that a suitable building had been secured in the southern part of Alberta, which would have to be moved only about sixty miles. The people felt quite happy about that; then, much to our disappointment, this further information came to us. I do not quite understand why that item is left out of this year's estimates. Indeed, I do not know whether it is left out. As a matter of fact I doubt whether it would be technically correct to say it is left out of these estimates, because I expect that quite apart from parliament voting this sum, if this project has been left out at all the department has left it out of its own particular administrative orbit, in that it has not included the project as one of those to be undertaken.

As far as this parliament is concerned I do not know that we are particularly informed as to every project that might be involved in an expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. This appropriation amounts to $226,709,331 or nearly $227,000,000. The details appear on page 275, where I see an item of $14,348,558 or nearly $14,500,000 for the acquisition, construction, purchase, maintenance, repairs, rentals and operating expenses of properties. That is a considerable sum of money. I am not objecting to it at all, but I would point out that it is for new equipment and repairs, which means it is at least in addition to what the defence department already have by way of buildings as a result of the recent war. I believe this amount of over $14,000,000 is sufficiently elastic for the minister to include the Vulcan drill hall in the list of projects for this year.

Now may I say that my small community of Vulcan feels quite justified in asking for a drill hall for the reserve forces that train periodically in that district. They feel justified for more reasons than one. The community has a very proud war record. I know that is the case with all communities, but we feel that we can put the record of our community up against that of almost any other in Canada. It is only a small community. In the purchase of war bonds I believe we rank among the highest in Canada on a per capita basis; and the same applies even to such small matters as salvage campaigns. My own children came home wearing upon their arms stripes they had earned in a campaign to collect

salvage. That is a small thing, of course. The Red Cross in our community has a wonderful record. Perhaps the thing of which we are prouder than anything else is that our war memorial, in the form of a cenotaph, has inscribed upon it the names of thirty-three young men, the very cream of the community, who gave their lives somewhere in the world during the last war. When I say this I am not boasting in any way, I say it in all humility. I know other communities have similar records, but I am stating these facts because to some extent we are dealing with public feeling. In spite of this record, to my knowledge the community of Vulcan has never asked the federal government for one nickel. That community has been on the contributing end of the nation's business. They are not sounding a grievance at all; they are proud of their efforts. Anything the town has it has obtained through its own efforts. We do not even have a publicly-owned post office, though very many communities of that size have such a building.

I say these things because I know if this town does not get this drill hall this year the people will feel extremely disappointed, and as far as I am concerned personally I will feel that the community has been slighted. I do not want to leave the impression that we are coming along asking for a favour. We are not. The community is asking that it might assist in our national defence programme, and that it be permitted to give that assistance under the most adequate conditions. That request, I think, is only reasonable. Furthermore I might say it is recognized by the departmental officials that such a project is needed. I wish to read a paragraph from a letter written by Colonel Snow, the officer in command of the western command. It is a letter that was recently received by a service club explaining why the $32,000 was not included in this year's estimates. In concluding his letter Colonel Snow says:

> I am very sorry indeed that this matter has taken the course it has and I agree with you that Vulcan must have military accommodation very soon if our reserve force in that area is to continue to function.

If the lack of a drill hall means that the reserve force in Vulcan is not going to function, surely that is a serious matter. Colonel Snow is a highly respected official of the department and I think what he says should be enough for the minister now to say: We will do all we can for you.

I understand that the policy of the government in respect to these drill halls is to expect that they might be used for community recreational purposes as well, and I agree with that policy, I think it is an admirable one, and since it is the policy of the government I suggest that our community has many small organizations without a place to carry on their activities. We have the boy scouts, the girl guides; we have cadets in that community; we have physical training classes and quite a few other movements of the kind. If it should rain, and I am sorry to say that we do not get much rain in that part of the country, but if it rains on the night on which one of these organizations is to meet, they have to postpone their meeting and stay home; nothing can be done. In the winter time their activities are almost non-existent. If a drill hall were constructed at Vulcan, the defence department would be doing a great deal for the community as well as in promotion of their own defence programme.

I have two suggestions to make. I suggest and urge as strongly as I can that if the minister cannot adjust his programme to include this project in this vote, he bring down a supplementary estimate to cover it. I do not want the minister to take advantage of my next suggestion, which is one that has been made by one or two of the organizations in that community; but if it is impossible for him to bring down an estimate for the construction of this drill hall, there is a recreation hall in the Vulcan air training school, which is situated about six miles out of the town. It would not be as satisfactory as a new drill hall, but perhaps it would be the next best thing; it would serve temporarily at least. It would have to be moved a distance of six miles, and I am suggesting that if it is impossible to go ahead with the plan for a drill hall as originally proposed, this recreation hall be moved and used for the purposes I have mentioned. I suggest that as the next best step. I understand that the building I have in mind has already been declared surplus. I must qualify that statement by saying that I did not get the information from official sources, but I understand that is correct, and if it is, the building belongs to the national defence department.

In conclusion, I know that the minister has called for a report on this matter and perhaps there has not been time enough yet to get the report from the western command at Edmonton or Calgary, whichever it is. If the minister has not yet received that report, I feel I know what his answer is going to be, that he will do his best to carry out my suggestion. I wonder if he can say to me now that something will be done about this matter this year. I want to thank the minister's parliamentary assistant for the time

he is spending on what might appear to be a very small thing when we are talking in terms of hundreds of millions of dollars. But it is not a small thing so far as that community is concerned. For them it is a big thing indeed, and the department needs a drill hall too. Will the minister now promise me that he will do something about it this year?

Mr. CLAXTON: Mr. Chairman, I think I should reply to the hon. member for Macleod at once, because some other hon. members may have drill hall problems on their doorsteps and perhaps a brief statement as to the position might be useful.

I think nobody appreciates more than the department and the officers of the services the very strong desire which has been repeatedly expressed by reserve units and members of parliament and other community leaders for the provision of suitable armoury accommodation where that is not now available. I can assure all concerned that plans are being prepared to enable the department to proceed with a construction programme just as soon as the government feels that the time is ripe. My predecessor had hoped to begin last year with the construction of four or five different types of armouries in different localities so that we could get on with the job and show our serious intent and also gain some experience. However, the shortage of housing accommodation was so great throughout the country that the feeling was expressed by the government, and I am sure was shared by members of parliament as well as by the people generally, that during these immediate post-war years we should deal with houses first. That is the policy of the government and of the department. As I have already pointed out, our target this year is to try to convert or construct over 1,000 new dwelling units for married personnel, thereby relieving the general pressure on housing accommodation throughout the country. On that account it has not been possible to calculate on making any new construction of armouries this year. I am sure that the hon. member for Macleod realizes that though his need is great and that of the reserve unit at Vulcan is great, there are units and places in Canada where the need is even greater. I know in the case of my old drill hall on Craig street, where they had only two major units before the war they now have four regiments of artillery and the Regiment de Maisonneuve. I can think of the drill hall at Quebec where instead of having two major units they now have four.

Mr. BENTLEY: Can the minister think of the drill hall at Swift Current?

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes, and also at Edmundston, Saskatoon, and a few other places where the need is great. What we are doing is to try to convert existing buildings which were built by one or other of the armed forces during the war to be used on a temporary basis. This has been done successfully at Winnipeg and other localities.

Mr. HANSELL: That is the very thing I am asking for.

Mr. CLAXTON: I can assure the hon. member for Macleod that the matter he raised is receiving the most active consideration. We have not yet reached the point where we can carry out the alternative he mentioned. Wherever it is possible we will do that, and when later on circumstances permit I hope we shall be able to proceed with a long term programme of construction.

Mr. MERRITT: Mr. Chairman, I was glad to hear the minister say what he had to say to the hon. member for Macleod. The question of training quarters for our reserve units is one of great importance, and it should be receiving close attention even though there is a housing shortage in Canada. I hope the hon. member will get a drill hall, either on a temporary or permanent basis, as soon as possible.

I should like to try to wrench the hon. minister's mind away from the consideration of a drill hall at Vulcan to the statement he made this morning. I was glad to hear him make that statement, and I was pleased with most of what he said. It represents quite a change from what I can only describe as the sorry attitude of the government during the past two years toward matters of defence. I use those words advisedly, because the policy was apparently dictated by the idea that all people interested in the defence of the country must remain in complete uncertainty as to what they were supposed to do until the united nations had laid down some task for us to follow. In saying what he did the minister was adopting what we in this party have been advocating in every session since this parliament began. He said that the first job of the armed forces of Canada is to defend Canada. By saying that, the minister has put certainty into the purpose for which our armed forces exist, and I commend him for that statement. From now on we will have a chance to create an adequate defence force in this country and to keep it up through the years. It seems to me that at last the government is really coming to grips with defence problems and is getting its feet on the ground. I was so delighted with most of what the minister said that I can only

express the wish again that he or his predecessor had said it two years ago, because it was as obvious then as it is now, and it was as necessary then as it is now.

I want to refer in particular to only two of the minister's statements, although I think all fourteen of the points he brought out were good. First, he said that the purpose of the armed forces was to defend Canada, and, second, one of his fourteen long-term points was that there must be government leadership to get the Canadian people behind the armed forces of Canada. By making those statements he is hitting the nail squarely on the head, and I am heartened by their having been made.

I should like to say one word about what was said by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. Probe) who expressed the views of the C.C.F. party on defence matters. The statement he made was most interesting, because to me it showed that the socialists have not changed.

Mr. PROBE: They have not.

Mr. MERRITT: The policy enunciated this afternoon by the hon. member, that we have no need of armed forces for internal security, that the first need of armed forces is to carry out some obligation imposed on us by a global organization, is just the disarmament talk of 1920 to 1940 dressed up in 1947 clothes. I warn the minister not to pay any attention to this disarmament policy. It was blown up before or by the last war. If he sticks to the policy which he has announced, which we in the Conservative party have urged on him, he will not go very far wrong.

I want to refer to one of the fourteen points announced by the minister, that there is need for government leadership to get the support of the Canadian people and of all Canadian organizations behind the armed forces. I mention that point to underline its importance and I ask the minister to underline its importance throughout the country. He should lose no opportunity of enlisting the support of various civil organizations and individuals making up our national life. We are not a warlike people; we are inclined to wait until we get into trouble before we make these preparations. In the past the armed forces have been handicapped by a lack of public realization of their value. I do not think that attitude has changed much. The Minister of National Defence should always keep that idea in his mind and should prevent us from sinking back into the attitude we had between the wars.

The new certainty which he has given by his statement was badly needed by both the active and the reserve forces. You cannot, as the minister has done, suddenly cut Canada's armed forces twenty-five per cent below what was stated to be the irreducible minimum without making people in the forces start to wonder whether the career they have chosen is worth while, and whether the opportunities they thought were ahead of them before that change still remains. Today they will feel reassured that their future is a safe one. The minister's statement that provision is to be made for permanent quarters for people in the active forces will do much to make these forces contented and of good morale. But when I turn to the reserve army—and I am dealing with the reserve army in particular, although I think it will apply to the reserve air force and to the reserve navy as well—I am not sure that the minister's statement today has really met their problem at all, at least not as far as it should.

The reserve army ought to have an honoured place in Canadian life. It should not be, as it is now and as it always has been, a poor relation of all other public functions. When the minister stated that the whole purpose of our force was to defend Canada, he might also have said—and I think he will agree with me—that the reserve navy, army and air force are the first line of defence of Canada's shores and of the Canadian people. It is the reserve forces upon which we must rely in case we ever need to defend this country. The active force cannot possibly hope to provide more than an infinitesimal number of the force necessary. The minister should keep pounding on that idea when he goes around the country, and perhaps state the purpose of the Canadian forces, and particularly the reserve forces, more specifically even than he did today when he said that they were to defend Canada. He should emphasize that the reserve forces are our first line of defence and are vitally necessary to us in these unfortunate and uncertain years. I do not think it can be said today that either the people of Canada or the reserve army itself feels that their purpose is so important in the mind of the government.

I took the trouble to find out from various parts of Canada how some chaps in whom I had considerable confidence were feeling about the reserve army of post-war days, and I was amazed at the uniform nature of the answers I received when I asked them how they were getting on. In every case it was said that the government had no certain policy. In other cases it was said that nobody had ever told them what their purpose was. In still other cases it was said that as a result of a failure to state the purpose and the policy behind the

reserve forces recruits were not coming in, and the high morale with which a large number of excellent officers and N.C.O.'s entered the reserve army at the end of the war was not being maintained as well as they would have liked to see it. It is true that they had other complaints which are perhaps more difficult of solution, such as adequate training quarters. But the complete agreement of all these people right across Canada, from one end to the other, people who did not know each other, people who served in different parts of the country in different units and under completely different circumstances, is something which I do not think can be ignored.

While I commend, as I have said already, the minister on his statement today, I am bringing this point to his attention now because I say to him that we have had fine words but we have had no performance as yet. We are delighted to accept his words but we require a considerably higher measure of performance than has been provided by the department up until this year. I want to say to him, too, that there is a great deal of ground to be made up; that, as I understand the case, it is not as though he can now catch easily the spirit which existed in 1945. He has to go and dig for people, and give not only the units themselves and the officers and N.C.O.'s, but also the general public, the idea that he is behind his reserve army and that he proposes to make it good and popular and to bring it up to adequate strength; that he is going to provide both moral and material backing; and the most important of these is the moral backing which he alone in his capacity as Minister of National Defence can give. I told his predecessor last year that he could be the least expensive and the most effectual recruiting agency this country could possibly have.

I want to ask the minister to give us now, having stated his principles so excellently, a statement of the practical steps that he is proposing to take to stimulate interest in our reserve army. I want him to tell us its strength, to give us an idea of the average number of men on the strength in some typical units, to let us know how recruits are coming in, what the wastage is in the discharge of people who have joined and are now going out, and to give us some further information on this recruiting programme that he plans in September.

I also wish to say to him that for the reserve forces at least, a September recruiting programme will not do; that it has to be a continuous recruiting programme going on all the time, and recruits being provided not by a campaign but by a continuous knowledge on the part of young people in each centre that in their armoury they can find interesting work, health-giving recreation, and above all that they have a useful part to play in Canada's service. I hope the minister will make a statement on the specific steps he proposes to take with respect to the reserve forces in carrying out these good principles that he has laid down.

Mr. PROBE: Before the gallant member for Vancouver-Burrard concludes I should like to direct one remark to him with your permission, Mr. Chairman. He made reference to the necessity of propagandizing this country as to the needs of defence. His statement, which I presume represents the policy of his party, is to my mind somewhat reminiscent of the conditions that prevailed in nazi Germany prior to 1939.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SKEY: Sit down.

Mr. PROBE: Let me finish. You do not have to agree with me at all.

Mr. SKEY: We do not.

Mr. PROBE: All right. Let me say—

Mr. SKEY: You had your say before.

Mr. PROBE: I will say it again. As I say, the German nation was prepared to the hilt for war by every possible manner of means before 1939. The Canadian nation, to quote the hon. member who has just sat down, and whose military opinion I value very highly, was totally unprepared in the sense that he wants us to be prepared now for war. I wonder, then, how he would account for the fact that the unpreparedness of the citizen army of Canada was equal on all occasions to the arms of Germany.

Mr. MERRITT: Two years of training after war broke out.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the British navy?

Mr. ADAMSON: And we so nearly lost the war that we don't want to be in that position again.

An hon. MEMBER: How many C.C.F. went to the war?

Mr. PROBE: May I say that if the statistics were recorded there were more members of the C.C.F. in the overseas armed forces than from any other single political party.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Where do you find those figures?

Mr. SKEY: What did your leader say? Cash on the barrel and not a man overseas.

Mr. PROBE: Not an industrialist would work for the minister of munitions and supply until the five per cent lid was taken off.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. PROBE: I asked a question in all sincerity, and I do not have to take dirty slurs from these warmongers to my right.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Not a man overseas.

Mr. PROBE: Don't worry. A lot of our men went overseas. Don't you kid yourself. You know better than that.

Mr. TIMMINS: What fighting outfit was the last speaker in?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. HARKNESS: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the hon. member withdraw the remark he made in which he called us in this particular party warmongers. He has no basis in fact or anything else for making that assertion, and I think he should withdraw it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I did not hear the statement.

Mr. HARKNESS: The hon. member for Regina City (Mr. Probe) finished his outburst a moment ago by accusing the members of this party of being warmongers. We are not warmongers, and I do not think any instances could be cited to show that that is the case. I would therefore ask that the hon. member be required to withdraw that remark.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): We are losing time.

Mr. HARKNESS: Can we have a ruling, Mr. Chairman?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I did not hear the remark myself, but if—

Mr. STIRLING: He shouted it.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am quite sure that if the hon. member said anything offensive he will be willing to withdraw it.

Mr. PROBE: If I injured the pride or the feelings of any of the members to my right I am exceedingly sorry I wounded their susceptibilities.

Mr. HARKNESS: On the question of privilege, the hon. member made an absolutely false statement—

[Mr. J. A. Ross.]

Mr. PROBE: Now you take that back.

Mr. HARKNESS—and I ask that he be requested to withdraw it.

Mr. CLAXTON: I am glad to feel that I did not contribute anything to the heat of this afternoon. I shall try now to contribute something in the way of light upon the situation with regard to the reserve forces. I appreciate the kindly spirit of the remarks of previous speakers and their very cooperative attitude, and I would like to deal with the question of reserves, because, as I have said on numerous occasions in this house and outside, they do form the foundation, the nucleus of any forces that might be needed to defend Canada in the event of an emergency.

I may tell the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard, who took his seat a few minutes ago, that I have some first-hand experience of the work of the reserves because before going overseas in world war I, I was in a reserve infantry unit and upon returning I was in a a reserve artillery unit, and since then I have kept up the connection with that unit in Montreal. I can tell hon. members, as I believe many know, that immediately after the last war the reserves were in a very low condition indeed. For the year ended March 31, 1920-21, the sum of $1,160,000 was all that was provided for reserve training. In the unit in which I was, there was no equipment, there was very little training, there were a few officers and a few non-commissioned officers, there were very few men, and very soon interest diminished and it took years before the reserve was put on a proper footing. I believe that following this war we have taken steps to avoid that happening with regard to the reserve navy, the reserve army and the auxiliaries of the air force. First of all we have tried to create a new approach to the whole subject of reserves. Previously they were regarded as a rather special and frequently a social group who spent one or two days a week and sometimes some of their summer holidays in drill and some exercises. That was quite an improper attitude, but it was the attitude that was taken. Our view is that, the importance of the reserves having been shown in two wars, we should now take them for what they are, namely, an essential part of the armed forces of Canada, and that all differentiations between the active and the reserve should be wiped out. We have done it with regard to the navy by abolishing the wavy stripe. As far as possible it is done with regard to the army. Further, as far as possible officers, non-commissioned officers

and men of the active and reserve forces mix together, wearing the same uniforms, undergoing the same training and using the same weapons. The psychological approach is therefore quite different.

With regard to the supply of training, there again we are on a different footing. New syllabuses, new methods of training developed during the war, are available, and every unit has full-time administrative and training personnel. This is an experiment that is being worked out in close cooperation with the reserve units themselves.

In addition, we aim to have in the reserve forces men who are physically fit and qualified from the military point of view to take their place in the field of action, should it become necessary, with a minimum of additional training. We believe that in many fields of activity it is possible over a longer period of time to bring the reserves up to the same efficiency as the active forces, and this year it seemed to us that the right place to start was first of all in getting these administrative and training officers attached to the various units and fitted into them; second, to have the units established through a cadre of officers and senior non-commissioned officers; and third, having them set up working conditions and administrative establishments that can really do the job when they get the men.

It would have been wrong for us to get large numbers of men without having officers, non-commissioned officers, training personnel and equipment to make really effective use of them so that they, in turn, would feel that they were making good use of their time. I believe from what I have seen, that in most units that have been activated across Canada, great progress has been made in these preliminary steps of organization. To indicate something of the magnitude of the difference between the reserve army now and what is was before the war, or still more at the end of the last war, I might mention that the amount provided in the army estimates alone for the reserve forces is of the order of $13 million. That is a sum equivalent to the total provided in the year 1932-33 for all the armed forces of Canada put together. But that is only part of the picture, because a major part of the work of the active forces is the training of the reserve and the supplying of stores, equipment and motor vehicles for them. This is now being done on a scale quite different from anything which has been done in the past.

With regard to numbers, the total number in the reserve army at June 15 was 33,704 men, to which should be added, I think, 1,418 in the Canadian officers training corps, although they do not form part of the reserve properly so-called. That makes a total of 35,122 men. For those on the establishment, training is provided this year for thirty days; and in addition, 10,000 are to receive fourteen days' training at summer camps. Provision is made to give 15,000 tradesmen and specialists, if they are available, fifteen days' additional training at local headquarters.

Mr. GREEN: How many of those are officers and non-commissioned officers?

Mr. CLAXTON: Of the 33,704, there are 4,716 officers.

Mr. MERRITT: Can the minister say among how many units that total is divided?

Mr. CLAXTON: I have not the figures.

Mr. MERRITT: Has the minister a rough idea?

Mr. CLAXTON: I will see if I can give it. It would be misleading to give any total number of units, because they vary from units which exist only as names on paper in the total establishment provided for, to units which are over their established strength; hence any notion of the number of units would be quite misleading. But there are approximately 650 units active in the reserve army in Canada.

Mr. MERRITT: Could the minister give a rough average of the number who would be on the strength of an infantry battalion, an artillery regiment, and field company engineers, so that we would have some idea of whether a unit existed on paper only or was one sufficient to train.

Mr. CLAXTON: The fact that there are 35,122 officers and men on the strength indicates that there is a substantial group of officers and men on the strength. However, I will try to get for my hon. friend some indication of the kind he has requested.

Mr. GREEN: That is not as many as there were before the war, is it?

Mr. CLAXTON: Oh, no. Before the war there were about 45,000, according to my recollection.

Mr. MERRITT: That is correct.

Mr. CLAXTON: Then, before the war I think the largest number to receive annual training at camp was about 14,000.

Mr. MERRITT: Seventeen thousand in 1938.

Mr. CLAXTON: This year we hope that an equal number will receive a superior type of training at camp.

Now with regard to recruits: there are exceptions, but in the great number of units that I have seen it would not have been a good thing for those units to have more recruits than they have at the present time. Their state of organization, the state of the equipment and training must be put into good order before they are ready to handle recruits properly. In some units that is not so. I have no doubt that with a campaign such as we envisage taking place towards the end of the summer, we can obtain for the reserve army the recruits that are needed to fill up whatever is fixed for their establishment for the next training year. I think that result will follow very easily for the great majority of units.

The hon. member has rather flatteringly urged that more attention be paid by myself, in my speeches, to the reserves. I have done what I could, I must say, on four occasions in the house so far, and I think in speeches in every province in Canada, including the four western provinces; certainly in a large number of speeches. I have not only endeavoured to draw the attention of the communities to the importance of the reserve, but also I have met reserve officers and men of the navy, army and air force at meetings specially arranged, and have discussed frankly with them the plans we have for them. Also I should say that I have met representatives of the council of defence of the reserve associations of the army—there are some eleven of them—representatives of the associations of the naval and air force officers in various parts of the country, and discussed frankly with them arrangements for reserve training and ways and means whereby we can work together in order to do this important job. I must say that the response has been good, and I believe that with the support of hon. members and other leaders in the community we can really make progress in this field.

I wish to say one word in conclusion on that subject, and it is this. In the western command there has been established a practice which has been found most useful. Under Major General Worthington there has been set up in each reserve unit in the western command a civilian committee charged with the function of supporting that unit in every way possible. In the great majority of cases these civilian committees are doing useful work in support of the reserve units. We hope that the same procedure will be applied in other commands across Canada. I may tell hon. members that as part of the changed organization of the armed forces, general officers commanding commands, and there are five of them across Canada, are given very much greater authority than ever before on a decentralized basis, and for the first time they can say what units are ready to take what classes of training. If a unit is ready to take training to a greater extent than is provided in the quota, he has power to make the necessary adjustments. Also the per capita grant made to the officers commanding units is to be on a flexible basis for the first time, so it can be adjusted by the general officer commanding. These arrangements have been made pursuant to suggestions by the reserve associations, and they have met with very general support. I would say our expectation is that the reserve units will be established on a very sound basis by the time they begin their autumn training this year.

Mr. MERRITT: If I may follow up what the minister has just said, I simply want to repeat that according to my information the men are not coming into the reserve army. I ask the minister to take that as an honest statement of opinion after investigation and look into this question again. Then I want to ask him this question. When the reserve army was first formed my understanding is that its total strength was to be 180,000, and that it was on a six-divisional basis. Since that time it has been cut, along with the regular forces, by two-thirds, according to a press report I have here. This would mean it was cut to about 50,000 men. Were the units in the reserve army, that is the divisions and the individual units, cut at the same time, or did that cut of two-thirds mean that an infantry battalion, for instance, would be authorized to train only one-third its proper strength, and so on with other units? From my own experience in the non-permanent militia before the war I feel quite certain that if you authorize the training by a unit of only one-third its strength, or perhaps even less, and only pay it for that number of men on strength, you will do quite a lot of damage to the reserve army, even without intending to do so. If the minister is going to cut the total force envisaged I think it very important that he cut the number of units instead of cutting the number of men who can be trained in a unit.

Mr. CLAXTON: The newspaper report to which the hon. gentleman has referred of course is quite wrong. There is nothing whatever in it. There was no justification and no basis for it. The establishment of the reserve forces of Canada remains exactly as it was, and no change has been announced in that.

Mr. GREEN: It remains at 150,000?

Mr. CLAXTON: It stands at 180,000 plus, and that is about what it was before the war. There have been adjustments to bring the figure into line with changes in the types of arms, and changes in the population of Canada, but there has been no great change in the figure of 180,000 as compared with what it was before the war. That is the establishment which has been set down on paper for six divisions, should it ever be decided to raise six divisions in the event of a war. However, it was never planned by anyone that there should be 180,000 officers and men in the reserve army of Canada in peace time, or if that was planned I never heard of it. The figure generally set has been of the magnitude of 50,000, or something of that kind; and for this year the ceiling was set at 30,000. We have exceeded that, as I have indicated, by some three or four thousand; and the figure for training will be set early next year so the officers commanding units may know what the programme is. We are combining that with what my hon. friend suggested; that is, leaving units dormant, on paper, rather than activating them when there seems very little chance of getting them up to strength and efficiency. The greatest possible attention is being paid to units in centres having quarters, equipment and traditions which indicate the strong probability of their being successfully brought to a state of efficiency at an early date.

Mr. HERRIDGE: I listened with great interest this morning to the comprehensive review of his department given by the minister. While it took some time to present that statement I think it was well worth while. I believe it was one of the most informative statements we have had from a minister of national defence in recent years.

I rise at this time to obtain some information from the minister. Recently in this city we had the opportunity to witness a parade of uniformed corps, under the discipline of officers and non-commissioned officers, bearing arms. Some of us judge there were between 2,500 and 3,000 men in these units. Large numbers of them carried rifles which were issued to the French army in the war of 1914-18. A smaller number carried Lee Enfield service rifles of the most recent issue, and some carried swords of a cavalry type. While I and others associated with me were enjoying the martial music and the rather gorgeous and unusual uniforms and admiring the military appearance of these corps, we were wondering what section of the Canadian armed forces we were seeing march by, because most of us had not been in eastern Canada for very long. Therefore I would like to ask the minister this question. Are these corps, which were under the discipline of officers and non-commissioned officers and bearing arms, under the jurisdiction of the Department of National Defence? If they are not, is it safe for us then to assume that there is nothing in the Militia Act or the law of this country or any regulation that prevents any organization from training uniformed men in corps under the discipline of officers and non-commissioned officers, and bearing arms?

Mr. CLAXTON: I must say I did not see the officers and men to whom the hon. gentleman has referred, so I am not in a position to speak about them at first hand. I recognize that he has had a very gallant war record and a great deal of experience and that he is in a position to speak at first hand, so I take it that what he says is correct. I must say it surprises me very much to hear that these forces, which I should think were quite outside the jurisdiction of the Department of National Defence, had anything in the nature of Lee Enfield service rifles. We have not disposed of any rifles in Canada except to some of the Pacific Coast Rangers, and they received American sporting rifles, not the service Lee Enfields. I do not know of any other rifles that have been disposed of to civilian corps or organizations in Canada. I shall be very glad to look into the question and also to look into the question of law to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

Mr. SKEY: We have had some discussion of the navy estimates, and also some discussion of the army and the reserve army. I should like now to draw the attention of the minister and the committee to the air force. But before doing so may I answer an observation by the hon. member for Regina City, who asked how it was that our citizen army did not lose the last war and how it had time to mobilize. May I tell him that it was the air force that gave the army time to mobilize, and that is why I wish to speak on the air force today. If the hon. member thinks that anyone in any government in Canada has any idea of aggressive warfare his thought is complete proof of his absolute military ignorance, and all that he has said on defence should therefore be treated with the contempt it deserves.

Mr. PROBE: I hope the hon. gentleman will not attempt to put words into my mouth. I can express myself volubly and adequately without any assistance from my excellent friend.

Mr. SKEY: You asked how a citizen army won the last war, and I am telling you.

Turning to the minister's statement of this morning, I was delighted to hear him place on the record of this house the war records of all the Canadian services. I am sure that we were delighted to see that the government have at last an appreciation of what the aims of the defence forces should be and that they have also a plan of action, which I should like briefly to discuss.

This fourteen point plan has already been referred to. In my opinion it is very domestic in nature. First the minister speaks of the unification of the departments, then of joint intelligence and planning. I feel that the intelligence side of it is important. The planning should be well on its way now; the department has had two years at least in which to consider its plans. Then the minister spoke of an appreciation of the factors in the last war. I happen to know a little bit about this subject, and whether Canada has an appreciation of it or not I would like to inform the minister that the military appreciations of most other fighting nations on the democratic side were arrived at before this war was over.

The fourth point speaks of active and reserve qualified officers—again domestic in its nature. When we get to the seventh point we begin to get something which seems to me important; it has to do with adequate reserves of equipment and weapons. It was amply proved in the last war that the degree of technology required to equip adequately any fighting service was of growing and tremendous importance. This seventh point seems to me to be the only really important one up to this stage. The eighth point deals with the integration of the armed forces, the ninth with cooperation with industry, and the tenth with Canadian Arsenals Limited, and with the design and manufacture of munitions, etc. If we intend to design and manufacture munitions in Canada it will be necessary for the government to give certain contracts both to our industrial organization and to Canadian Arsenals Limited. It will be necessary in those contracts to lay down service specifications which will keep our arms up to date, instead of letting them get out of date as we have done in many cases heretofore.

Then there is civilian defence and government leadership. The same government leadership that we asked for two or three years ago is now on the fourteen point programme. It is heartening to see it there and I must congratulate the new minister on his recognition of this necessity. It is indeed a step forward, though it comes at a rather late date.

[Mr. Skey.]

Point thirteen deals with commercial cooperation and point fourteen with cooperation with the commonwealth and other friendly democratic nations not inclined towards aggression but inclined to stand and fight for their country.

I said at the outset that I wished to refer particularly to the air force. It seemed to me at the end of the war that the job which the air forces of all the nations did actually spoke for itself, and I thought it would not be necessary to speak on behalf of the air force in this house at least, because it was so evident in every action that we fought successfully in the last war that the air was the dominant factor. However, the rats have been gnawing at the policies of the government since the war, and I feel that it is necessary for me here today to remind the Minister of National Defence and the government that they are behind the times with regard to Canada's air defence, so deplorably behind the times that I am actually shocked when I read the answers that were brought down for me on the fifty-eighth day of this session in reply to seven questions that I had asked. I call attention particularly to one thing. We find that the strength of headquarters establishment is over double the actual number of men who should be there. In other words in non-effective jobs, in non-operational functions, there are over double the number of men who should be used on this particular type of work.

We have heard earlier of the auxiliary and reserve forces being the backbone of our defence system. The government authorized fifteen auxiliary squadrons to be established and equipped across Canada. I understand that six of these squadrons have actually been established, that four are in process of establishment, and that five have been deferred indefinitely. I shall not discuss their equipment. The minister knows what kind of equipment they have and what sort of shape it is in, and I am sure he is not awfully proud of it.

Just why the government has failed to establish auxiliary squadrons at Halifax and Victoria is very difficult to understand. Halifax, as the minister well knows, was one of our key defensive sites in this war, with a fine harbour, aerial headquarters for the north Atlantic convoy patrol, and equipped also with excellent fighter defence. Why we should not have had an auxiliary squadron established at Halifax, which is our key winter port, is difficult to understand. It is equally difficult to understand why an auxiliary squadron should not have been established at Victoria. Ottawa

could have been left out for a while, because after all there are so many airmen here at headquarters that perhaps they could defend us without an auxiliary squadron. We find also that no auxiliary squadron is established at Calgary and Quebec. In my opinion the fight for recognition of the auxiliary air force must begin all over again. It seems to me that here in Canada our air force has been pushed into the background until today it is actually but a shadow of its former self.

I would not take up this fight today if I were not sure that the defence of Canada is tied completely to our air strength. I speak only of defence; I speak only of the repelling of an aggressor. It was that same air strength that gave Britain her time in 1940, and it is that same air strength which can stop any aggressor flying over our country and rendering us helpless in something like sixty days, which people now predict is all that would be required to knock out a modern industrial power. If we take those sixty days into consideration we realize that we would not have time to prepare our air defences after there has been a declaration or indication of war. Those air defences must be prepared now. So that the minister may not think I am extreme in asking him to prepare the air defences now, I should like to quote an article from the *Letter Review* of June 30, 1947, with reference to statements made by Colonel Goforth:

> We have perhaps ten years of comparative safety from attack, perhaps followed by another five or ten years of rather acute danger, after which, if war has not occurred, the odds against it will become definitely better.

Colonel Goforth says that we have perhaps ten years of comparative safety. His opinion is not altogether agreed with by a presidential commission in the United States, which is referred to in a report in the *Globe and Mail* of June 2, 1947. The question was asked: When should such an attack be expected? This is the reply of the commission:

> For a period estimated by responsible scientists at not less than four years and not more than ten years, we can expect immunity from such an attack because we alone possess the atomic bomb.

That commission in Washington gives the United States four years of immunity. They said earlier in their report that the possibilities of an atomic age war are so great and the destruction would be so ferocious that it would require sixty days or less to determine whether the United States would win or lose. We have a Canadian authority saying we have ten years of immunity and a United States authority saying we have only four years of immunity. They are referring to a war fought with the same weapons we used in the last war; but a lot of people are concerned with a push button war. A report in the *Globe and Mail* of April 10 quoting a dispatch from Washington states that it will be at least twenty-five years before an atomic rocket war is possible.

I am laying the position before the government that there is an immunity of from four to ten years, with the possibility that a rocket war is twenty-five years away. The government have the defence of Canada in their hands. What are they going to do about it? Are they going to build drill halls and dig a few trenches here and there, or are they going to be realistic? Are they going to face the problem and say, "How can we defend Canada; how can we repel an aggressor?" I think the only answer that can be given is that an interceptor air force must be built up.

Lest the minister should think that I am merely expressing my own opinion with regard to the functions of the air force I would refer him to Sir Arthur Harris, who is reported in the *Globe and Mail* of April 26, 1947, as follows:

> He said he "supposed" the invasion of Germany was carried out because "we had the troops to invade with," but insisted air power could have done the job alone.

I emphasize that word "alone". There is also a report made in October, 1945, by the D'Olier civilian commission, and in this connection I quote from the New York *Times* of October 31, 1945, as follows:

> A civilian committee, after an exhaustive survey of the air war in Europe, declared today that, while allied air power was "decisive" in forcing Germany's defeat, a number of phases of the strategic bombing campaign were ineffective in their long range results.

I just call the minister's attention to the fact that that is the report of a civilian commission. They declared that the allied air power was decisive. I want also to refer to German military experts. This is the opinion of one of the enemy who felt the weight of our air force in the war. He said:

> Your bombing of our communications prevented our troops from ever coming into effective tactical employment against your forces. Without this strategic bombing the invasion would have been a dismal failure.

I regret that I cannot give the name of the German expert as that is taken from the speech delivered by Sir Arthur Harris in Montreal. He quoted another German expert as saying:

> We had forty reserve divisions in readiness. Your bombing made it impossible to move our troops rapidly, if at all,

In sending a message to the air forces General Montgomery said:

> But we also know well that you are always ready to bring your mighty effort closer in when such action is really needed and to co-operate in our tactical battle. When you do this your action is always decisive.

Those are the words of General Montgomery who was so successful in the organization of our ground forces. He said that the air force was always decisive.

In the past in Great Britain and also in the United States there was a fight for recognition of the air force. In Great Britain Lord Trenchard fought for recognition and understanding of the air force. In the United States the great General Billy Mitchell's words and predictions were well borne out in this war. In Canada great men like Bishop, Barker and others carried on the same fight. We also had the premier of Ontario, Colonel George Drew, an artillery man who wrote that great volume "Canada's Fighting Airmen". Somehow between the first and the second war the job that the airmen did was forgotten or not properly appreciated. It is my desire today to bring these facts to the attention of the government to see whether they really intend to carry out the first aim that the minister expressed when he said the aim was to defend Canada, because if he wants to defend Canada he must make the same decision today that Great Britain made in 1936 when they started to build up their fighter forces. They started to build up these fighter forces in preparation for what they knew would happen should a war develop. They chose to build their defensive forces. I speak today not of anything in the way of aggression as far as the air force is concerned. I speak only of defence so that my socialist friends cannot misinterpret anything I say. All I want to do is to defend Canada. I do not want to strike anyone else, or do anything like that. I am merely pointing out that the way to defend Canada is the same way that Britain defended the British isles in 1940. If the minister is sincere in his first aim, then he must get his air force on an effective operational basis and see that it is properly equipped and manned by sufficient people at least to repel the majority of any invading air force that may stand prepared to attack our country.

Mr. CLAXTON: May I first answer the hon. member for Trinity. He almost challenged me to find his statement extreme, and I must say that I do in some respects. His advocacy of the role of the air arm does great credit to one who has had a great record in the air force, but I think there are some hon. members in the committee who feel that in the end the infantry had something to do with it too. The way he has put it leads me to say at once that within recent weeks I have made a collection of a number of prophecies about the nature of the next war, from which it can be developed out of the mouth of somebody, not under the rank of lieutenant-general or its equivalent in the other services, that every single arm or weapon is obsolete today.

With regard to the air force, in testimony before the senate military affairs committee in the United States in 1945 Rear Admiral Forrest P. Sherman said as reported at page 505: "The carrier may prove to be less obsolescent than the strategic air force." And no less a proponent of air power, Lieutenant-General James H. Doolittle at page 296, said: "The weapons of the future may not be aeroplanes." I just mention these two to indicate that we are at a stage in development where armies and weapons are changing rapidly. In Canada we ended the war with a very large supply of planes such as Lancasters, of planes which had done such magnificent jobs as the Mosquitoes, as well as training planes of various types. We believe that every single one of these planes with which we ended the war is now obsolete. We are waiting to receive some of the latest jet propelled planes which have been on order for a number of months, but which have been delayed in delivery.

Mr. GREEN: Where is the minister getting them?

Mr. CLAXTON: From the United Kingdom.

Mr. SKEY: Is the minister making any effort to produce them here?

Mr. CLAXTON: We have experimental work going on with both planes and jet engines. The situation is as I have described it. When my hon. friend speaks as if we should have a large, fully manned and equipped operating air force on a basis to take the air in defence of our country against attack tomorrow, it seems to me that he is failing to take account of the realities of the situation.

We have weapons that were used in the last war. We are going to get aeroplanes that may be useful in some future war, when we can get them, but we cannot get them unless they are being produced, and unfortunately the production does not lie within our own hands; it lies within the hands of another country.

With regard to our ignoring the air force, as the hon. member seemed to indicate, I think

I need mention only one figure to him to indicate that that is simply not so. Out of this total appropriation of $240 million for the armed forces not less than $73 million is the portion which is applicable to the air force; in other words more than twice as much as was applicable to all the armed forces of Canada in 1938-39. Further, the strength of the Royal Canadian Air Force at the present time in officers and men is 11,804, plus an interim force of 337, making a total of 12,141. The air force is being reorganized, as are the other armed forces, on a post-war basis, which we believe to be sound, with reference to the needs and the capacity of the country. In the first place they have been formed into two commands with a very high degree of decentralization. Air stations have been established or are being established to conduct every kind of training, and I can refer my hon. friend to a press release which has just been issued, indicating the places where that training is being carried on at this very moment.

This year we have the largest programme of aerial photography ever to be undertaken in this or I believe in any other country. We have a very considerable number of air crew, planes and ground crew engaged in photographing for mapping purposes no less than 700,000 square miles of Canada. The air force has also undertaken the responsibility for work in connection with the northwest staging route and various other outlying parts of Canada. It has been working closely with the naval air arm in this work at Dartmouth. It is responsible for search and rescue at sea under our arrangement with the international civil aviation organization. This is going on at the same time as tradesmen of all kinds are being trained. The joint services training which has been continued at Shilo is being moved to Rivers, which is now being activated. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that from his own knowledge of the men with whom he served in the Royal Canadian Air Force overseas, the officers and men in our air force at the present time are among the pick of the Canadians who made the great record of which we are all so proud.

Mr. SKEY: Yes, I should like to agree with that immediately.

Mr. CLAXTON: Men with remarkable flying and fighting records. I visited some of them at the air staff college. I remember saying to the commanding officer, Air Commodore Ross, G.C., as I left: "These are a magnificent group of men," and he said: "Yes, sir, I do not think there is any group like it in the world." And that is my conviction from what I have seen of them.

Mr. SKEY: I have advocated that we equip our air force with modern weapons for the next four to ten years. When General Doolittle and the others made their statement they were looking into the future.

Mr. CLAXTON: I do not necessarily agree with them. I quote them to show that there are two extreme points of view.

Mr. SKEY: It seems that in Canada we are always waiting for something. We will not buy the 1947 model because the 1948 car will have an automatic refrigerator, or some other new gadget. We never get anything because we are waiting for something that is nebulous and in the future. The important point is that we must have an air force in being.

Mr. HLYNKA: I am glad that the minister takes a realistic attitude on the problem of defence. Speaking in Halifax on June 24 he is reported to have said that Canada considers that peace must be based on understanding and knowledge, and meanwhile she, meaning Canada, meant to see there is nothing second-rate about her navy, her army or her air force. I agree whole-heartedly with that attitude, and the minister is to be congratulated on it.

I rose to say a word about another matter and that is the wearing of military dress in peace time by officers and men in Canada's permanent services. I was told by several officers that owing to the ridiculing references in this house and in one or two newspapers, officers have had to abandon wearing their uniforms when attending various social and other functions. If that is true, then it is a shocking state of affairs. What sort of defence shall we have when irresponsible attacks on officers force them to abandon the wearing of their uniforms for fear they may be called "brass hats" or something of the kind? What is the government's attitude on this matter, and does it intend to correct the situation?

I do not know whether the two gentlemen in front of the minister are military men, but if they are they should have had the privilege of wearing their uniforms here this afternoon unless they themselves chose otherwise. This matter is more important than it may appear on the surface. The situation reflects a retreat on the part of our national defence in the face of irresponsible utterings. I call this to the attention of the minister and ask him to take steps to correct the situation. Personally I am not at all disturbed when I see our own

Canadian soldiers in uniform parading in Canada. We must make sure, however, that no foreign troops parade here.

Mr. ADAMSON: Like many other members of the house, I was pleased to have the elucidation of the defence programme put in fourteen rather clear points this morning. However, before I go on to discuss one point in particular, I would ask the minister to comment on a question that has received a great deal of attention in the press. I refer to the statement made, or alleged to have been made, and reported in the Calgary *Herald* of July 3, by the chief of the general staff, Lieutenant-General Foulkes. The statement as it appeared in the press on that date is:

> Asked about Alberta's probable role in the event of an enemy attack across the Arctic, the general decried all the poppycock that has been given out regarding such a possibility. He went on to say, "Fifty-seven pounds of freight to maintain a single man."

This is a direct quotation.

> "Can you imagine how many aircraft would be needed to keep an enemy force going in the Arctic? The Arctic wastes are our strongest defence.

If that statement is correct, I am reminded of those wishful thinkers who before the last war said that the Atlantic was our first line of defence. I want to remind the house that an enemy operated in the gulf of St. Lawrence and operated there quite successfully. If the statement I have quoted is correct, I would suggest that the minister find out from the chief of the general staff what he meant by it.

There is one more thing about this that I think should receive attention. It is an editorial in the Montreal *Gazette* the day before yesterday on the same subject:

> Lieut.-General Foulkes, rejecting the professional opinion of every United States general officer who has expressed himself on the subject, maintains that talk of Canada as a victim of invasion in another world war "is all poppycock." The defence of his unique position rests on the question-begging statement that "a little simple arithmetic proves this;" together with a vague remark concerning supply problems in the northland.

Two other paragraphs which I think are very important I would quote.

Mr. CLAXTON: Mr. Chairman, is there not a rule about reading editorials? I was called to order by the hon. gentleman himself on a previous occasion.

Mr. ADAMSON: If there is a rule, then I will paraphrase.

Mr. CLAXTON: You can adopt it as your own.

[Mr. Hlynka.]

Mr. ADAMSON: I do not think I ever called the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. CLAXTON: Then somebody sitting close to the hon. member did.

Mr. ADAMSON: I will certainly abide by the rules. To go on, the two paragraphs are that General Foulkes appears to ignore the constantly extending offensive power of the V-weapons, of which V-1 and V-2, which we knew during the war, were, although extremely effective, but early types of self-propelled projectiles which are to come and which will be very much more destructive. The second point is that he envisages a force maintained in the Arctic. It does not take very much of a force to launch the modern type of self-propelled weapons, particularly those which are known as self-guided or guided weapons. Experiments, I believe, have taken place recently in which these weapons have been known to travel extraordinary distances of well over two thousand miles. Whether that is still on the secret list I am not aware, but that statement has been made in the United States press.

The point I bring out, Mr. Chairman, is that the chief of the general staff is making a statement at considerable variance with the statement made in this house by the minister himself, and certainly at great variance with what was said in the railway committee room yesterday. I suggest to the minister that great care should be taken with utterances of highly placed officers of the Department of National Defence. Particularly should this be so with regard to the chief of the general staff, who occupies a position of tremendous importance in this country. For him to have made these statements—as he did if the paper is correct—is something that I contend goes far beyond the function of the chief of the general staff. It gets definitely into the question of policy and politics, and I think it was an unwise procedure.

I now want to continue with the minister's statement of this morning. The fourteen points he brought out were sometimes duplicates of each other, but I think his second point is the most important of all at the present time. He referred to the joint intelligence and planning groups. There is no service today which is as important as the intelligence service. With an efficient and effective intelligence service, a surprise attack can be forestalled or largely prevented. May I say that it is surprise attacks that we must expect if we are attacked. The old days of declarations of war and withdrawal of ambassadors have gone. The new type of warfare now exists. The war starts before it is declared.

Intelligence can be divided into three parts: political, military and commercial. Up to the present time we have regarded our intelligence as three separate services. Intelligence should be regarded as one service, as is defence. Coordination should be complete and absolute. I want to say to the Minister of National Defence, to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and to the Secretary of State for External Affairs that there is no cheaper service to any country than an effective and efficient intelligence service. Intelligence is the fourth and the newest of the services. It can truly be said to be a defence service. We must be prepared and we must know what is likely to happen. It is being said that a push-button war, so-called, is not likely for a period of a quarter of a century. That may or may not be so, but we should be extremely foolish to assume now that it is not so and, therefore, to leave ourselves open. To be without an effective intelligence service would be to court disaster. The unfortunate abolition of the United States intelligence service, particularly the military intelligence service, known as the O.S.S., has caused a serious situation in that country. I feel that the most important immediate step the government should take is the creation of an effective intelligence service at all levels. Naturally I shall not ask the minister to say what is being done, but I want to make the plea that this is the most important immediate necessity.

Before the war the foreign office experts in London warned the British government, particularly the Prime Minister, of the conditions in Germany. There was a mass of information well known by the consular and diplomatic service; there were statements of the number of troops, of the number and types of weapons and other statements concerning the effectiveness and efficiency of the German army. The then Prime Minister of Great Britain, if one can believe the memoirs which have subsequently been written, refused to believe his own experts and went on with the policy of appeasement which so nearly proved disastrous for the whole civilized world. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, and to emphasize most strongly that the intelligence service at all levels should be kept up to the highest pitch of efficiency. We in Canada have a peculiar flair for intelligence, and we should not allow our talents to go without being utilized; I will not say "rewarded", because there is no reward in intelligence.

I wish to turn to another side of intelligence. Today we have a necessity for providing commercial intelligence and intelligence in research. New processes and new offensive weapons are being perfected all the time. That information must be made available to those whose duty it will be to defend this country should another war break out.

I emphasize the fact the minister also mentioned, that one of the big problems of the armed forces, particularly the navy, is to winterize the ships and equipment, so that they can operate in Arctic and sub-Arctic waters. I want to point out also that today in Russia there are 500,000 men north of the Arctic circle, where an efficient and effective piece of work is being done by the Soviet Union. I say that to indicate that our meagre efforts, such as Exercise Musk-Ox and other small exercises carried on last year, were minuscule in comparison with the operation going on in Siberia. Whether we like it or not, the world is divided into two camps; you may call them totalitarian and free, if you like. We have the two great protagonists, Russia in Asia and Europe, and the United States; and we are sandwiched in between. We cannot afford to risk finding ourselves in an unprepared position. Geography cannot be denied.

I want to say one last word about the air. The battle of Britain protected the civilization of the world in which we now live. If it had not been for the gallant work of that extremely meagre force the airfields, the landing strips, the centres of communications and the harbours of the United Kingdom would have been put out of business. Had that happened, as we have since learned from the records of the German army, England would have been virtually undefendable. Had England become undefendable, the last bastion would have gone and the raw and undefended flank of the Atlantic coast of North America would have been the immediate object of attack by the efficient Nazi regime.

We talk about always waiting for the most effective and most efficient weapon to turn up, but it has been said that as soon as a weapon gets into production it is already obsolete. It is true that the Hurricane and Spitfire aircraft were most effective in the battle of Britain; yet such old types as the Swordfish, the Wellington, the Hampden, and others did extremely effective work at that time. It is unlikely that the Hurricanes and Spitfires, effective as they were, could have won that battle without the help of the old, inefficient and even obsolete aircraft, both fighter and bomber which were also used. Just because some aircraft are not the latest type, are we going to say we will not even use such of them as we had at the end of the war—

Mr. CLAXTON: We have plenty of them in Canada now.

Mr. ADAMSON: That is so, but according to the minister's statement this morning the training being done is very limited indeed. We are not carrying on training with these aircraft because to do so would be a waste of money.

Mr. CLAXTON: I am sorry, but I did not say that. I said that to acquire new aircraft, unless they were the most modern types, would not be useful at the present time.

Mr. ADAMSON: Then I misunderstood the minister.

Mr. CLAXTON: Perhaps I did not make myself clear.

Mr. ADAMSON: I want to bring out clearly that to have an airman trained, even in an obsolete aircraft, is infinitely better than to have an untrained man.

I go on now to the important matter of training. The chief of the general staff, speaking of university cadets and junior officer training, according to a report in the Calgary *Herald* said that, after serving for three months a year for three years, such officers would be well trained in the most modern weapons. Well, in my opinion there months a year for three years will not adequately train an officer in the most modern weapons. I doubt whether three years of intensive training will bring an officer up to high efficiency in the most modern weapons. Every day, every month, every year we are getting more complicated weapons. More and more do we need engineering scientific and technical skill. To say you can train a man for three months, then send him back to his civilian occupation for nine months, then start training him again, and carry this on for three years, and that at the end of three years you will have an efficient officer capable of instructing others is in my opinion, not a correct statement of fact. I am not being critical of what has been said because, as I indicated, this is merely a newspaper report; but I want to show that with the present highly intricate, extremely technical and high speed methods of warfare it is infinitely more important now than ever before that those in our fighting forces should receive the highest and most intense type of training. We cannot allow ourselves to get into the position in which we found ourselves in 1939. We can never take that risk again. Whether it is a push-button war or a war on the surface of the tundras, no matter what it is we must have our intelligence giving us proper and complete information; and we must be prepared at least to repel the first attack before it reaches the centres of population. One thing is absolutely sure, the speed of warfare is constantly accelerating, and the range, accuracy and destructive power of all weapons are increasing tremendously.

Mr. CLAXTON: The hon. member referred to an article in the Calgary *Herald* of July 3 which reports Lieutenant General Foulkes, chief of the general staff, as rejecting the possibility of a push-button war occurring in the immediate future and calling it poppycock. If that is what the chief of the general staff said I must say he made the statement on the best authority, because on July 2 Field-Marshal Viscount Montgomery said at a press conference there was no evidence yet of a future war of the push-button variety. It seems to me that the chief of the general staff was speaking with the best possible authority and also with good sense. There has been a great deal of talk about push-button wars as well as about saucers flying in formation and the like. That does not mean that we should not keep up to date and do the utmost in research and industrial organization and have as much as we can afford of the most modern weapons. But it does seem to me that we should keep our feet on the ground and look at the realities and consider what the probabilities are in the light of the best kind of intelligence we can get. I am sure that the chief of the general staff in speaking as he did was endeavouring to meet this extreme kind of excited and unrealistic statement which is doing a good deal at the present time to upset the world and effect the chances of our working out some foundation for living together.

I should also like to say this. The chief of the general staff and, I must say, all the other officers of the armed forces with hardly a single exception have, since I have been there, been scrupulously careful to speak only on matters that would properly come within their fields. Sometimes they are quoted when they do not expect to be, and sometimes they have been misquoted, but I want to say at once that there has been nothing but the most loyal cooperation in what I believe every hon. member would regard as the best kind of parliamentary as well as service practice.

I take the opportunity while on my feet of raising a matter as a kind of personal privilege. I find that when I said that eleven babies were delivered at the Shilo military hospital in June I was basing my statement on advance information. There must have been some miscalculation. In June there were only four babies delivered. I was also in error in under-

stating the cooperative activities. The cooperative activities functioning or being formed include in addition a service station and garage, outdoor swimming and wading pools, seamstress, riding school, bus service, drug store, butcher shop, dry goods and hardware shops and milk delivery.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The minister has, in my judgment, impressed the house with his sincerity and his realistic approach to the problems of his high office, and I wish to congratulate him on his approach and on the way in which he is attacking his problems. The social crediters he will find will endeavour to take a realistic attitude toward Canada's defence as they have done since first coming into public life. In 1936 I made a statement supporting the immediate preparation by Canada for effective participation in the war before ever I came into parliament. Social crediters have taken the attitude consistently, that we should be prepared. It will be altogether too late if we are caught unprepared. One of the speakers referred to the miraculous way in which we came out of the last war with everything against us, seeming, I thought, to imply that we need not now worry too much about being prepared, that we shall come out of the next war in a similar way. That reasoning is probably satisfactory if one does not carry it too far. But what came into my mind as he spoke was: How far and how often should we tempt Providence? Our coming out of the last war successfully was, I think, the result of a great many miraculous interventions by Providence by which we were enabled to save ourselves when our own management did not justify us in expecting to come out of that war successfully at all.

The minister's words have a pleasing and reassuring sound, as most hon. members have pointed out to the committee. All will depend upon the interpretation which he and his department place upon his words, and also upon the attitude which the people of Canada adopt towards defence matters. I thought the remark made by the hon. member for Vegreville concerning silly remarks made about brass hats and the effect that they had on certain gentlemen in the country were very appropriate. In any democracy such as Canada, comprising peoples of different racial origins and with four parties participating in Canadian political life, the greatest care must be exercised by everybody who expresses himself in public or in private, whether it be through the press or otherwise, because so frequently what is said has effects which were not intended.

In a general way I am somewhat concerned about the substantial cuts which have been made in these defence estimates. The minister has said nothing either privately or publicly to indicate that the treasury board were hard on him. If they were, probably the first thing we shall have to do is to assure the treasury board that we do not want the defence needs of Canada to be controlled by the treasury board. We want the treasury board to be controlled by the defence needs of Canada. I think the minister should assert himself definitely in this respect. I gathered from his words that he had in mind the defence we could afford rather more than the defence we needed. I think he should determine the kind of defence we need in Canada and then, having determined that, tell this parliament how much money this is going to cost and require parliament to vote the money. That may sound a little extreme. But if we got into war we would not hesitate regarding money. We would give the minister a blank cheque just as we did in the last war. Why not give him a blank cheque while we are preparing for war? That seems the sensible thing, and that is the policy that, I with moderation, would advocate that parliament should adopt with respect to defence.

I believe the minister ought to inform parliament from time to time as to Canada's needs so that he can take us into his confidence. We shall trust that there will come into parliament no members who will be as irresponsible as a number of members were before the last war, and who will say things that never should be said to the minister. I trust we shall all be able to keep our feet on the ground, all political parties and all racial extractions all over Canada, so that we shall have the best chance of coming through these perilous times we face with the best possible hope of coming out successfully, so that our children and our grandchildren and future generations may continue to enjoy the freedom which our race has struggled for through the centuries.

Canada should, I believe, assume that her defence will depend, of course, upon her own efforts, but mainly upon the efforts of the British commonwealth and empire as a whole. Our friends in the commonwealth and empire have always been ready in the past, and there is no reason why they should not be ready in the times to come. Twice within the memory of all of us we have faced what seemed to be an impossible situation. The British commonwealth has proved to be the backbone, the stomach and the sinews which saved us, under God, in both those wars. I

think we would be well advised to assume that similar conditions will obtain in the future.

Canada should look very carefully to the British commonwealth and empire. I suggest to the minister that we should endeavour to build up that commonwealth and empire, so that it will possess the industrial strength which is necessary to fight a major war. To defend ourselves in such terrible times, we must have industrial self-sufficiency.

I would direct the attention of the minister to what Canada has done in providing herself with rubber through the Polymer establishment. It would be well if Canada would see that every major necessity which it is possible to provide is provided, including large supplies of vital commodities. Every member of the commonwealth should follow the same policy, so that we shall not be in danger of being emasculated, by being cut in two or probably in four through the exigencies of a future war. There should be the greatest cooperation among the members of the commonwealth and the empire in all matters pertaining to the economic and financial strength of the empire.

I think we should strive to build up morale in the commonwealth. We should bring about such conditions in our commonwealth that we shall have prosperity and a high standard of living, so much so that the people will know that the commonwealth is a good place in which to live. We have a good illustration of what might happen if such conditions do not obtain. I think it is well known that the main reason why Eire did not fight in the last war was that conditions economically in Eire had been allowed to deteriorate below a reasonable standard. Eire made up her mind that she simply had to be independent in order to have a greater measure of prosperity. There is no reason why Eire should not be more prosperous as an integral part of the British commonwealth than she could possibly be alone. There have been faulty policies adopted throughout the empire which have resulted in Eire feeling that she had to go out of the empire. People are much inclined to look at the standards of living which they have when they are estimating the value of conditions under which they live. I say that we should raise commonwealth morale by bringing about high standards of prosperity in every part of the empire.

This may all seem a little off the subject of defence, but we must bear in mind that in times of war there is a good deal of truth in what was said regarding the contestants in world war I. It was said that that war would be won by the nation with the deepest stocking; in other words, by the nation that had the strongest financial resources. We should keep in mind that we simply must keep ourselves economically strong all over the empire; otherwise we are not going to fight successfully. Let me mention to the minister, in passing that there has been a determined attempt on the part of a nation that should know better, to break down imperial preferences in the British commonwealth, thereby weakening the economic structure of all the members of the commonwealth. Such attempts as that should be resisted with every bit of strength that we can muster, both publicly and in private, until everybody comes to realize that we must insist on safeguarding our economic and financial strength as a part of our preparations for defence. Imperial preference is one of the devices which we have found advantageous in the past in the development of our financial and economic strength, and obviously it will be a device of great value in that respect in the future.

There should be financial cooperation among the members of the commonwealth to obtain expansion of production and consumption. There should be adopted a scientific method of distribution, both domestically and throughout the commonwealth. I do not propose to enter into a discussion of what method should be used, but I do say that nothing has been found up to the present time that begins to compare in theory with the social credit proposals. If social credit were applied throughout the British commonwealth and empire the empire's fighting strength would be astoundingly increased. It would enable all parts of the empire to take advantage of the resources of all the empire, a thing which today is quite impossible. I point that out to the minister; I point that out to the members of the house and to the people of the country who will read my words.

Up to the present it has not been a question of the capacity of the various members of the empire to produce; it has not been a question of the resources they have; it has been a question of whether we can use those resources. In the past, except in times of war, we have not been able to use the valuable resources which Providence has put in our hands. Let any man who thinks he is able to devise a way of solving the problem proceed immediately to offer his suggestion. I suggest that the application of social credit is a means at our disposal which would make us strong for the terrible times which I think every member in this house feels are not very far ahead.

After the commonwealth, Canada should count upon the United States. I think the minister is doing that quite satisfactorily. There is no objection to close cooperation and collaboration with the United States, but in our dealings with the United States we should be sure that we are protecting our interests politically, economically, financially and strategically. This we should do before we enter the next war, during that war and after that war is over.

It may not be entirely in order for a member of the Canadian House of Commons to make observations concerning the transfer of so many of our commonwealth bases for forty or fifty outmoded ships during the last war, but I think every red-blooded Britisher from one end of the empire to the other resented deeply the fact that the United States took advantage of the difficulties we were in to get 99-year leases on certain vital bases in the British commonwealth. When we consider that her own safety was at stake just as much as ours, I think we must all agree that the correct words to use about that occurrence would not be suitable words to use in a parliament of the empire.

So I say we ought to take pains to see to it that we protect ourselves politically, economically, financially and strategically before the next war, during the next war and after the next war whenever we are dealing with the United States. I have no desire to be harsh about things which happened during the last six or seven years. We are grateful for the assistance that the United States gave us, but I hope she is equally grateful for the assistance we have given her.

Canada should not neglect the united nations organization, but we should be very careful with respect to that organization. Of course most hon. members are quite at variance with me in regard to that organization, but I think the day will come when they will see things very much as I see them in respect of the whole united nations organization and the charter. I would warn that we do not trust too far in our dealings with that organization. We should take every care to guard our sovereignty and freedom, politically, economically, financially and strategically, just as we should with respect to the United States before the coming war, during the war and after the war.

All we need to do is to remember the dismal record of the league of nations. There are those who will say, "Well, the united nations organization is quite different from the league of nations." I do not see that it is any more likely to succeed than the league of nations was. Hon. members know what happened to us as the result of the league of nations. I was as ardent an advocate of the league of nations as anyone, but this is what actually occurred. The league of nations caused the British commonwealth to count upon it too much. It caused us to neglect our defences in every way. It even made it so that it was difficult to get an intelligent and realistic discussion in the matter of defence in the various houses of parliament of the empire. If anything like that occurs as a result of the united nations—and we see signs of that already—then the united nations organization can be something that we may regret very deeply. Therefore I say, let us just be careful in respect of that organization. I am afraid it will be found by the people of the future that the whole united nations organization and united nations covenant were devised as a United States commercial contrivance, aimed at increasing the sales of United States goods all over the world. That was the primary object.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I have allowed the hon. member wide latitude, but I feel that he should direct his remarks to the department which is being considered, the Department of National Defence. I realize that there is some connection between economic theories and defence, but I do not think the estimates of the department should be used to illustrate economic theories. May I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks more directly to national defence.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I have said all I want to say in that respect, Mr. Chairman, but I think it would be quite in order to point out to you and to hon. members that whenever we have endeavoured to bring these matters up before the House of Commons they have been always out of order on one ground or another. Yet it can be found that these matters are of the most vital concern to us. There is something radically wrong in the world today; otherwise we should not have a world divided into two great camps, led by two great nations, each of which prides itself upon being a peace-loving nation. There is something terribly wrong somewhere. We ought to find out what is the matter, but I will say no more on this now. I would simply say that the nations would be well advised to be wary how far they put their trust in the united nations organization for their defence.

In my judgment steps ought to be taken to have the people of Canada informed as fully as possible on all matters pertaining to Canadian defence. The value of the British commonwealth, the greatness, the strength, the

potentialities of the British commonwealth should be brought before the people. In centres throughout the country, in the press and elsewhere, I find a tendency nowadays to disregard these matters. I was principal of schools for some twenty years before I entered parliament. I know what was on the curriculum of the schools in Alberta. I think Alberta was no different in this regard from the other provinces. The attention which has been given to these vital matters of our defence has been so slight that the boys and girls have had no chance at all to form a sound opinion as to how to plot their course for the greatest possible safety of their society. How you can possibly have a nation safe when it is so ill-informed on vital matters is something that I fail to be able to see. What I suggest to the minister is that a part of his work should be devising ways and means whereby we can get out to the youth of this country and the people generally the essential facts. The remarks of the hon. member for York West regarding intelligence were appropriate. I would take the matter of intelligence just a little bit further and advise that intelligence for the people all over the country concerning all matters pertaining to the national well-being and defence should be more carefully attended to. Every precaution should be taken to see that nothing but the absolute truth is given. That is a matter which would help us greatly in our defence in the future.

Much attention ought to be given to the causes of war and how to remove them. In his statement this morning, the minister said nothing as to the causes of war or whether or not we are doing anything to remove them. I would think that if we want to defend ourselves one of the very first things we ought to discover is whether or not we are contributing to the causes of the next world war by the policies which we are pursuing. I think there is hardly any doubt that we are contributing to the causes of the next war by the policies we are pursuing. In my opinion, much attention should be given to that by the minister. Let it be borne in mind that the cause of war is hot commercial rivalry, the struggle for markets and for raw material; also unemployment and poverty which brings about such extreme movements as the nazi movement and other movements which indirectly resulted in the last war. To what extent are we pursuing policies which are resulting in the accomplishment of the evils from which we suffered in the last war? In my judgment, much could be done to eliminate or at least to remove the intensity of the struggle for markets and raw materials. It seems to me that the minister is partly responsible for discovering what that may be and advocating that it ought to be done.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I do not think the Minister of National Defence, as Minister of National Defence, has any control over the discovery of markets. I do not think that discussion should be carried on under these estimates.

Mr. BLACKMORE: As a matter of fact, it is a matter of difference of opinion. The minister is meeting with the other members of the cabinet and the cabinet is devising the policy for this country. However I am not going to pursue the matter. I submit to the minister that he seriously consider it just as other hon. members should.

The citizens of Canada ought to be trained in first aid of all kinds. In his statement, the minister hardly mentioned that. Possibly he has something of that sort in mind, but we should not wait until the V-1 and the V-2 bombs and the other horrible monstrosities come, to begin to teach our people first aid. The people should know all about these things. They should have first-aid shelters all over the country. I had the privilege of being in Britain in 1941 along with the Chairman. He will remember how difficult it had been for them to establish first-aid shelters and how important they were. I should think they ought to be established all over the country before the trouble comes along. Why should people not be trained? I should think it would be a part of our defence mechanism.

We should have people trained in fire-fighting, because certainly if any credence can be placed in the suggestions as to what terrible instruments of war are being developed, fire is going to play an important part in the suffering which people have to go through in the next war. Fire will be among the people just as it was in Britain.

There should be an organization for local defence. The minister has talked about reserves. I would commend him for all he said about keeping up the reserve force, but I have an idea that the people should be trained as citizens' armies. I remember the great anxiety which was felt in certain parts of Canada when we were in the midst of danger from attack by the Japanese. I heard people in western areas say they would give almost anything if they had a few machine guns and knew how to use them, because the possession of the right kind of arms, and skill in using them, by the ordinary citizen, by farmers and others who might be in danger of being overrun, could easily have turned the

tide in case of a Japanese invasion. This matter should be given a great deal of thought while we are training reserve forces. I may have more to say regarding defence at a later time, but perhaps this is sufficient for the present.

Mr. WYLIE: During this debate we have heard many speeches about the navy, the army and the air force, and I feel that I should say a few words at this time. I cannot be accused of taking up much of the time of the house. As a matter of fact, this is only the third time I have risen to speak. I hear certain murmurs on the other side of the house but I ignore them. I could discuss the army and perhaps do so sensibly since I was a member of the southern Alberta regiment for three years, but I will not go into that question at the present time. I intend to discuss it under another item, particularly with regard to the uniforms that men in the army have to wear. I have worn these uniforms, and when I put them on I certainly did not feel very well dressed in comparison with members of the air force and the navy. I intend to go into that question under the appropriate item when we come to it.

The matter I now wish to discuss does not pertain to any of the three services. I am not sure where I am in order, thought I hope I am. If not, then I can discuss it under some other item. What I shall have to say now has reference to the area that is known as the British block adjoining Medicine Hat. It is an area that was taken over in 1941 by the Department of National Defence, and this meant the moving of 130 families from the area.

The area comprises 700,000 acres of land. Last January, at the convention of the united farmers of Alberta a resolution was passed unanimously endorsing steps taken by one of the men who were moved from that area. In the course of this session every hon. member must, I am sure, have received a copy of the resolution. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee in reading the resolution now, since, as I say, everyone has a copy of it. The minister, I believe, also received a copy. The resolution was passed, as I say, at a convention of the united farmers of Alberta, which is the largest organization of farmers in that province, and it was passed unanimously.

On March 15, 1947, there appeared in *Maclean's* magazine an article under the title "Cross Country", from which I will read certain excerpts for the information of hon. members. This is what the writer of this article states:

> In the dark wartime spring of 1941 a party representing the British government appeared in the "British block" of southern Alberta, a sparsely settled area of more than 700,000 acres between Suffield and the Saskatchewan boundary. They wanted the land, and they wanted it fast.
>
> To each of the 130 families in the block this offer was made: trade acre for acre, for crown lands north of the Red Deer river, plus a cash settlement for buildings, or, instead, a straight $6.50 per acre. The farmers thought both offers unfair.
>
> But the government—and the war—couldn't wait. R.C.M.P. officers summoned the farmers to court in Medicine Hat, where they were summarily ordered off their land in 15 days, and recompensed at $1 an acre for raw land, five cents per acre for each unexpired year on leased land, and $4 per acre for standing crops, $2 per head for moving livestock and no stated offer for buildings.
>
> When the settlers had gone, the area around Suffield became the "New Mexico" of Canada. It was used by Canada, Britain and the United States as a supersecret testing ground, chiefly for poison gas, but also for explosives and other weapons. The area is now a permanent military experimental station, including three camps and an airfield, that cost more than $8 millions.
>
> The 130 families scattered across Canada and the United States. Some of them refused to accept a cent of the award. All of them felt that they had been treated unfairly, that the people of the "British block" got less than British justice. Now they want the question reopened. The united farmers of Alberta support their appeal for arbitration.

After that article appeared in this magazine, one of the members of the board who had something to do with making settlement with these farmers put another article in *Maclean's* magazine. I read that article, as I have no doubt many other hon. members did, and after reading it I wrote to the Minister of National Defence suggesting that the case be reopened and further consideration be given the farmers. I thought that possibly that would be done, but this, in part, is the letter which I received from the minister dated April 30, 1947:

> A short time ago *Maclean's* magazine published an article on this matter with the result that one of the men who acted for this department wrote a letter to Mr. Horace T. Hunter, president of the Maclean-Hunter publishing Company Limited, copy of which is enclosed, and which I think deals with the matter thoroughly.

That is the letter I got in reply to my letter to the minister. I will read the letter to Mr. Hunter. It is quite a long letter, but I will read it and another letter before I am through. It is dated March 14, 1947, and is addressed to Mr. Horace T. Hunter, president

Maclean-Hunter Publishing Company Limited, 481 University avenue, Toronto 2, Ontario. It reads:

Dear Sir: An item "Cross Country—The Prairies," which appears on page 72 of the March 15, 1947, issue of *Maclean's* magazine, is the type of misleading malicious report which is fuel for communist propaganda.

May I digress for a moment. First of all, I want to say that the man who wrote this letter did not know the first thing of what he was talking about. If he had lived in that area, as many of the farmers, and as I myself have done, he certainly would not say that it was communist propaganda.

Mr. CLAXTON: But he did not say that in the letter. He said that the article was fuel for communist propaganda.

Mr. WYLIE: That is exactly what he said, and he certainly did not know the facts or he would not have said that. I know every farmer who resided in that area and I am sure there was not a communist there.

Mr. CLAXTON: But he does not say that. He does not say there was a communist there. He says that that kind of attitude, that kind of misstatement, would be fuel for communist propaganda.

Mr. WYLIE: I will accept the statement of the minister, but I still contend that he should have kept that out of this letter. He goes on:

As a member of the real estate adviser's staff who proceeded to Medicine Hat in May, 1941, to acquire the "British block," comprising approximately 1,100 square miles, and which was so urgently needed at that time by the British government for experimental purposes, I am fully aware of all the facts, which are as follows:

I do not know the details of any offers which might have been made to the owners of the property prior to May, 1941, before the real estate adviser's branch was requested to take over, but I know no progress had been made in obtaining this land.

Lieut.-Col. Goodwin Gibson, O.B.E., at that time real estate adviser to the Department of National Defence, and presently president of Gibson Brothers, Toronto, assembled at Medicine Hat the following:

Mr. H. A. Dyde, O.B.E., lawyer, Department of National Defence, presently practising law in Edmonton; Mr. G. M. Bowes, O.B.E., of the real estate adviser's office, Department of National Defence, presently vice-president, Oldfield, Kirby and Gardner, Winnipeg; Mr. Frank W. Collins, industrial commissioner, Canadian Pacific Railway; Mr. G. H. S. Dinsmore, assistant to real estate adviser, Department of National Defence, presently director, lands and buildings, War Assets Corporation; Mr. J. Wurtele Rankin, O.B.E., assistant to real estate adviser, Department of National Defence, presently vice-president, Westmount Realties Company, Montreal; Mr. Harry Allum, chief field representative, soldiers' settlement board for Western Canada, Edmonton, presently head of Department of Veterans Affairs, Edmonton, Alta; fifteen field representatives of the soldiers' settlement board from all sections of Western Canada; Royal Canadian Mounted Police personnel stenographers, et cetera.

Because of the urgency of possession, the property was expropriated, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were used to distribute the notices of expropriation over this huge area, and they had nothing whatever to do with issuing summonses to farmers to appear in court in Medicine Hat. The expropriation was dated June 4, 1941, and everyone had to be off the area by July 1.

The court house in Medicine Hat was loaned to the real estate adviser's department only because there was no other suitable vacant space available in Medicine Hat, and it was just coincidental that this location was obtained.

Digressing for a moment from the letter, may I say that according to the letter the court house was used entirely for this purpose. At that time my office was in the court house and they certainly did not use my office. It is quite true they used a small space in there, but once again this writer is wrong. I continue:

A complete inventory and valuation of each owner's property was made by field representatives of the soldiers' settlement board, who are acknowledged as being well versed in prairie farm values, and who worked day and night to accomplish the task in short order.

The buildings were put in at full value to the farm, and not the depreciated value as they should have been. After paying the owners for the buildings, they (the owners) were given the right to remove any or all buildings, fences or equipment, and as a result many buildings were moved to Medicine Hat and elsewhere, and are in use today.

Among allowances given were $3 per head for driving off cattle, $1 for each horse, 50 cents for each sheep, being amounts determined by drovers and cattlemen as being fair and reasonable; $3 per ton in stacks for what went as hay but which would not be regarded in better areas as feed at all; from $50 to $250, depending on the size of the family and the distance from Medicine Hat, was allowed for moving expenses, 25 cents per foot for each dug well, 5 cents per acre per year, limited to ten years, for unexpired ranch leases, the rentals of which were in many cases in default and yearly grazing leases had not been renewed but were recognized just the same.

In regard to the type of land, the biggest rancher in the area had about 40,000 acres under lease and, by drilling gas wells by the river, obtained power to pump water by which he irrigated some three thousand acres of land. In this way, he was able to grow alfalfa grass and thus obtain winter feed for his herds. In spite of this, however, his foreman claimed that the land could only support thirty head on each section of 640 acres. This should show that $1 per acre was a generous amount for raw land of this description, but it should be noted that as high as I think, $27 per acre was paid for some of the best land. Naturally, in such a large area, the type of land varied and was priced accordingly.

In spite, however, of all the allowances given to the various owners, it was found in many

cases that their accumulated debts were still greater than what could be allowed them. Colonel Gibson contacted Hon. Mr. W. A. Fallow, at that time Minister of Agriculture of the province of Alberta—

May I digress just here for a moment and say that Mr. Fallow was never minister of agriculture of Alberta. Mr. Fallow is minister of public works of Alberta. The minister of agriculture of Alberta at that time was Mr. D. B. Mullen, if I am not mistaken. To continue:

—and appealed for help for these unfortunates. As a result, the province generously agreed to forgive all debts up to the point where $1,500 could be paid these settlers for their lands and buildings with the other allowances made added to that amount.

The owners of the cultivated land had the opportunity of either accepting $4 per acre for standing crops, or could harvest their crops, whichever they chose, but could not live on the land after July 1, 1941. Practically all decided to accept the $4 per acre for crops, and as for the very few who did not, I understand they did not net more than the amount offered for standing crops. This area is in a dry belt, occupation of the area should never have been permitted in the first place, and it was a godsend to get these settlers off this type of land.

Mr. MacINNIS: Six o'clock.

Mr. WYLIE: May we call it six o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member desire to finish reading the letter?

Mr. WYLIE: I can finish after six o'clock.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at seven o'clock.

PRINCESS ELIZABETH

ANNOUNCEMENT OF BETROTHAL TO LIEUTENANT PHILIP MOUNTBATTEN

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): With the consent of the house, Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to the next item I should like to say a few words with respect to an important and historic announcement which has been made in the United Kingdom today. It will be with the greatest pleasure, I am sure, that the people of Canada will have learned of the announcement made in London today that Their Majesties the King and Queen have given their consent to the betrothal of their elder daughter, the Princess Elizabeth, to Lieutenant Philip Mountbatten, Royal Navy, the only son of the late Prince Andrew of Greece and the Princess Alice of Battenberg. The Canadian government was informed earlier by His Majesty of the betrothal of the Princess Elizabeth, and was most pleased to give its concurrence.

I am sure that hon. members of both houses of parliament will wish to join in an expression of our warmest good wishes to the Princess Elizabeth, whose charm and sincerity have already endeared her to the Canadian people, and also in hearty congratulations to Lieutenant Philip Mountbatten. It will be the wish of all that health, happiness and Divine guidance may gladden the path through life of Her Royal Highness and Lieutenant Philip Mountbatten as they face the future together.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I am sure it will be the wish of every hon. member of this house to join with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in extending to this young couple our congratulations and best wishes. As for myself, as they enter upon a new career in a new world I should like to express the hope that it may be given to Princess Elizabeth and her prince consort to do as much for the commonwealth and the world at large as it was given to Queen Victoria and her consort to do in an earlier period in our history.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I am sure all hon. members on all sides of the house and of all parties will wish the young couple everything that is good in life.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, the members of the Social Credit party join with the other hon. members who have spoken in extending the warmest good wishes to the princess and her prince consort; and we wish them a long life and great achievements in their reign.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Fifth and sixth reports of standing committee on public accounts—Mr. Picard.

TAX AGREEMENTS

COMPENSATION TO PROVINCES IN LIEU OF INCOME AND OTHER TAXES

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Hon. Mr. Abbott for the second reading of Bill No. 411, to authorize the government to enter into agreement with the governments of the provinces pursuant to which, in return for compensation, the provinces agree to refrain from levying certain taxes for a limited period.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): The bill now before the house embodies the final outcome of negotiations that

have extended over a period of almost two years. It authorizes the governor in council to enter into agreements with provincial governments embodying the terms and conditions so negotiated, it gives authority to carry out certain ancillary actions, and it provides the necessary appropriations.

As hon. members well know, the arrangements which have been agreed upon represent a compromise with our original objectives which we found it impossible to achieve, because of the failure to reach agreement with all of the nine provinces. I do not intend by that statement to cast blame in any direction. I am only stating a fact. I cannot let the occasion pass, however, without again affirming that the dominion government has made every effort to reach unanimous agreement, and far from being rigid and uncompromising in its attitude, as has been alleged on several occasions during the course of the negotiations, it has repeatedly made adjustments in its proposals, repeatedly accepted suggestions put forward by various provincial governments, repeatedly made concessions to secure unanimous agreement. In order, therefore, to place the present position in its proper perspective, I wish to say a word about its historical background and then to review briefly and simply the course of the protracted negotiations from 1945 to date.

The genesis of the current phase of dominion-provincial relations dates back to the financial difficulties faced by several provinces during the depression years of the thirties. In spite of large dominion grants in aid and heavy construction expenditure, the burden of unemployment relief had been such as to weaken the financial position of all provincial governments, but in the prairie west drought and depressed agricultural prices had created an additional, almost intolerable strain, leading to default on the part of Alberta and threatening the solvency of the other two provinces. Further financial assistance of an interim character was granted to Manitoba and Saskatchewan as a result of reports made by the Bank of Canada in the spring of 1937 but it had already become clear that no permanent or satisfactory solution could be developed without a fundamental inquiry into the financial powers and responsibilities of Canadian governing bodies at all levels. This led to the establishment in August 1937 of a royal commission, first under the chairmanship of the Honourable Justice N. W. Rowell of Toronto, later under that of Doctor Joseph Sirois of Quebec, to inquire into the constitutional allocation of revenue sources and governmental burdens in Canada and—

> . . . to express what in their opinion, subject to the retention of the distribution of legislative powers essential to the proper carrying out of the federal system in harmony with national needs and the promotion of national unity, will best effect a balanced relationship between the financial powers and the obligations and functions of each governing body and conduce to a more efficient, independent and economical discharge of governmental responsibilities in Canada.

If I may say so, that statement, extracted from order in council P.C. 1908 of August 14, 1937, of the high objective of a healthy and vigorous federal system of government, has remained throughout the long years and the changing circumstances since that time the fundamental objective of the government of Canada.

After the most thorough-going and comprehensive inquiry into the problems of federal government ever undertaken in the history of any state, the commission submitted its report on May 3, 1940, nearly three years later and after the outbreak of war. Stated very briefly, its chief recommendations were: (1) exclusive dominion jurisdiction in the fields of income and corporation taxes and succession duties; (2) acceptance by the dominion of responsibility for relief to the employable unemployed; (3) assumption by the dominion of net provincial debt charges; and (4) payment by the dominion of national adjustment grants designed to put each provincial government in a position to provide average standards of services without imposing higher than average rates of taxation.

A dominion-provincial conference was called in January 1941, to consider the royal commission's report but after sitting two or three days the conference broke down in the face of opposition from the premiers of three provinces.

It soon became apparent, however, that Canada's chaotic tax structure would not permit the financing on either an efficient or an equitable basis of a war effort of the magnitude which the necessities of the second world war were to make imperative. Consequently, in the budget of April 29, 1941, the then minister of finance made an offer to the effect that if the provincial governments (and their municipalities) were prepared to suspend imposition of income and corporation taxes until the end of the war and one year thereafter the dominion government would make annual payments to the provinces equal to either the 1940 revenues of the particular province from these sources or the amount of that province's net debt service less succession duty

collections in 1940. The offer also included some relatively small "fiscal need" subsidies proposed in those cases where budgets could not otherwise be balanced, and an offer to guarantee provincial gasoline tax revenues at the 1940 level. Agreements were negotiated with all the provincial governments in 1941 and the necessary legislation was passed in the spring of 1942. I think it not unfair to say that it is impossible to exaggerate the contribution which this co-operative arrangement made to the efficient and equitable financing of the war, to the maintenance of Canada's financial stability during the war, and consequently to Canada's ability to meet the financial and economic problems of postwar reconstruction.

It was our experience with these war-time tax agreements and the knowledge that after their termination a number of the pre-war financial and constitutional problems would probably arise in an exaggerated form that led the dominion government to take the initiative in preparing the way for postwar agreements with the provinces. After a great deal of consideration over a period of many months, there had been worked out a comprehensive set of proposals which were broader in scope than the Sirois report recommendations but were framed in an earnest effort to avoid, if at all possible, the major objections that had caused the rejection of those recommendations. The agreement was to be for a temporary period and therefore its terms would be subject to review prior to any renewal. In particular it would require no constitutional changes, although there was one recommendation for a constitutional amendment to provide for delegation of powers from the dominion government to a provincial government or vice versa, whenever desired by both governments. Other less important features were designed to avoid possible objections.

The purpose of the dominion in preparing these proposals was to endeavour to work out with the provinces a coordinated programme by which the dominion and provincial governments could most effectively work together to maintain high and expanding levels of employment and national income such as had been attained in war time, to provide a wide measure of economic and social security, and finally to give the Canadian people a less burdensome, more efficient tax system, which indeed was a prerequisite for attaining the other objectives. In the field of public welfare, the proposals included constructive measures for a programme of health insurance and health grants, a comprehensive scheme of pensions for the aged and the blind and the provision of unemployment assistance, with the whole or a substantial share of the cost being borne by the dominion. In the field of public investment the dominion outlined a substantial expansion in its programme for natural resource development, conservation and public works, and also a large increase in dominion assistance to provincial services and construction projects either through joint participation or by grants in aid. Particular emphasis was placed upon, and tangible encouragement offered to, the advance planning of public projects, and in so far as practicable, the timing of public investment expenditures with a view to helping stabilize employment and offset fluctuations in the business cycle.

To avoid duplication and conflict in the tax field and to enable the dominion to develop an equitable and efficient tax system, the proposals included a provision that the provincial governments should rent to the dominion for the term of the agreement their rights in the fields of income and corporation taxes and succession duties. As compensation or rental therefor, the dominion would make annual payments to the provinces on the basis of $12 per capita of provincial population, with an adjustment for increases in gross national product per capita over the base year 1941. These payments would include the ordinary statutory subsidies. This formula would guarantee the provinces a minimum annual payment of $138 million and for a year in which the national income had risen to $950 per capita, as is now roughly estimated for 1947, the formula would call for a total payment of about $195 million. The dominion felt at the time that payments of this magnitude, coupled with the various other proposals in the field of public investment and social security, would enable all provincial governments to carry out their constitutional responsibilities with assurance and adequacy; under prosperous conditions they would be expected to have surpluses, perhaps even substantial surpluses, but at the same time they would be protected against any major deterioration in revenues when business fell below normal. If I may quote from the so-called Green Book proposals (page 51):

> To sum up, it is the belief of the dominion government that the proposed financial arrangements in conjunction with the other measures recommended would strengthen the federal system under which all ten governments here represented function. They would give to each government an assured basis of financial responsibility and freedom of decision in the matters entrusted to it by the constitution.

The proposals of the dominion were presented to the provinces in a dominion-provin-

cial conference held in Ottawa during the week beginning August 6, 1945—incidentally, the week which saw the surrender of Japan and the end of world war II.

At this conference, the provincial governments accepted the dominion's proposals as a basis for discussion. It was suggested, however, that better progress could be made if an opportunity were given to all governments for studying the proposals and if the procedure was such as to avoid projecting controversial issues into public discussion. It was therefore decided to establish a coordinating committee, composed of the heads of the various governments, to consider further procedure and to examine in detail the proposals made by the dominion as well as those that might be made by any other government.

This coordinating committee met in November, 1945, in camera and there was a full and frank discussion of the important issues involved. At this meeting it was decided to establish an economic committee composed of technical representatives of the dominion and nine provincial governments to examine in detail all the dominion's proposals against the background of the economic prospects that might be expected during the period of the agreement. This committee carried on its work during the months of December, 1945, and January, 1946, giving detailed consideration not only to the dominion's financial, social security and public investment proposals but also to proposals made by certain of the provinces, particularly those of the province of Ontario.

In January, 1946, the coordinating committee was reconvened to discuss the dominion's proposals and any alternatives advanced by provincial governments in the light of the findings of the economic committee. This conference, which lasted for several days, was also held in camera but there was later public disclosure of the fact that the dominion had made substantial concessions to the provinces, in particular the proposal to increase the guaranteed minimum payment from $12 to $15 per capita with adjustments from the 1942 base for increases in provincial population and in gross national product per capita. Two additional options were provided. In the first place, no province was to receive less than $2 million, an option designed to fit the special case of Prince Edward Island, and in the second place, any province had the right to accept as its minimum 150 per cent of the amount which it had been receiving from the dominion under its war-time tax agreement, an option which had special appeal for British Columbia. The effect of these proposals was to increase the total of the guaranteed minimum payments to the provinces from $138 million to $180·4 million, an increase of over thirty per cent. The dominion also gave an undertaking in this conference that it would not enter certain fields of taxation which the provinces were currently cultivating, would not increase certain of its own excise taxes, and would undertake to seek a new constitutional amendment that would allow the provinces to impose a limited retail sales tax. Certain modifications were also proposed in the public welfare measures, which entailed additional commitments by the dominion.

Like its two predecessors, the January conference adjourned without reaching a decision but it was decided to hold a further meeting at the end of April, 1946. During a two-day session in camera, the dominion answered certain questions that had been asked by provincial premiers, and made an important modification of its earlier proposals, the effect of which was to allow any province to remain in the succession duty field if it so wished, in which case an appropriate adjustment would be made in the annual payment due to it. It was then decided to move the conference into plenary session and public meetings were held daily from April 29 to May 3. In these open sessions the dominion proposals as revised from time to time in the preceding conferences were presented and discussed. An alternative proposal was presented by the premier of Ontario which was found unacceptable to this government because of the large additional cost which we estimated it would involve to the dominion treasury. In its revised proposals the dominion felt that it had made as comprehensive an offer and had undertaken to assume as great a financial burden as it then believed it possible to justify to the people of Canada. The negotiations had already extended over nine months and during that period of time the dominion had repeatedly revised its proposals in the endeavour to meet the several requests made by the provinces. The dominion was still willing to accept suggestions for modification of its proposals provided that they did not further increase the burden upon the taxpayers of Canada. In particular and because of the strongly expressed desire of several provinces to have fields of taxation solely for their own use, the then minister of finance expressed the dominion's willingness to rent for a temporary period our rights to use certain fields of excise tax (gasoline taxes, amusement taxes, taxes on pari-mutuel bets) in the same way as we were asking the provinces to rent to us temporarily their rights in certain fields of direct

taxation. However, there was no agreement reached among the provinces with respect to an appropriate rental consideration. On May 3 the conference adjourned *sine die* without any agreement having been reached.

Failure of these protracted efforts to achieve general agreement on its comprehensive proposals posed a difficult problem for the dominion, as well of course as for at least several of the provincial governments. The dominion budget had to be brought down within a matter of weeks. The war-time tax agreements were to lapse in the case of three provinces in the late fall and in the case of all other provinces in the spring of 1947. Under these wartime agreements, the dominion was committed to making certain reductions, in its income and corporation taxes as from January 1, 1947, but it could not simply carry out its commitments and remain indifferent to the financial problems which at least the less favoured provinces were bound to face. For several of these provinces the pre-war situation had been intolerable but meanwhile provincial expenditures had expanded greatly and while revenues had also increased to some extent, it was obvious that without new agreements several provinces were going to be faced with a difficult budget problem. Financial pressure on these provinces, it was clear, would give rise to increasingly arbitrary and discriminatory taxation tending to hamper production, would lead to interference with interprovincial trade, and would tend to promote the extension of government operation of business merely in order to obtain additional provincial revenues, which of course would mean loss of revenues to the dominion. An inefficient and chaotic tax structure might seriously impair the capacity of private enterprise to provide high and expanding employment. Budget difficulties and financial pressures would tend to weaken the financial autonomy of the provinces and impair the strength of the federal system. Some provinces might indeed find it difficult to maintain their solvency.

After very careful consideration the government reached the conclusion that it would be shirking its responsibility to the people of Canada if it allowed such a situation to develop without a further attempt to prevent it. It sought therefore to devise some modified proposal which could be accepted by those provinces which wished to accept it and be left aside by those which did not desire it or felt they had no need for it. It was this type of proposal which the then minister of finance outlined in his budget speech of June 27, 1946. Without the prospect of unanimous agreement, it was necessary to limit the proposal to the financial provisions relating to the rental of tax fields. No changes were suggested in the formula for calculating the annual payments to the provinces but the proposal as a whole was so designed that any province that did not accept its terms could impose its own taxes without placing its taxpayers in an unfair position relative to the taxpayers in other provinces. The agreeing provinces, for example, were to impose a 5 per cent tax on the income of their corporations, so that a corporation in a non-agreeing province which imposed a tax no higher than that rate would be in the same position as a corporation in an agreeing province. The dominion also offered to allow a taxpayer a credit against his personal income tax up to five per cent for personal income taxes paid to a province; this would allow a non-agreeing province to impose a tax of this weight without subjecting its citizens to double taxation. Finally, the dominion proposed that its succession duty rates should be doubled and a credit given up to one-half thereof for duties paid to a provincial government, as a means of allowing any government, including that of an agreeing province, to continue to impose succession duties if it so wished.

As I have stated, the formula for calculating the annual payments to the provinces was the same as that outlined to the dominion-provincial conference by the Prime Minister on April 29, 1946. However, in the course of the negotiations with individual provinces during the months following the delivery of the budget, the government became convinced that these financial terms, standing alone and extracted from the broader context of the original proposals which provided assistance in other forms to the provincial governments, might prove inadequate in certain cases to protect a province against the rising costs of government that might be anticipated in the years ahead. This was particularly true of the special formulae, applicable to the provinces of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, as the flat payment of $2 million in the one case, and the payment based on 150 per cent of the war-time tax agreement receipts in the other case, were not subject to adjustment for increases in population and gross national product. To correct this situation, the dominion first undertook that these minimum payments to Prince Edward Island and British Columbia would be subject to adjustment for increases in population and gross national product. Later, when it was urged by the other provinces that the basis of their compensation should also be reviewed, a modification of the original formula was worked out, and made applicable

to all provinces, in January 1947, under which it is believed the maximum practicable degree of "equalization" of the terms of payment to the various provinces has been achieved.

Under the new formula every province will have a guaranteed minimum annual payment which will be subject to adjustment upward for increases in provincial population and in gross national product per capita, in just the same way as for all other provinces. For the province of Prince Edward Island, the guaranteed minimum will be the flat sum of $2,100,000. All other provinces will have the choice of either one of two formulae for determining their guaranteed minimum annual payment.

As the house will recall, the first option involves the addition of the three following elements:

1. $12.75 per capita based on the 1942 population of the province;

2. Fifty per cent of the revenue of the province from income and corporation taxes for the year ending nearest to December 31, 1940, as agreed for purposes of the wartime tax agreement; and

3. the amount of the statutory subsidies payable to the province in 1947.

This option is the one which proves to be most favourable in the case of New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia. It will be noted that it has the great merit of including in the guaranteed minimum payments the amounts of the statutory subsidies payable to the various provinces, which have been the product of eighty years of historical development and negotiation. For the rest this particular option is based on a reasonable compromise between the principle of basing the annual grants on equal per capita payments and the principle of adjusting the grants to the varying capacity of the provinces to raise revenues from the tax sources which they are renting to the dominion. The greatest weight is placed on the principle of equality but at the same time reasonable weight is given to the principle of tax ability or tax potential, which is of advantage to the more favoured provinces, and reasonable weight also to the principle of need, which is reflected in the statutory subsidies and which is of course of greatest advantage to the less favoured provinces.

The second option gives the province the right to receive a guaranteed minimum annual payment equal to the sum of its statutory subsidies payable in 1947 and an amount equal to $15 per capita based on the 1942 population of the province. This is the option which proves most favourable to the provinces of Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan. In the case of Nova Scotia the province had not been cultivating the fields of income and corporation taxes as intensively as other provinces in the base year of the war-time tax agreement and in the case of Saskatchewan prevailing economic conditions in that province had led to a relatively low yield from these tax fields in 1940. It could have been contended, therefore, that the first option would not be fair to either of these two provinces, and consequently the second option was worked out to meet their special situations.

With the consent of the house I shall now place on *Hansard* a table showing the calculation of the guaranteed minimum annual payment for each province, as well as a table showing how the adjusted annual payments for 1947 are calculated and how they work out for each province on the basis of the latest data now available.

(*Tables appear on following pages*)

Mr. BRACKEN: Has the minister extra copies of these tables?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have not. They are long, complicated tables and that is why I am placing them on *Hansard*. They show in detail how the calculations were arrived at. I thought that was information which hon. members would like to have. I am afraid I have not additional copies with me at the moment.

The first of these tables shows that if all provinces should enter into agreements, the aggregate of the guaranteed minimum annual payments (including statutory subsidies) would be $206,463,248, made up as follows:

Prince Edward Island	$ 2,100,000
Nova Scotia	10,870,140
New Brunswick	8,773,420
Quebec	56,382,127
Ontario	67,158,027
Manitoba	13,540,038
Saskatchewan	15,291,490
Alberta	14,227,882
British Columbia	18,120,124
	$206,463,248

As already indicated, the amounts payable to the various provinces will never fall below the amount of the above-mentioned minima. However, the actual payment to any province in any one year will be the higher of two amounts, that is to say, either the amount of its guaranteed minimum or alternatively the amount of that minimum adjusted upwards for changes in gross national product per capita and in provincial population. This adjustment is based on the average of the amounts for each of the three calendar years immediately preceding the fiscal year in

[Mr. Abbott.]

CALCULATION OF GUARANTEED MINIMUM ANNUAL PAYMENT

—	Prince Edward Island	Nova Scotia	New Brunswick	Quebec	Ontario	Manitoba	Saskatchewan	Alberta	British Columbia	Total
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
FIRST OPTION—										
(1) $12.75 per capita on 1942 population *(a)*.	1,147,500	7,535,250	5,916,000	43,222,500	49,521,000	9,297,045	11,262,470	10,169,413	11,092,500	149,163,678
(2) 50% of provincial income and corporation tax revenue for year ending nearest Dec. 31, 1940 (Wartime Tax Agreements)	125,972	804,715	1,225,034	10,293,037	14,482,020	2,527,370	1,046,461	2,040,430	6,024,184	38,569,223
(3) Statutory subsidies payable in 1947	656,932	2,005,140	1,632,386	2,866,590	3,155,007	1,715,623	2,041,525	2,018,039	1,003,440	17,094,682
Total	1,930,404	10,345,105	8,773,420	56,382,127	67,158,027	13,540,038	14,350,456	14,227,882	18,120,124	204,827,583
SECOND OPTION—										
(1) $15.00 per capita on 1942 population *(a)*.	1,350,000	8,865,000	6,960,000	50,850,000	58,260,000	10,937,700	13,249,965	11,964,015	13,050,000	175,486,680
(2) Statutory subsidies payable in 1947	656,932	2,005,140	1,632,386	2,866,590	3,155,007	1,715,623	2,041,525	2,018,039	1,003,440	17,094,682
Total	2,006,932	10,870,140	8,592,386	53,716,590	61,415,007	12,653,323	15,291,490	13,982,054	14,053,440	192,581,362
THIRD OPTION—(Prince Edward Island only)	2,100,000									
MOST FAVOURABLE OPTION	Third	Second	First	First	First	First	Second	First	First	
AMOUNT UNDER MOST FAVOURABLE OPTION.	2,100,000	10,870,140	8,773,420	56,382,127	67,158,027	13,540,038	15,291,490	14,227,882	18,120,124	206,463,248

(a) For Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta 1942 population determined by straight line between 1941 and 1946 census figures; for all other provinces 1942 population as estimated by Dominion Statistician.

CALCULATION OF ADJUSTED ANNUAL PAYMENT FOR 1947

(BASED ON LATEST ESTIMATES OF POPULATION AND GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT AVAILABLE AT JULY 2, 1947; SUBJECT TO REVISION)

—	Prince Edward Island (a)	Nova Scotia (a)	New Brunswick (a)	Quebec (a)	Ontario (a)	Manitoba (b)	Saskatchewan (b)	Alberta (b)	British Columbia (a)	Total
BASIC DATA—										
(1) Population of Provinces—										
1941 ..... No.	95,047	577,962	457,401	3,331,882	3,787,655	729,744	895,992	796,169	817,861	
1942 ..... No.	90,000	591,000	464,000	3,390,000	3,884,000	729,180	883,331	797,601	870,000	
1944 ..... No.	91,000	612,000	462,000	3,500,000	3,965,000	728,052	858,009	800,465	932,000	
1945 ..... No.	92,000	621,000	468,000	3,561,000	4,004,000	727,488	845,349	801,897	949,000	
1946 ..... No.	94,000	612,000	480,000	3,630,000	4,107,000	726,923	832,688	803,330	1,003,000	
(2) Population Ratios—										
1942 ..... %	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	
1944 ..... %	101·11111	103·55330	99·56897	103·24484	102·08548	99·84531	97·13335	100·35908	107·12644	
1945 ..... %	102·22222	105·07614	100·86207	105·04425	103·08960	99·76796	95·70014	100·53862	109·08046	
1946 ..... %	104·44444	103·55330	103·44828	107·07965	105·74150	99·69047	94·26682	100·71828	115·28736	
(3) Gross National Product per Capita Ratios *(c)*—										
1942 ..... %	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	
1944 ..... %	111·26135	111·26135	111·26135	111·26135	111·26135	111·26135	111·26135	111·26135	111·26135	
1945 ..... %	107·38954	107·38954	107·38954	107·38954	107·38954	107·38954	107·38954	107·38954	107·38954	
1946 ..... %	102·35532	102·35532	102·35532	102·35532	102·35532	102·35532	102·35532	102·35532	102·35532	
(4) Composite Ratio—(2) above multiplied by (3) above—										
1942 ..... %	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	100·00000	
1944 ..... %	112·49759	115·21480	110·78178	114·87160	113·58168	111·08924	108·07188	111·66087	119·19032	
1945 ..... %	109·77597	112·84078	108·31531	112·80654	110·70745	107·14035	102·77194	107·96796	117·14100	
1946 ..... %	106·90444	105·99231	105·88482	109·60172	108·23205	102·03850	96·48711	103·09052	118·00275	
MINIMUM PAYMENT—										
(Most favourable of Option 1, 2 or 3) ... $	2,100,000	10,870,140	8,773,420	56,382,127	67,158,027	13,540,038	15,291,490	14,227,882	18,120,124	206,463,248
ADJUSTED PAYMENT IN 1947—										
1944—Minimum X 1944 composite ratio. $	2,362,449	12,524,010	9,719,351	64,767,051	76,279,215	15,041,525	16,525,801	15,886,977	21,597,434	
1945—Minimum X 1945 composite ratio. $	2,305,295	12,265,951	9,502,957	63,602,727	74,348,939	14,506,844	15,715,361	15,361,554	21,226,094	
1946—Minimum X 1946 composite ratio. $	2,244,993	11,521,512	9,289,720	61,795,781	72,686,509	13,816,052	*(d)* 15,291,490	14,667,598	21,382,245	
Total ..... $	6,912,737	36,311,473	28,512,028	190,165,559	223,314,663	43,364,421	47,532,652	45,916,129	64,205,773	
3 year average (1947 payment) ..... $	2,304,246	12,103,824	9,504,009	63,388,520	74,438,221	14,454,807	15,844,217	15,305,376	21,401,924	228,745,144

(a) Population for 1941 from census of same year; later years as estimated by D.B.S. and subject to revision in case of 1944, 1945 and 1946.
(b) Population for years 1942, 1944 and 1945 determined on straight line between 1941 and 1946 census figures.
(c) Calculated from following figures—

	Gross National Product	Population	G.N.P. per capita
1942	$10,296,000,000	11,654,000	$883·47349
1944	11,771,000,000	11,975,000	982·96451
1945	11,498,000,000	12,119,000	948·75815
1946	11,129,000,000	12,307,000	904·28212

(d) The adjusted figure being less than the guaranteed minimum, the guaranteed minimum is substituted.

respect of which payment is made. Calculation on the basis of this three-year average, it will be noted, will serve to reduce the fluctuations from year to year in the revenue receipts of the provinces.

The second table which I have placed on *Hansard,* showing the relevant factors in the calculation of the adjusted annual payments for each province and just how the calculations are made, indicates that on the basis of the data at present available and if all provinces should accept the agreement, the aggregate of the adjusted annual payments (including statutory subsidies) in respect of 1947 would be $228,745,144 made up as follows:

Prince Edward Island	$ 2,304,246
Nova Scotia	12,103,824
New Brunswick	9,504,009
Quebec	63,388,520
Ontario	74,438,221
Manitoba	14,454,807
Saskatchewan	15,844,217
Alberta	15,305,376
British Columbia	21,401,924
	$228,745,144

The amount payable by Canada to any province in respect of any fiscal year is to be estimated forthwith after September 14 in the said year on the basis of certificates from the dominion statistician in regard to the gross national production ratios and the provincial ratios that are pertinent to the calculation. The excess of this amount over the ordinary statutory subsidies less certain deductions which I shall later describe, is to be paid to the province in four equal quarterly instalments on September 30, December 31, March 31 and June 30, respectively. Appropriate provision is made for adjustments in respect of recalculations made after September 15, in the following fiscal year on the basis of revised estimates of population and gross national product. A final adjustment is also to be made at the termination of the agreement in 1952. At that time the population figures obtained by the census for the year 1951 will be available and it will thus be possible to correct earlier estimates of population made by the dominion statistician on the basis of a straight line projection between the base year 1942, or, in the case of the prairie provinces, the census year 1946, on the one hand, and the census year 1951 on the other hand. If changes or improvements in the method of calculating the gross national product have been made by the dominion statistician during the course of the agreement which result in a series of amounts for the gross national product different from those produced by the method used at the beginning of the agreement, the province will be given the benefit in the final calculation at the end of the agreement of whichever method results in the greater total of payments for the period of the agreement.

I referred a few minutes ago to certain deductions which are required to be made from the amounts otherwise payable to the provinces.

The first of these types of deduction arises from the rather complicated provisions which have had to be evolved in order to avoid substantial unfairness as between the corporate taxpayers of agreeing and non-agreeing provinces respectively. If a province chooses to remain out of the agreement, it will presumably have to levy taxes on its own corporations in order to secure adequate revenues, and there would therefore be unfairness if the government of an agreeing province were to receive full payment from the dominion for the rental of its corporate tax rights while at the same time its corporations were not subject to provincial tax. Consequently, even though an essential part of the new agreements involves the dominion renting full provincial rights in the corporate tax field, nevertheless the agreements contain clauses allowing adhering provinces to impose a standard of five per cent tax on corporate income earned within the province, to be collected by the dominion without cost to the province, and providing that the amounts otherwise payable to a province shall be reduced by either the amount of the provincial corporation tax actually collected or one-sixth of the dominion corporate tax relevant to corporate incomes earned within the particular province, whichever is the greater. It will be noted that no province is required to levy this tax but if a province chooses not to levy it, the payments it will receive from the dominion are correspondingly reduced. Incidentally, the agreement includes carefully worked out provisions for allocating as between the various provinces the income of a corporation which is operating in more than one province; it is believed that if these rules for allocating income were adopted by all provinces, there would be eliminated the tendency which prevailed at times in the past for various provincial governments to impose tax, in the aggregate, on more than the total income of a corporation carrying on business in several provinces. The agreements also contain a provision to the effect that if Canada so requests, all the agreeing provinces will take such steps as are necessary to repeal or suspend their legislation imposing the standard five per cent tax on corporate income.

The second type of deduction from the annual amounts otherwise payable to an agreeing province, relates to deductions which may be made if a province which has agreed to rent its corporation taxes to the dominion proceeds to take over the whole or any part of the business or undertaking or assets of a corporation and thus serves to reduce the tax revenues which the dominion would otherwise obtain. This section of the agreement has been worked out with great care but I need not go into all its complications.

I should at this point call special attention to a provision of the bill which is of an entirely different character. Stated briefly, this provision authorizes the dominion to pay to a provincial government one-half of its net collections of tax on the income of certain specified public utility corporations resulting from the distribution to the public or the generation for distribution to the public, of electricity, gas or steam in the province concerned. From these payments is to be deducted the amount of certain royalties or rentals and taxes and fees paid by the corporations concerned to the government of the said province or its municipalities. This refund of part of the dominion's collections of taxes from specified public utility corporations will apply not only to governments which have entered into agreements with the dominion but also to the governments of non-adhering provinces as well. The only difference between an adhering and a non-adhering province in this respect will be that in the former case the dominion will be bound to make these refunds for the five-year term of the agreement. In the other case, it will have the power to do so but will not be bound.

There is another provision of the bill to which I should call attention. In addition to making provision for the guaranteed minimum annual payments and the adjusted annual payments for all agreeing provinces for the five fiscal years beginning April 1, 1947, there is a provision in the bill which authorizes special payments to be made to the maritime provinces to fill in the so-called gap in their case between the beginning of the new agreements, April 1, 1947, and the end of the old wartime tax agreements—October 31, 1946, in the case of New Brunswick, November 30, 1946, in the case of Nova Scotia, and December 31, 1946, in the case of Prince Edward Island. These payments are the appropriate fraction in each case of the guaranteed minimum annual payments to each province less the proportionate amount of the statutory subsidies payable in respect of the periods in question and less deductions in respect of provincial succession duties collected by the province or allowed by the dominion as credits in respect of deaths during these periods. Before the deduction relating to succession duties, the amount is $2,975,430 for New Brunswick, $360,768 for Prince Edward Island and $2,955,000 for Nova Scotia. These payments are to be charged as an expenditure to the fiscal year 1946-47.

There is only one other provision of the bill or the agreement to which I feel I should call attention at this time and that is the option provided to adhering provinces in the case of succession duties. Any province may come into the agreement and still retain its own succession duty levies if it wishes to do so. The dominion believes that there are important reasons to justify the elimination of double taxation in this field but at the same time it recognizes that certain provincial governments place special emphasis on the desirability of continuing to levy their own succession duties. In the desire to remove any obstacle that might otherwise prove an insuperable barrier to unanimous agreement, the dominion has made it possible for any province which so desires to rent to the dominion only its rights in the field of income and corporation taxes and to retain its own succession duty levies. In such a case, taxpayers in the said province will receive a credit against the dominion succession duty of the amount of the duty paid to the province up to one-half of the dominion levy and the annual payments otherwise payable to the province by the dominion will be reduced by the aggregate of such tax credits.

Before I conclude, I wish to deal briefly with a few general aspects of these agreements.

My first point has to do with the basis of determining the amount of rental we are to pay for the tax fields in question. Our contention is that our formulae represent the most equitable and most realistic basis so far devised for determining the rentals to be paid to the various provinces. I have been asked why we have not based them solely on the principle of equal per capita grants. The simple answer to that question is that it would be inequitable. Equal per capita grants may sound like equality but, if so, the equality is of a very specious type. It is certainly not equity.

For one thing, you cannot consider separately each type of assistance given by the dominion in the various provinces. If you put these on a per capita basis and look at each one alone, you get the most amazing results. Take the statutory subsidies, for

instance. Based on 1946 population estimates, they run all the way from about 80 cents per capita in the two central provinces to $1 in British Columbia, $2.36 in Manitoba, $2.45 in Saskatchewan, $2.51 in Alberta, $3.28 in Nova Scotia, $3.40 in New Brunswick, and $6.99 in Prince Edward Island. Yet in spite of these wide variations, no one would regard the subsidies as unfair—on the contrary, the variations represent the historical result of a series of attempts to achieve equitable treatment under very diverse conditions. Then, as another instance, take the family allowance payments. Here it is British Columbia which turns out to have the lowest per capita payment ($16.11 for the twelve months ended May 31, 1947), while Quebec has one of the highest per capita payments ($23.04), against an average of $20.26 for the country as a whole. No one could regard these variations as unfair, nor the similar variations in the dominion's per capita contributions to pensions for aged and blind persons. However, if we take all these payments by the dominion, including the annual rental payments to be made for the rented taxes under our latest offer, we will find that the aggregate per capita payments to the various provinces are very much closer to equality. On this basis the average for Canada as a whole is $42.54, with $41.29 for British Columbia, and $43.83 for Quebec.

But even this greater approach to equality on a per capita basis should not be overstressed because—and this is my second point—equality per unit or per head does not represent equity, if the units or the heads differ in character or importance. The fact is that the units do differ—and differ widely—because of the varying composition of the population in the various provinces. In other words, the percentage of children in the population, the size of families, the relative numbers of adult income earners and of taxpayers—all these factors and others vary from province to province. It should be obvious that this type of variation makes it quite impossible to satisfy the test of equity by making annual payments to the provinces on the basis of an equal amount per head of population.

There are some who realize that equal per capita payments would be unfair but ask why our annual payments should not be based on the principle of fiscal need. It should be clear from the figures I gave some time ago that our basis for determining the annual payments does recognize this principle of fiscal need to a very substantial extent. The reason that certain provinces may be in a position of fiscal need (assuming that it has not been due to reckless spending in the past) is that the head offices of large corporations as well as the wealthy individuals and large estates are concentrated to a very substantial extent in two or three provinces, and consequently it is impossible for the other provinces to derive from income and corporation taxes and succession duties adequate revenues to meet their constitutional responsibilities. Now the proposals which we are making are designed to correct this difficulty. What they accomplish is to make sure that a maritime province or a prairie province is able, by renting its rights in the three great fields of direct progressive taxation to the dominion, to derive approximately as much revenue per capita from these major sources of revenue as any other province.

I contend therefore that the proposals meet substantially the test of fiscal need but they do it in a way which is not open to the objections to which ordinary fiscal need grants are subject. If we adopted *in toto* the principle of grants on the basis of fiscal need, I suggest to hon. members that we would be faced with this dilemma: Either the government of Canada would be forced to raise money from the taxpayers of Canada as a whole and hand it over to provincial governments to meet their deficits, no matter how reckless their expenditure policy might be, or, conversely, the dominion would be forced to supervise the budgetary policies, including both the spending and the tax levying policies, of provincial governments. This government does not believe the first policy would commend itself to Canadian taxpayers and it will resist to the utmost any proposal which would require it to supervise the budgets of provincial governments.

We are forced to the conclusion, therefore, that there is no single principle which can be applied exclusively in determining the magnitude of these annual rental payments. Our formulae are based on the several principles which seem to be pertinent. They may seem complicated but, we believe, the complications are necessary if we are to meet fairly and equitably the varying needs and conditions of all the provinces.

My second point relates to a problem which led to a good deal of discussion during the negotiations, namely, the treatment of certain minor fields of taxation. It was understandable that the provinces generally would desire to have, if possible, certain tax fields specifically reserved for their own use. The levies which they most frequently requested should be left to them exclusively were suc-

cession duties and taxes on gasoline, amusements, pari-mutuel bets and electricity.

In appraising this request, it is desirable to call attention to four or five relevant considerations.

First, to grant the request would not be in accord with the constitution, for the British North America Act quite clearly provides that the dominion government has full authority to impose taxation by any mode or method whatsoever, whereas the provincial governments are limited to direct taxation.

In the second place it is always desirable to remember that in the case of war or emergency it is the central government upon which responsibility must fall. It was probably for this reason that the fathers of confederation felt that the dominion's taxing powers should be unrestricted and their wise foresight has now been amply confirmed by Canada's experience in two world wars.

Thirdly, it had to be remembered that any sacrifice of these minor taxes by the dominion would almost certainly under prevailing conditions of revenue and expenditure and with the national debt at so high a figure have to be made up by increases in income tax, a tax already at such high rates and so steeply graduated, that in the minds of most people it constituted or was likely to constitute a serious impediment to increased employment, production and national income.

In the fourth place, some of the taxes over which the provinces sought exclusive jurisdiction would bring important advantages, if collected solely by the dominion. I refer particularly to succession duties. I shall not repeat here the various arguments advanced by the Sirois commission and others for transferring or renting this tax field to the dominion but I believe most people would agree that the pre-war system under which nine separate jurisdictions impose succession duties, resulting in double and sometimes triple taxation of the same estate, producing great variations in burden as between one province and another and tending to encourage transfer of estates from one province to another solely for tax reasons, was burdensome, inequitable and harmful to the free flow of capital and natural economic development. Perhaps an even more compelling reason from the dominion's point of view is the very important part which dominion succession duties play in contributing to an efficient enforcement of the income tax. The former deputy minister of national revenue (taxation) has stated that we get more revenue from them indirectly than we do directly. However, in spite of the powerful arguments for unified collection by the dominion of succession duties we recognized, as I have already said the apparent strength of the desire of one or two provinces to remain in this field and we modified our offer in such a way that any province which wished to do so could continue levying its own succession duties. I am happy to be able to report that all of the seven provinces which have signified their intention of entering into agreements with us apparently expect to repeal their succession duties for the term of the agreement.

Finally, neither the government of Canada, nor anyone else, so far as I am aware has ever been able to discover any way in which the total tax field could be divided between the dominion and provincial governments in such a way as to make it possible for the dominion government on the one hand and all provincial governments on the other hand to obtain from the sector of the field allotted to each the revenues required to carry out their constitutional responsibilities. It would of course be possible to assign such a portion of the tax field exclusively to provincial governments as to enable some provincial governments to meet their requirements but most methods of allocation would leave other provinces in a weak or impossible position financially. This of course arises from the highly different potential yields of different taxes in various provinces, and is one of the major factors making it so difficult to get all provinces to agree on any single course of action in the fiscal field. To approach the objective of meeting the requirements of the less favoured provinces as well as of those most favoured would mean assigning to provincial governments so large a portion of the total field as to make it completely impossible for the dominion to meet its responsibilities.

In spite of all these considerations, the dominion has gone very far in its endeavour to meet the wishes of provincial governments in this connection. In the revised offer outlined by the right hon. the Prime Minister to the dominion-provincial conference in April-May, 1946, the dominion made several commitments in regard to its future tax policy. It undertook for the duration of the agreement not to enter the fields of real estate tax and automobile licenses now exclusively occupied by the provinces. It agreed to allow the provinces to tax mining and logging operations either by royalties or by taxes on the net profit of these operations, and to recognize such levies as an expense for purposes of dominion tax. It undertook for the duration of the agreement not to increase its

special excise taxes on gasoline, amusements or pari-mutuel betting, subject of course to the condition that in the event of a national emergency it would be free to take whatever steps might be necessary to meet the emergency. It undertook to pay to the provinces one half of its own net collections of tax on the income of certain specified public utility companies derived from the distribution to the public, or the generating for distribution to the public, of electrical energy, gas or steam. It undertook to seek a constitutional amendment permitting delegation of powers from the dominion parliament to provincial legislatures or vice versa, and it stated that once such an amendment was made the dominion government would request parliament to broaden considerably the field of provincial taxation by delegating to the provinces, for the duration of the agreement, the right to levy retail sales taxes within limits to be specifically defined. Finally, it stated that, while in view of the enormous financial burdens and responsibilities falling upon the central government, it could not in justice to the taxpayers of Canada increase the magnitude of the burdens which as a result of the new proposals it was undertaking to bear, nevertheless it would be willing to consider renting to the provinces for an appropriate financial equivalent agreed upon by the provinces the field of gasoline tax and some of the other minor tax fields. This meant that the dominion was offering to rent to the provinces its own rights in certain specified fields of taxation for an agreed consideration, just as it was offering to rent from the provinces their rights in certain other fields of taxation for a consideration which all will agree is highly advantageous to the provinces.

Several of the provinces expressed themselves as willing to accept this offer but they were unable to agree on an appropriate rental for the reason mentioned above, what one province would accept as a fair rental was believed to be highly unfair or inappropriate by another province. Nevertheless the dominion continued to give careful study to this whole problem. Late last fall, the prospect of substantial improvement in dominion revenues made it possible to sacrifice $40,000,000 of expected revenue by dropping as from April 1 this year, its three cent a gallon tax on gasoline. Not only was this tax the most important of the minor taxes which had been the subject of controversy but in dropping it the dominion recognized the force of arguments made on several occasions that it was a particularly suitable source of provincial revenue and related closely to the maintenance of provincial highways.

This action by the dominion left only two disputed taxes of any significance, the tax on electricity and that on amusements, including pari-mutuel betting.

With regard to the former, hon. members are aware that there is no electricity tax as such and that what is referred to is merely our ordinary sales tax applied to electricity purchased for domestic use, the previous exemption of this item having been cancelled early in the war. The sales tax is a long-standing and important feature of the dominion's revenue system. Moreover the sales tax on electricity is an indirect tax which could not be levied in any case by provincial governments which are restricted by the constitution to direct taxation. On the other hand it is true to say that the dominion recognizes the importance which the provinces attach to the taxation of electricity because of their interest in rural electrification and their desire to supply electric light and energy to rural dwellers at the lowest possible cost and for this reason a tax on electricity sales is one which the dominion would prefer to avoid if it could afford to do so.

The tax on amusements and pari-mutuel betting is a high-yielding tax, accounting for about $17,000,000 of our revenue at the present time, and is also one which is generally regarded as a desirable tax under present circumstances. Certainly I think hon. members will agree that it would be impossible to raise a corresponding amount of revenue either from income tax or any other field of taxation without producing more harmful economic and social effects. It is also true that this is a tax, the yield of which varies greatly as between the different provinces. If the dominion were to step out of the field, some provinces would not increase their rates of amusement taxation at all, and some might raise their rates but receive very little additional revenue, whilst others might obtain fairly substantial benefits from an increase in rates. On the other hand, I am free to admit that some provinces feel that taxes on amusements and pari-mutuel betting go hand in hand with licensing and regulating functions which provincial governments necessarily perform.

From the correspondence with provincial premiers which has been tabled, the house will be aware that we had been giving the most careful consideration to these remaining minor fields of taxation over a period of many months. They were part of a whole series of special taxes which we had been forced to impose during the war emergency and which included a number which we did not regard as likely to continue indefinitely. No government wishes to keep taxes on a moment longer than

they are needed and the areas where reduction or removal can be effected soundly and equitably are under constant study. As the end of the war receded into the past, we were succeeding more and more in effecting large reductions in our expenditures, and at the same time as a result of the speed and smoothness with which reconversion was being accomplished our revenues were showing a buoyancy to which no one could have looked forward with assurance. It was against this economic and financial background and in the desire to do as much as the dominion government could responsibly do to assure the agreement of all provinces that on April 21 last I wrote to the premier of Nova Scotia outlining the dominion's position in regard to the remaining minor taxes. In regard to the electricity tax I referred in the terms I used a few minutes ago to the dominion's recognition of the interest which provincial governments attach to this tax and concluded with this sentence:

> At the moment I cannot go beyond assuring you that the representations of the government of Nova Scotia and those of other provincial governments, respecting the present sales tax on electricity, will be fully considered.

In regard to the amusements tax, I made the following statement:

> The dominion recognizes the desire of the provinces to have taxation fields of their own. We are prepared, therefore, to say that in view of the nature of the amusement and pari-mutuel fields, and of the special interest of the provinces in respect thereto, it will be our policy to vacate these fields as soon as circumstances permit.

In a later letter to Premier Macdonald I made it quite clear that in the sentence just quoted I was stating that it would be our policy to vacate the amusement and pari-mutuel fields without compensation as soon as circumstances permit, although this of course did not imply recognition by the dominion of the desirability of any change in the constitutional position respecting taxation.

I have dealt at this length with the question of minor taxes because I wished to remove any cause for misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the dominion position. In addition I trust that this exposition has made it clear that there cannot be found in this question of minor taxes any sufficient basis for failure of any province to enter into an agreement with the dominion.

My third point relates to the magnitude of the annual payments to the provinces. There are some who point out that they are larger than those contained in our original offer to the provinces of August, 1945, larger even than those contained in the budget offer of June 27, 1946, and criticize us for making several improvements in our proposals during the course of the protracted negotiations. We certainly did try to go as far as we could to meet the objections and secure the agreement of all provinces. We admit that the annual payments to be made to provinces under our present offer are substantially higher than those recommended by the Rowell-Sirois royal commission, than those made under the war-time tax agreements, and than those we originally offered. If we can be criticized at all, I think it would be on the ground of the generosity of our proposals. On the other hand, we believe we can justify these agreements, if they result in placing the governments of all provinces in a position to carry out their constitutional functions efficiently and independently, if they safeguard against a scramble amongst ten competing governments for revenues in the field of direct taxation, and if they allow the dominion to develop a sound and efficient tax system calculated to increase employment, production and national income rather than one which acts as a drag upon production.

I believe that those provinces which enter into the agreement will find themselves in an enviable financial position as compared with anything which they have experienced in the past. They will receive revenues from income and corporation taxes and succession duties very much larger than ever before. The guaranteed minimum payment of $206 million and the estimated adjusted payment for 1947 of over $228 million to which I have already referred compare with a peak yield obtained from the rented tax fields by provincial governments of some $117 million. What is more important in enabling provincial governments to plan programmes of service and expenditure over a period of years is the assurance that for the next five years they will have at least the very high guaranteed revenue from these tax sources, regardless of fluctuations in the national income, regardless of whether the next few years are to bring a business recession, a crop failure or a substantial decline in commodity prices. If, on the other hand, the national income increases and their own population continues to grow, they know also that they are assured of proportionately increased revenues from these tax sources.

Finally, as I said in my budget speech, instead of the provinces which accept the agreement—

> —weakening their autonomy or sacrificing any of their constitutional rights, they have merely found a method of utilizing one of these rights, a method of renting instead of cultivating a tax field, whereby they can assure this revenue at generous levels guaranteed against the risks of

economic adversity and participating also in the profits of growth and prosperity. With this assurance of stable and rising revenues, they are for the first time in a position to plan with courage and confidence and a sense of real independence, programmes for the efficient discharge of their constitutional responsibility.

If I may state this in a different way, we are convinced that acceptance of the proposals will increase rather than diminish the power and prestige of provincial governments because it will enable them to carry out far more effectively and independently the responsibilities which have been assigned to them under our constitution. Nevertheless, it is quite open to any provincial government to hold a contrary view. There is no obligation on any government to enter into the agreement unless it is convinced that such action would be its own best interest. We trust and believe that when the proposals are fully understood, they will commend themselves to all provincial governments. Such general agreement is necessary in order to make possible the achievement of the great national purposes which inspired the comprehensive proposals of August, 1945. The details of our original proposals may of course change as a result of further study or of developing public opinion or of discussion with provincial governments at a general conference which will be necessary before they can be implemented. The proposed contributions which the dominion may be able to make in the field of public investment and social security may, as I have said publicly and as I advised the provinces which were negotiating with us last winter, have to be revised to take into account the substantial increase in the financial payments which the dominion has now undertaken to make as rental for the tax fields in question. But the main objectives expressed in those proposals remain the guiding objectives of this government. We are hoping that agreement of all provinces may be secured in order that the people of this country may be able to secure the benefits of an efficient and equitable tax system, and in order that all governments may be able to follow policies which promote high employment and high national income, and safeguard against the recurrence of the "boom or depression" experience of the pre-war period.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the bill before us this evening is one which has to do with the financial relationships between the provinces and the dominion. This is a country which has a federal system of government, one in which we find a division of government responsibility. We have the central government—in this case the dominion government—and we have the provincial governments. Each of these governments has certain responsibilities and certain taxing powers.

In Canada the responsibilities are divided between the dominion and provincial jurisdictions. In some cases these responsibilities are not clearly defined. In this country the taxing power is limited in the case of the provinces, and unlimited in the case of the dominion. In other words, there is no taxation field in which the dominion cannot operate. But the provinces are limited to direct taxes.

The bill before us tonight is one to authorize the government of Canada to enter into agreements with the governments of the provinces, agreements in which, in return for compensation, the provinces agree to refrain from levying certain taxes. In other words, the dominion government in this bill asks the provinces to refrain from taxing in certain fields, and for that concession the dominion government undertakes to pay money to the provinces. I believe I have thus correctly described the basic principle in the bill.

The minister has reviewed in brief the history in recent years of dominion-provincial financial relations, and I do not propose to go over that ground again. I did it in a general way on one or two occasions in the last session of parliament, and I do not know that there is anything I can add by way of detail to the statement I then made.

May I at this point refer to one or two comments made by the minister. He referred to the report of the Rowell-Sirois commission, a commission which was appointed by this government ten years ago and which made its report to the government seven years ago. It was a commission the functions of which were to study this question. It did study this question; indeed it studied it thoroughly and for a longer period of time than any other dominion commission of which I am aware. That commission made a most valuable report, one in which is contained what I believe is the fullest and most valuable statement of dominion-provincial affairs made since confederation.

The basic recommendation of that commission was that the provinces of Canada should be aided by the central government on the basis of fiscal need. What does that mean? In a federal system where we have a central government and, in this instance, nine provincial governments, some of those provincial governments may be operating in an economy which does not give as high a standard of living as is enjoyed by other sections of the nation. That condition is true in Canada. The standard of living varies in different parts and from time to time; and one section may be

down today or five years from now as compared with the others. In this nation the economy of each province is not exactly a duplicate of the economy of every other province: in fact there are vast differences, so that we find in this nation six different major types of economy.

In the past, some of these provinces have not been able to secure as high a standard of living or of public service as some of the others. In the past, they have been the prairie provinces and the maritime provinces. The result is that in those areas if the people are to have a standard of public service equal to the average in Canada they have to apply taxation rates much higher than the average taxation rates throughout the rest of the country.

For many years that condition was permitted to pass by without serious protest, although it is a fact that practically since the time of confederation there have been protests pointing out the inequality of the situation. Any province which has had this condition has considered it a serious matter, but it was not until the depression in the early thirties that the difficulty came prominently to the fore. At that time the provinces in those sections of Canada to which I have referred —and perhaps others—felt they could not face the future and meet their obligations unless these problems were solved.

I believe it will be admitted that it was partly due—and I was going to say largely due—to pressure from certain of those provinces that the dominion consented to have this study made ten years ago. As I have pointed out, the basic recommendation of the royal commission was that the less favoured provinces of Canada should be aided by the central government, the only government able to collect taxes from whatever sources they may be obtained throughout the nation, and that they see to it that the needed moneys will be spent where they are required. The recommendation was that the central government should collect taxes wherever they can be obtained, and that the provinces suffering from poorer economy should be benefited on the basis of fiscal need; that is to the extent of the amount of money necessary to enable those provinces to have the same level of public service as the other provinces have, without having to apply a higher level of taxation.

I need not go into the history of what happened to that report. Everyone knows that in the second year of the war a conference was called and that owing to the objections of certain provinces and the unwillingness of the dominion government to proceed in the face of those objections, those proposals failed of acceptance. The dominion government came along with another kind of agreement which met these difficulties in somewhat different terms. Those agreements were arranged to terminate at the end of the war.

Then, anticipating the termination of those agreements, the government came forward about two years ago with the plan to which the minister has referred. He has spoken of it as a plan broader in scope than that envisaged by the Rowell-Sirois commission. It is true that it is broader in scope, much broader. The cost of the plan proposed by the Rowell-Sirois commission cannot in fairness be compared on equal terms with the cost of the present proposals. It is just as well, however, to know what the costs were. The minister says the plan of 1945 was on a broader scope. The net cost to the dominion government under the plan proposed by the Rowell-Sirois commission was not $228 million a year; it was but $40 million a year. I am not suggesting that the figures are exactly comparable, but those were the figures they gave. Tonight the minister intimated that the cost of paying the provinces during the war was $117 million, although I had thought the figure was lower than that—some $86 million.

The Rowell-Sirois commission plan was to cost the dominion $40 million; the war-time tax agreements, as I gathered from the minister, $117 million, although I thought the cost was less than that; the 1945 proposals, $138 million; the 1946 proposals, $198 million; the present proposals, $228 million. We are in this position then; not only were the 1945 proposals much broader than those of the Rowell-Sirois commission, but the proposals tonight are very much broader at least in cost; they constitute a much greater burden on the Canadian people than the proposals made by the Rowell-Sirois commission; they are very much greater than the payments made by the dominion under the war-time tax agreements; they are very much greater than the proposals brought forward in 1945, and they are very much greater than the proposals brought forward in 1946. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin) intimated the other night that if the 1945 proposals were fully implemented they would mean a charge upon this country of $500 million to $600 million a year. Briefly, there is the growth in the development of these projects in recent years.

In my judgment, no good Canadian in any province can oppose payments by the dominion to the provinces on the basis of fiscal

need. I do not think any provincial government in Canada would oppose that. I do not think any thoughtful student of these matters in Canada would oppose it. I would think they would all take pride in trying to bring about that measure of equity in this nation. Certainly that is my view and I hope it will be found to be the view of those who sit with me. I am sure it will.

I have not seen certain of the calculations and figures which the minister put on the record tonight, but I am going to refer to them in a moment. But in so far as this measure provides fiscal need for the provinces of Canada, it will receive our support. In so far as it fails to provide fiscal need, the bill is weak and should be remedied. In so far as it provides more than fiscal need, it is not a sound method of financing in Canada.

Does this proposal meet fiscal needs? I will not answer that myself; I will let the government's figures answer it. The 1945 proposals were to cost $138 million; the 1946 proposals, $198 million, and these proposals, a minimum of $206 million, and on the basis of the 1947 figures which the minister gave, $228 million. If in the 1945 proposals the government was planning to meet the fiscal needs of the provinces by providing $138 million, certainly it is paying enough to meet the fiscal needs of the provinces now by providing $228 million which is $90 million more. On that basis I do not think there can be any question but that this plan does meet the fiscal needs of the weaker provinces.

The question now arises: How wise is it to proceed to do more than that? Do not misunderstand me; I am not proposing that the provinces of Canada get less than the plan offered now. We are looking at the question of the wisdom of the policy of one government raising money and giving it to other governments to spend. To the extent that it is necessary to meet fiscal need, I will support it and I think every good Canadian will support it; but to the extent that it goes beyond that, I ask this question: Is that sound fiscal policy? Is that sound financial policy? I am not going to depend upon my own opinion in that matter, I am going to quote what another authority had to say several years ago on this question. I should like to quote from page 316 of *Hansard* of February 21, 1929. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), speaking at that time, had this to say:

> I believe that everyone who has given any attention to public finance will agree that it is a thoroughly vicious system to have one body raise taxes and another body expend the money thus secured. In other words, give to the provinces these grants from the federal treasury, without their being obliged to raise the money themselves by taxation, and you will not get, with respect to expenditure, that careful supervision which would be exercised if the provinces themselves were obliged to raise the money in the first instance. It is a bad system, a thoroughly vicious system, and that is the reason why the present administration has been seeking to put an end to a system that grew up at a time when the country was in the throes of war or had to meet a post-war situation—a system which, had it been permitted to develop, would have become thoroughly destructive of anything in the shape of economy with respect to the expenditure of the people's money.

The same position was taken later on, on April 3, 1930. The same authority, the present Prime Minister of Canada, had this to say, as reported on page 1237 of *Hansard*:

> When on a previous occasion we were discussing this matter of grants from one treasury to another, I said I thought it was an unsound principle; in fact, I think I used the expression that it was a vicious principle to have one body raise the taxes and another body spend the people's moneys thus raised. Is there any hon. member who will disagree with me in that statement?

Those are not my words; they are the words of the Prime Minister. That question is his question, not mine. Then he went on to answer it as follows:

> There is none. That is the extent of the statement I made. I was referring to a principle of financing, speaking simply in relation to what is sound and what is unsound in financing. Anyone interested in financing, whether of a municipality, a province, a dominion, an empire, or a league of nations, will, I think, admit it is unwise, an unsound, a wrong principle for one body to have to do with raising the taxes and another to be concerned with the spending of the money so raised, that other body not having to account to the representatives of those who have paid the taxes.

As I said, this measure, in so far as it provides fiscal need to the provinces of Canada will, I hope, receive the support of every right-thinking Canadian. This measure does that; but I criticize it on several grounds. I criticize it, first, because the government goes at the question of solving this problem in the wrong way, a way which makes for disunity in Canada. It approaches the provinces one by one. It has now got seven provinces in out of nine. These seven provinces represent only about one-third of the tax-paying part of Canada and only a little more than one-third of the population of Canada. Of the money that is being used by the government for this purpose, two-thirds or three-quarters of it come from those provinces which, under the present arrangement are receiving no benefits. The point I am now making is that the approach is wrong; the government, as I said, is going at the problem in the wrong way. It is an

approach which makes for disunity. Was there ever any question in anybody's mind that when a proposal like this came forward, a proposal in which the government of Canada said to the provinces, "we will get two-thirds or three-quarters of this money from two provinces and give it to you", those six or seven provinces would eventually accept? None at all. That is my first criticism. Is it a healthy condition that we should have seven provinces accepting this, seven which get much more than they could raise from these revenues in their own jurisdiction, and two not having it; yet paying much of what the others get? I ask, is that a healthy state in this nation? Should we not be applying ourselves seriously to trying to solve these problems without having such a situation as this arise?

My second criticism is this. In a federal state this policy of the government goes a long way toward centralizing taxation powers. Whether that is good or bad there can be no question of the facts. That is what it does. We have admitted that it does secure a small measure of equality, having regard to the responsibility of the provincial governments. This measure helps certain provincial governments; but it does not help correct inequalities in the economy of the different parts of the nation. It helps governments improve their problems with respect to public services. My immediate criticism is that in a federal state, with each government having to raise its own revenues, this plan goes a long way toward centralizing taxing power in Canada. The government asks the provinces to give up their powers to tax. The government says, "We will give you money back for this concession; we will give you more than you raise yourselves". But the fact is, that having been done, the powers of taxation rest in this government, not with the provinces.

The minister talks about "renting" taxes. It is more than renting taxes; it is asking the provinces to give up constitutional rights.

Mr. ROWE: Renting rights.

Mr. BRACKEN: My third criticism is that in a federal state—and that is what ours is—this plan fails to give to the provinces any clear field of taxation of their own; it does not give them even any minor fields. There is not a single taxation field into which the dominion cannot go. There is scarcely a single field into which the dominion has not gone. I do not think there is a single field into which the dominion has said that it would not go. It has left some fields temporarily; it may stay out for a while, but it has not said it would stay out indefinitely. It does not say that the provinces can have any small taxation field of their own from which the dominion would keep away.

My fourth criticism is that the government's procedure, as it worked out, has failed to achieve continuance of plans for dominion-provincial conferences. That is a serious criticism. The government may say, "Well, we tried and we failed; we have not any hope of getting anywhere if we call another conference," and the other folks will give their answer and say, you were too rigid, and so on. If we are to wait until these problems are easy to solve before we are willing to sit down together and face hard difficulties and overcome them, we are going to be a long time in getting a better country. My criticism is that the government has failed to achieve a continuance of dominion-provincial conference. In a federal state that is a serious condition of affairs. Here we are working together, dominion and provinces; sometimes our jurisdictions overlap; sometimes they do not, but they are always closely related. The healthiest condition this nation could have would be for the dominion to have regular conferences with the provinces. I feel that, to the extent powers are centred here in Ottawa and used here, we are arriving at a dangerous situation where a few men can make major decisions on important matters. This nation will be a healthier place if the dominion and the several provinces were to sit down together more frequently. If the provinces are not well informed, inform them. But do not try to order them. Inform them and educate them. Get them to come together with the dominion. But I am not suggesting that the provinces need education.

Mr. HARTT: I think they do.

Mr. BRACKEN: All right; name which ones.

Mr. HARTT: I will name them.

Mr. BRACKEN: My fifth criticism is that this policy has resulted in delaying certain social security, health and public investment policies which were well received across this nation when they were put forward by the experts of the government some two or three years ago. This government brought forth these policies and said they were good. They said, we will put them into effect if the provinces will agree. It turns out that these policies will cost the nation $500 or $600 million a year when they are implemented. The government now comes forward and says, only seven provinces having agreed, it cannot bring

forward these policies which it said would help this nation head off a depression in the future. It is said that a depression is in the offing and these things would help avoid it. Yet, the government fails to come forward with these measures itself and it fails to call the provinces together to try to get a plan to put them into effect. I say their plan has delayed the bringing forward of these policies of social security, health and public investment—public works or whatever you like to call them—policies aimed to correct certain social inequities in Canada and at the same time help to head off the danger of a recession.

My sixth criticism is that the plan abandons the principle of fiscal needs. The minister referred to that. He said that it is different from fiscal need. He said that his plan had covered the principle of fiscal need; but, Mr. Speaker, this plan is not a plan of fiscal need; neither is this plan on the basis of equal per capita payment; this plan is the result of going at things piecemeal and having to consider something different for each province. This plan is the result of going at this thing piecemeal; having got three provinces to agree at first, the government found that British Columbia wanted more and they had to give more to get British Columbia in. The government having got British Columbia in, the other provinces felt they had a grievance and came here and the government felt it had to give them more.

Mr. REID: We think we did all right in British Columbia.

Mr. BRACKEN: Finally, as the minister said tonight, the seventh province has come in. Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say this to the minister who has introduced the bill. He put on the record certain calculations, certain figures, which none of us have seen. I can complete my remarks tonight at this stage and be through, but I am wondering whether that will accomplish most in the way of expediting the debate. We are not planning to have many speakers on this side. I should like to deal with the matter as fully as needed and as fairly and frankly as I see it. If the government is not ready to go on with anything else and wishes me to complete my remarks tonight I will do so but if I do, and I find in the record something that we have not seen, or something that is new, or something that needs to be answered, we shall have to deal with it as necessary in committee of the whole. We can do that, and from the point of view of the opposition, perhaps from a purely political point of view, that would be the better thing for us to do. I am willing to go on and finish my remarks tonight, or I am willing to leave the matter over in order to see what there is that is new in what the minister has put on the record, and then conclude tomorrow. I am not asking any favour of the minister. If he feels that it will expedite the work of the house in dealing with this particular matter to go on with other matters now, that can be done, but if he prefers to have me conclude now I can follow that course.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am willing to meet my hon. friend's convenience, but I do not think he will find in the tables I placed on *Hansard* tonight anything that contains new material. It is largely informative, to show how the increased commitments are calculated on the basis of the gross national production, set out in detail, the minimum payments on the latest population figures we have for the various provinces, and so on. But if my hon. friend prefers to adjourn the debate and go on later, I would not object. As I say, however, he will not find that the tables I have put on *Hansard* tonight will supply any material for which he would have any particular need for the purposes of his statement.

Mr. BRACKEN: I will leave it with the minister. He may not think so, but I am trying to help him.

Mr. ABBOTT: Perhaps the hon. member had better adjourn the debate.

Mr. BRACKEN: Then, if the minister is willing, and the house as well, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

SUPPLY

The house again in committee of supply, Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The committee is considering item 551, national defence.

Mr. WYLIE: When the committee rose at six o'clock I was reading a letter which appeared in *Maclean's* magazine, and I should like to finish it now:

> Before the price to be offered to each owner was finally decided upon, each property was reviewed by a board of appraisers, made up of those listed herein, when the soldiers' settlement representatives appeared before the board to discuss and justify their valuation of each property. All were treated alike, there was no coercion, no favouritism, and in my estimation, never was an expropriation more carefully planned and more equitably settled than this undertaking.

If the owner thought the amount offered to him was not fair, and he had even the slightest reason for his contention, the property was re-appraised by two soldiers' settlement representatives, and adjustments made if found warranted.

How you can print such a report without fully investigating the facts, does not seem in keeping with your usual standard. Surely you do not print everything any crackpot says, and I suggest a little more vigilance on the part of your editors would keep out such erroneous reporting.

It seems to me that in a spirit of justice you should rectify this statement by printing the facts in your next issue.

Yours very truly,
Westmount Realties Company,
J. W. Rankin,
Vice-president.

That is a letter which appeared in *Maclean's* magazine. I may say that many of the statements in that letter were entirely wrong. The letter may express the writer's point of view, but it was certainly not the point of view of the settlers who had resided in that area for thirty or forty years, and some of them perhaps longer.

While I do not wish to tire the committee, I should like to read a letter which I received from one of the residents in that area, a man who had lived there for thirty-five years and who perhaps knew the conditions in that district better than any of those the government had in there. The letter is from a man named Philip E. Birtwistle, a resident of Medicine Hat, who had resided in the area. The letter is dated June 21, 1946, and reads:

An item appeared in *Maclean's* magazine of March 15, referring to the British block and the injustice of the settlement with the expropriated residents. It evoked a letter from a Mr. Rankin of Montreal, which appeared in *Maclean's* of June 1, in which he says the article is misleading and makes several statements in support of his contention. I have written a reply to his letter, refuting his statements. I am enclosing a copy of the letter as it will probably be a month before it appears in print. I also enclose a resolution from the Redcliff town council. Plenty of supporting evidence can be produced should the case be reopened.

This is what this gentleman has to say. He s writing to the editor, *Maclean's* magazine, Toronto, Ontario:

Dear Sir: I have read the article in Cross Country of *Maclean's*, March 15 and a letter from a Mr. Rankin of Montreal, commenting on it. As the first article was a fair, but by no means complete statement of the case, I did not feel called upon to amplify it. But, as Mr. Rankin's letter may prejudice the chances of a reopening of the case, I would like to answer, and refute, the statements he made.

As a farmer in the block I was served with a notice of expropriation by an R.C.M.P. officer, not by mail, and told I must get out by a certain date. There was no question of negotiating agreements, but, being dissatisfied with the amount allotted to my partner and myself, I saw Colonel Gibson, who was in authority, who did not think it necessary to interview me in an office, but did his business with me in the lobby of the court house, standing up. He refused to discuss the settlement in detail, or to give me a detailed, itemized statement. He said I could accept or let it go to the exchequer court, but, he added, by the time the exchequer court settled it, the buildings and other improvements, which we were to be allowed to remove, would be gone. I asked him where they would be and he replied, "Oh, just smashed up and got out of the way."

The statement that all interested parties accepted the terms offered, although apparently correct, is actually wrong. Two factors forced the farmers to accept, although most of them tried to get better terms with little or no success. The first factor was, that it was a war measure. We were told, and it was correct, that the area was needed for the prosecution of the war. To buck it or delay it would be unpatriotic and we definitely agreed with this.

The second factor was economic. The farmers had just been through the worst depression in history, with prices for farm products at an all-time low. They were making out all right, but were unable to leave their homes and finance themselves until the exchequer court settled the case. How could they set about securing another location, purchase another farm, move on to it and wait a year for returns from it, without any settlement of their holdings? What would the majority of them live on, for perhaps a year, before the exchequer court settled it, while their crop was in the ground and they could not harvest it? Although not legally forced to accept, actually they had no alternative.

The next statement, that, "of 275 interested parties, more than half had found it impossible to make a living," is another half-truth. There were actually 126 families residing in the block at the time of the expropriation. Like all such pioneer settlements, many left at different times for many different reasons. Some left for their health as the climate did not suit them. Some were unable to stand the grind of pioneering. Some left because of the distance from town, and the depression and low prices was a main factor in forcing many away. But the 126 that remained were doing all right, many of them were engaged in large scale farming, with power equipment, and stock as a sideline, and, had they been left there, would have made very good and substantial gains in the past five years of rising prices. The last statement, referring to the delegation who wished to be included in the block, is on a par with the other statements. They knew nothing of the prices, good or bad, but as their grazing and other holdings would be seriously reduced by the closing of the block and, as this would cut out a large part of their income, they considered they would be unable to carry on with their diminished holdings.

I enclose a statement of the holdings of my partner and myself, and the amount we received, which I believe is fairly average, and it may be appended if the editor thinks fit to do so. I could amplify this further but I think the above is sufficient to show we have a good case for reconsideration.

That is a letter from a resident of that block, who lived there for many years and

made a success of farming in that dry area. I may say that the settlement in this Bingville district was one of the happiest communities in Alberta. Many social events were held there where the people got together. They were the ones who had been left there while the others moved out, and the settlement they got was entirely inadequate.

An hon. MEMBER: Carried:

Mr. WYLIE: It will be carried when I am through.

Mr. LESAGE: Is that a promise?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. WYLIE: I want to put on *Hansard* a statement regarding the settlement made with this farmer and his partner, and what he got for 640 acres of land with buildings and everything. This is a statement of holdings in the spring of 1941: land, 640 acres, full title, unencumbered and all taxes fully paid; 1,280 acres under crop lease from provincial government; 320 acres under grazing lease from provincial government; house, 18 by 24, two story with verandah and porch; granaries, capacity, 10,000 bushels—five, 12 by 14; one, 12 by 16; one, 18 by 24; barns—one 18 by 30; one, 18 by 28, with lean-to 24 by 16; garages—one, 12 by 20; one, 10 by 16; blacksmith shop, chicken house and coal shed; fence, five miles, 850 posts, 12 miles barbed wire; two wells, one dam and two miles of graded road, built by them at their own expense. In addition to that, they had 620 acres seeded to wheat in that year. For those holdings they received the sum of $5,700. After a period of forty years, does anyone consider that to be a fair settlement? I should think not. I am afraid that those farmers are not in the same class as those whom we were discussing in this house just a little while ago, where one could go to the government and get a better settlement, and then another come along. These farmers were not in that class. They had to accept what was offered to them; and, being good patriotic citizens, they did that and assisted in the war effort all they could.

I feel that more consideration should be given to them and I see no reason why the case should not be reopened. I know of one farmer in particular who had gone through a period of bad years, when he had no crop for six or seven years. By 1941 he was just getting back on his feet and had a nice herd of cattle. He was running about 125 head of cattle and about forty head of horses. He was too old to go out and start up in a new community. Therefore he had to dispose of his stock and everything and move into the city of Medicine Hat. Everything he got for his holdings is now pretty well gone, because of the increased cost of living and many other items. I hope the minister and the government will see fit to reopen this case and see if these farmers cannot get a better settlement and if a readjustment cannot be allowed on many of the settlements which were made. I should like to know what the government intends to do about this matter. There is no use in letting it slip along. The parliamentary assistant to the minister is here and he should be able to let me know what the government intends to do about it.

Mr. HUGUES LAPOINTE (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence): I can only say that I shall be pleased to bring the matter to the minister's attention for his consideration; but, as the hon. member knows very well, it has been considered from time to time. Up to this date it has been considered that the settlement was adequate and no decision has been made to reopen the case. I shall again draw the matter to the minister's attention.

Mr. WYLIE: Can the parliamentary assistant say when the consideration will be given and how many applied for consideration?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It has I know, been given just lately. As soon as the estimates are through, I shall be very glad to have the matter reopened.

Mr. GREEN: I should like to ask the parliamentary assistant four or five questions, and in doing so I would not want to be understood as trying to injure the defence forces in any way. The present position of Canada is such that we must do everything possible to help the men who are trying to give us efficient defence forces. We have moved from the bush league into the big league in world affairs, and from now on for all time we must be prepared to face this question, not only of whether we are able to defend ourselves, but also of whether we are able to do our share in building up an effective world police organization.

The first question I would ask the minister, who has now come into the house, has to do with the trained field force, about which very little has been said today. When the former minister of national defence laid down the policy in this house on October 16, 1945, he dealt fully with this field force. He was giving the two main elements of the post-war army. In the first place, he referred to the part-time reserve army, and then went on to

deal with what we call the permanent force. At page 1135 of *Hansard* for October 16, 1945, he said:

The second will be the permanently employed active force, whose duty it will be to assist in the training and administration of the reserve army and to supply the necessary staffs, services and scientific research and development personnel, augmented by a small formation of essential field units. This formation will be maintained as a trained field force, fully epuipped, ready to meet whatever commitments may arise. Until we know more about our international obligations and consequent requirements, these active force units will be retained as a minimum and would be subject to whatever expansion might later be required in the light of any obligations which we might accept to assist in maintaining the peace of the world. Preliminary estimates indicate that the numbers involved in the active permanently employed force will be between 20,000 and 25,000 all ranks.

We were given to understand at that time that this trained field force would be, in effect, a brigade group, with infantry, armour, artillery, engineers and so on; that it would be a field force ready to operate as such. A year later, in October, 1946, the same defence minister, the present Minister of Finance, was questioned about Canada's peace-time forces while he was visiting in Victoria. At that time the Russians were demanding a general reduction in armaments, and the minister was asked what Canada would do about reducing her armaments. His answer was to this effect, that Canada's peace-time forces were so small there was nothing to cut. That was the substance of his statement at that time. Then in January, 1947, the present minister announced a twenty-five per cent cut. I should like to know what has happened to this trained field force, whether it is still in existence or just what has happened to it.

Then I wish to ask a question in the same connection about the reserve army. In the statement on October 16, 1945, the former minister laid great stress on the role of the reserve army, and referred to it as—

. . . this important force which will form the background of any possible future military endeavour . . .

Today we find much the same statement made by the minister as the fifth paragraph of the programme he presented, in these words:

Development of reserve forces of an age and with educational and physical standards and training approximating those of the active forces competent to go to sea, take the field or fly.

Yet this afternoon he said the men in the reserve forces would get only fourteen days of training in a year, though some groups such as trade groups may get extra training. In the face of a programme of that kind I would ask him to explain how it is going to be possible to build up a reserve army with standards of training approximating those of the active forces, competent to go to sea, take the field or fly. Two years ago we warned the then minister that he would have to give a very strong lead at once if he wished to build up a reserve army in Canada. I have here a clipping from the Montreal *Gazette*, published in the minister's own city, dated June 28, just a few days ago—

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence): Not my paper, though.

Mr. GREEN: Well, the minister will agree that it is a good paper.

Mr. CLAXTON: I do not think I agree with that in regard to its news items or its editorials.

Mr. GREEN: This is a news item, and I do not think he will question it.

Mr. CLAXTON: I certainly do.

Mr. GREEN: The heading is:

Black Watch only military unit to arrange for summer camp.

All other reserve bodies are much below strength due to general lack of public interest, is claim.

The article goes on to say this, about this famous regiment:

The Black Watch (RHR) of Canada will be the only military unit in this area to attend summer reserve camp in a body this year, it was learned yesterday. The Black Watch will spend a week end in July at Farnham.

Because of a general lack of interest in reserve army training since the end of the war, all units are very much below strength.

I would ask the minister to deal with those two points, the matter of the field force and the possibility of building up a fully trained reserve army on the basis of a few days' training a year, as he announced this afternoon.

Mr. CLAXTON: In regard to the last remark of the hon. member, concerning a quotation from the Montreal *Gazette*, I should say that is the kind of incorrect editorializing that frequently appears in some newspapers in Canada. That article is not in accordance with the facts as I know them. Other units are going to train; and the kind of training provided, as I have said, is on a scale never before equalled in Canada. Provision is made for thirty days training for the quota of 30,000, and, in addition, fourteen days at camp plus fifteen days additional training for tradesmen. I would ask any hon. member who has had any experience with the reserve forces to say whether anything has

ever before been done to this degree in Canada. With regard to the statement about the twenty-five per cent cut—

Mr. MERRITT: If I may ask a question, surely that 30,000 covers all three services, not just one?

Mr. CLAXTON: This is just for the army alone.

Mr. MERRITT: Thirty thousand for the army alone?

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes; and, with regard to the 25 per cent cut, may I say that is something which I believe was developed out of the newspapers. What has happened is that for the purposes of the armed forces this year we are recruiting only up to 75 per cent of the established strengths of the active forces. There has been no change in their establishment. That applies also to the brigade groups. It is quite right for the hon. member to ask about the status of his brigade group. It does not yet exist as a fighting unit fit to take the field at any moment. That work is still in progress. The men are still being trained and organizational work is being done. In it at the present time there is a total of 192 officers and 1,952 men.

Mr. GREEN: What would be the establishment for that field force?

Mr. CLAXTON: A brigade group has always been a fairly indefinite term. I believe the idea in mind at the time it was first suggested was that it should amount to something of the magnitude of about 5,000 officers and men.

Mr. GREEN: That is the figure I had in mind.

Mr. CLAXTON: And I believe, on the 75 per cent strength, it would be of the magnitude of 3,541 officers and men.

Mr. GREEN: Does the minister not think it would be wise to carry out the original policy, recruit this brigade group up to strength, and keep it up to strength and trained as a fighting unit? As I understand it, they are now scattered all the way from Esquimalt to Sydney or Halifax. Would it not be wise to relax the 75 per cent rule in respect of that field force, bring it up to strength, and have a first-class and efficient fighting brigade group in Canada?

Mr. CLAXTON: The hon. member's question is a difficult one to answer because it depends upon a great many technical and strategical considerations, with which I am not competent to deal. But I should think that once one regards the armed forces of Canada from what I believe is the right point of view at the present time, that is as a training force for future staff officers and leaders, and for the reserve forces of Canada, then I should think the wisdom of keeping constantly mobilized and ready for action anything in the nature of a brigade group in one place would be a mistake.

It all depends upon time, circumstances, dangers and everything else. Given the present development of weapons—and I say that advisedly in view of what was said this afternoon —we can take care of anything that happens in Canada in the immediate future. Given another kind of development of weapons and technique, that might not be adequate. But for the time being I believe our primary purpose should be to develop staff officers, officers training establishments, depots, technicians and tradesmen, as well as trained personnel who are competent to provide the nucleus for anything that might happen in the future.

Mr. GREEN: That can only mean, then, that the government has now abandoned the policy announced in 1945.

Mr. CLAXTON: No.

Mr. GREEN: Yes, it does.

Mr. CLAXTON: It has to be related to the time.

Mr. GREEN: The policy then as stated by the Minister of National Defence was perfectly clear, and here it is:

> This formation will be maintained as a trained field force fully equipped, ready to meet whatever commitments may arise.

The minister's statement tonight means that we are reverting to the days of the thirties, when we are using our permanent force for training and staff work. Obviously there is a change of policy, and I do not think it is a proper change. I suggest, however, that the committee can see for itself what is meant. The minister cannot rise in his place now and say that the policy he has announced is anything but an absolute turning away from the policy announced on October 16, 1945, with regard to the field force.

Mr. CLAXTON: It is a question of time and of the wise spending of such resources as we have.

Mr. GREEN: Of course things are more serious now than they were then.

Mr. CLAXTON: Well, they may be. The fact is that I believe we can take care of things as they exist today in Canada. We are not abandoning, as has been suggested by the hon. member for Vancouver South, the idea of a brigade group which might be ready to take the field if that were necessary. That

has not been abandoned at all; it is being organized, trained and worked at. On the other hand, we are concentrating our attention equally on the other necessities of defence: how much we do of each depends, in part, on the flow of training schedules, the flow of recruits and on other considerations which vary from time to time, as well as on the necessities of the case.

As I see it at the present time, we are going sufficiently fast with both, provided that during the current year we can encourage, with the support of hon. members and other public-spirited people throughout the country, young Canadians to go into the armed forces in sufficient numbers to bring them up to the strength authorized. That requires some additional enlistments, particularly in connection with the army. They are coming along; and in order to secure them we are putting on the campaign next September to which I have already referred.

Mr. GREEN: I believe the minister would find that one of the greatest attractions to the young men of this country would be the possibility of enlisting in a crack field force where they would receive the most modern training. We understood, in 1945 for example, that the whole field force were to be trained as paratroopers. If the minister were to set up something of that type he would find that young Canadians would respond quickly and would make the finest force in the world. But I say to him it will be very difficult to build up a first-class force if these units are to be scattered right across Canada, away under strength, and simply doing sentry duty or routine training of one kind or another. I would ask the minister to turn that over in his mind between sessions.

Mr. CLAXTON: That is one of the difficulties any country the size of Canada has in apportioning its armed forces among three services over a great area. I appreciate the point the hon. member made, because that is one thing that gave us much concern. I must point out, however, that all the men entering the armed forces receive the most modern training and that very few of them are engaged in sentry duty or anything of that kind.

Mr. GREEN: I meant duties of that sort.

Mr. CLAXTON: I understand that. But in anything of that kind our aim is to have as much as possible of the work of security guards, fire-fighters, clerks, mess orderlies, cooks and the like done by civilians, so that all in the armed forces will be trained fighting soldiers. Whether one of those soldiers is at any given moment made part of a brigade group, which is a fighting operational unit, or is made part of a training establishment in one of the training camps in Canada probably matters very little from the point of view of that man's efficiency. We hope to have everyone efficient and we believe they are. It may be that we shall find that to isolate them in brigade groups doing nothing but operational exercises will not be the best way to keep up their keenness and that they should be associated with men in training in other fields. The whole operation and plan will have to be worked out, and I think it is being done in a sensible way.

Mr. GREEN: I suggest to the minister that he have some special name for that brigade group; make it a corps d'elite. I think, if it were permitted to train in different parts of Canada at different times he would find that the effect would be most beneficial both to the reserve army and to the active army.

My next question has to do with these more modern weapons of war. This morning the minister referred to atomic bombs, jet-propelled planes, rockets and higher speed submarines as being the principal new weapons introduced near the end of the recent war. He referred also to chemical and bacteriological agents. During his statement this afternoon he explained that the jet-propelled planes were on order from Great Britain. Has the Canadian government taken any steps to invite the British government to send their airmen here to train in jet-propelled planes? I believe they have the greatest difficulty in training over the United Kingdom because they hardly get started before they are over the sea. Out on the prairies we have the air fields, the distances and the suitable weather, and it seems to me that it would be appropriate for Canada to take a lead in setting up some type of commonwealth air training plan for the training of personnel in the handling of these jet-propelled planes. The same thing is true in connection with training in the use of mechanized units by the army. Has Canada taken any steps to arrange for this kind of training to be done in Canada? The Ottawa *Citizen* of June 14 contained an article headed, "See Canada as key in era of superweapons. Even atom mist range in northland reported." This was a dispatch from London, and referring to Canada it said:

> For Canada this scheme is believed by these sources to envisage the setting up of an atomic range in the frozen northland on the lines of the Australian rocket range in the bush country. Here experiments with radio-active "clouds" could be carried out in safety. This was forecast for the near future

Will the minister state whether anything has been done along the lines I suggest?

Mr. CLAXTON: There is a great deal of misunderstanding about jet propelled planes. I certainly am far from being an expert in this or any other military field, except perhaps the six-inch howitzer which is long obsolete, but I understand that flying a jet propelled plane does not entail any particularly new problem. I am informed by my advisers that they are as easy to fly, if not easier, than many of the later type planes in the last war and that their landing speeds are not very different from those of other planes. Apart from their higher speed and probably cheaper cost of production, they are not very different from ordinary planes.

We have not had any request from the United Kingdom that we should provide training fields for flyers along the lines of the British commonwealth air training plan, nor have we had any request for training in mechanized warfare. I would think that the United Kingdom had ample facilities for both types of training. On the other hand, we exchange staff officers and technicians every now and then; we exchange information and have the closest kind of cooperation with the United Kingdom as we have with the United States. There is nothing additional that appears to be necessary to be done in this connection at this time. It has not been suggested by anyone with army experience. Our cooperation with what I described as other like-minded nations is free and frank and leads to greater efficiency on both sides.

Mr. GREEN: Would this suggestion, if carried out, not help our own air men? Would there be any objection from the Canadian point of view to carrying out a plan of that type? The training would be done under the department and the Canadian authorities.

Mr. CLAXTON: I am not sure how that would work out and I would have to discuss it with my colleagues. If it seems to be desirable from the air force point of view, then it would have to be considered from the point of view of policy and so on. I am not in a position to give a reply offhand. I can assure my hon. friend and the committee that there is the closest cooperation with regard to staff work, instructors and technicians.

Mr. GREEN: In recent weeks there has been considerable publicity with regard to the acquisition of United States equipment. There have been discussions in the United States congress about putting through a statute allowing them to help other nations in the Americas to equip their forces. According to newspaper articles, it would appear that Canada can acquire only used equipment or equipment which has been discarded by the United States forces. Is that correct, and can the minister outline the situation with regard to this equipment?

Mr. CLAXTON: The bill referred to by the hon. member was introduced in the United States congress quite recently and is still under consideration, not having as yet been adopted. It is purely facilitative or enabling legislation. It would permit the President of the United States or the administration to make arrangements with any of the American states to provide them with equipment or assistance with regard to defence. So far that bill has not been passed. Whether or not it is passed is, of course, for the United States congress to say. If it were passed it would, I think, within its terms, and probably hon. members will agree that it might, enable the United States to make equipment available to us on any terms that were agreed to by the administration. We, however, have a quite different arrangement with the United States, that expressed in the Ogdensburg declaration of August 19, 1940, and now carried forward by the declaration of the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States of America on February 12, 1947. Under this we agreed to cooperate with regard to the defence of this continent. All hon. members are familiar with the provisions of that declaration.

So far, with regard to equipment we have bought from the United States with United States dollars the equipment we have felt we needed, and we have got it on terms that have been worked out by agreement between the two countries. There has been no suggestion that we get only used equipment. That is not so. We get what we want when they have what we want and what we cannot make ourselves, and we have so far paid for it.

Mr. GREEN: Then we really do not need this enabling statute which is before the United States congress.

Mr. CLAXTON: So far we have not used it. It has not been in force and we have not used it. We cannot see everything that will happen in the future, but so far this measure, which is HR-3836, and which was introduced in the house of representatives on June 13, 1947, has not been enacted. It has not been applied, and so far Canada has got along under a totally different arrangement.

Mr. GREEN: I should like to ask the minister a question with regard to Canada's com-

mitments to the united nations. In his statement this morning he said that Canada's defence force may be required:

1. To defend Canada against aggression;

2. To assist the civil power in maintaining law and order within the country;

3. To carry out any undertakings which by our own voluntary act we may assume in co-operation with friendly nations or under any effective plan of collective action under the united nations.

Can the minister give us any idea of what sort of assistance Canada would be expected to furnish to the united nations? Within the last few days proposals have been put in to the security council for a world force. Does the minister know where Canada fits into that picture? I see that on April 12 of this year he ventured into print on the question at Winnipeg. That is a long way from Ottawa and the quotation may not be correct, or the minister may have been enjoying the western air out there, as we westerners all hope to to do in a few days. The heading is:

Canada may send troops overseas for peace force.

The press dispatch is dated April 12 and reads as follows:

Canada is prepared to send troops overseas to take part in an international peace force should one be established, Defence Minister Claxton said here. He is in Winnipeg on a tour of western Canada.

Can the minister give us some further statement with regard to that position?

Mr. CLAXTON: With regard to what I said at Winnipeg, it was just the same as what I said today; it is the same as the Secretary of State for External Affairs has said on previous occasions, namely, that any arrangements for our contribution to a united nations force would have to be agreed to in accordance with the charter of the united nations by the Canadian government and the Canadian parliament. I said that in Winnipeg; I cannot say anything different; it is a fact, both from the charter and from the realities of Canadian policy. If the hon. member had quoted all of what I had said—

Mr. GREEN: That is all they printed. I do not know what else the minister said.

Mr. CLAXTON: Then the newspaper may have left out something of what I said. The report that I saw of what I said at Winnipeg was completely correct; that is, that it was qualified in the sense in which I have just qualified it, and the only sense in which it could be qualified; that is, that we will agree to use our forces in conjunction with those of the united nations by act of our own parliament after they have seen what the situation is and learned what it is. I could not say anything more than that, but certainly we are not committing ourselves in advance to any blank cheque. As to what we may be expected to commit ourselves to, I can only say that, as a fairly realistic people, we would like to see what it is before I can give an answer to my hon. friend.

Mr. GREEN: Can the minister give us any idea at the present time?

Mr. CLAXTON: There is not the slightest idea in anyone's mind as to what it might be. The discussions of a possible united nations force have certainly not yet reached that level; but I would think myself that whatever it might be it would be well within our capacity to give.

Mr. GREEN: One final subject, the question of civil defence. The minister listed as his eleventh objective today:

Organization of government departments and civilian agencies capable of putting into immediate effect a plan for civil defence.

What is in mind in that connection? Such a plan necessitates support of civilian bodies all over Canada, and that support cannot be gained in a hurry. They have to be sold on the need for some such organization, and there is a great deal of preliminary work to do before such an organization is made effective. Has the department taken any steps at all, or what is the picture at the present time? In April of this year, Colonel W. W. Goforth, retiring deputy director of defence research gave a five-point programme in Vancouver to prepare Canadians against possible atomic assault. He was not speaking officially for the Department of National Defence, but he listed five interesting ways of building up this special defence. They were as follows:

1. That the three forces "will so combine and organize their strength within the limited resources assigned them that they may provide efficient early warning, interception and close support services to guard our great cities and vital centres from the first waves of enemy attack."

2. That each community of 50,000 population and over, "encouraged and guided by provincial authorities," study the results of atomic destruction as now known and "translate these into amendments of greater dispersion, even into their system of granting building permits relative to the zone of danger."

3. That professional societies such as the Engineering Institutes of Canada, Royal Architectural Institute of Canada, Canadian Medical Association, and others "study and devise codes and simplified instructions for use by their members in local surveys and in expert counsel to local authorities."

Mind you, all these are startling proposals.

4. That individual industries and public utilities start reviewing ways and means for achieving gradual dispersion "but with comparable productivity and economy."

5. Not an immediate problem but "one needing serious preliminary attention within the next five years," is the question of "a revived and greatly-strengthened air raid precaution (ARP) organization with gradually developed plans for mass evacuation and billeting of non-essential population from the larger cities.

The minister should give the committee some statement with regard to this question of civil defence. His department is obviously concerned about it, and there should be something more definite than statements such as that given by Colonel Goforth. It is an alarming statement which may be a thoroughly wise warning. Will the minister make a statement with regard to civil defence?

Mr. CLAXTON: Colonel Goforth spoke for himself. With regard to what I had in mind when I suggested that, I can say at once that what we intend to do is to have the Department of National Defence and other departments concerned work out plans which might be put into effect progressively as the threat grew. We certainly have nothing in mind along the lines of the suggestion made by my hon. friend.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. BENTLEY: There is quite a chorus of "carried" from the other side. If hon. members had the privilege of seeing the list of speakers, as I have had, they would not call "carried" for a while yet, because there are quite a few. Incidentally, I am not one of those who clamour for a hurried-up closing. I never did believe that we would finish on the 12th of July and I do not believe it. There are too many matters to be discussed. Those hon. members on the other side who shout "carried" should exercise some influence in their party caucus to have some of the important legislation introduced in the early part of the session. If they had done that, instead of fiddling a month away in February, possibly it would not be necessary for them to join the chorus shouting "carried." However, let them have a good time.

I wish to compliment the minister on the clarity of his statement this morning. It was one of the clearest and most definite we have had on this or any other government subject since I have been a member of this house. I have not a copy of the statement, but I listened carefully, and the *Evening Journal* prints a copy of the fourteen points which the minister announced this morning. I presume that copy is correct. There are one or two of the points that I might feel like questioning, but in the main I agree with them.

This afternoon the hon. member for Trinity spent a little time in extolling the value of the particular branch of the forces in which he had such distinguished service. I do not blame him for doing so, nor do I blame some other members who have promoted the particular branches of the service in which they were engaged; but I would remind them, without drawing comparisons as to which branch is better or worse, or which is more valuable, that we old mud-sluggers, the P.B.I.'s did our job too. The others might not have done so valuable a job had not our service played its part too. That is not an odious comparison. It is simply a reminder that whether you fly or tramp around in the mud to your waist you are doing the best you can.

Mr. FULTON: How about a little more pay for the infantry?

Mr. BENTLEY: Now you are talking. I suggest that it be brought up to the others. I will support the hon. member there, even though I may not succeed.

Mr. CLAXTON: They get the same rate.

Mr. BENTLEY: I am glad to hear that. All the way through, considering allowance?

Mr. CLAXTON: Oh, yes, all three services.

Mr. BENTLEY: I am glad to hear that. The hon. member for Selkirk says we joined too late, or too soon rather. We were born thirty years too soon. I want to point out that this group do recognize the need for a defence board. Once in a while some unfortunate statements are made in the house, possibly in consequence of a little stir-up, but I do not think the C.C.F. group need take a back seat to any other group, and again that is not an odious comparison. We all made what contribution we could during the war. There may be a difference in policy and in ideas from time to time as to when is the strategic time for Canada to enter war, but I do not think there will ever come a time when Canada is at war that those of our group, and those associated with us in the country, will not make their full contribution in man and woman-power and in other ways when they are called upon to do so. Whether there are more from one group or from another represented in the military forces, I do not know, and I do not see much difference in proportion to membership in the house.

Certainly we recognize the need for, and we should like to see, a well-balanced military establishment, and that is one thing about

the minister's statement that I liked. It appears at least that he has a good idea of how to bring about a well-balanced and well-coordinated military establishment. That means not only well-trained but well-equipped troops, and I hope he is successful, because, while I do not like war, and cannot by any stretch of the imagination be said to wish that we ever have another one, unfortunately we have not yet any assurance that we shall have the permanent peace we all hope for but still are not too sure of.

We have our obligations to defend ourselves in the event of attack, which I hope never takes place. We have our obligation to the united nations organization when and if the security council makes some decision as to what Canada's part should be, and we must be ready to play that part if we believe what we say when we are members of the united nations. I am not particularly impressed by the minister's statement that we need military forces here for peace, order and good government in Canada. It has been a long time since the citizens of Canada have required anything more than a little bit of caution from the regular police forces to keep us in order. Generally we do not do much that requires a regiment of soldiers to come and prevent us from doing what we might be supposed to be doing.

I want to point out to the committee that there does not seem to be the urgency in this matter that some seem to indicate in their speeches. I would remind the committee that yesterday the Ottawa *Journal*, evening edition, carried what they said was a report of a statement made by Mr. L. B. Pearson at the secret session of the external affairs committee to which members of parliament and members of the other place were invited. I would never mention this myself, but I took it from the *Journal*, so that somebody must have told them and they reported that Mr. Pearson predicted that, in his opinion, there was no danger of a war before 1959. And we are led to believe that Mr. Pearson's opinion is something to which it is worth while giving consideration.

That being the case, considering the type of establishment the minister has envisaged in his statements, in answer to questions, it seems to me that he has time enough to introduce a well-coordinated scheme for national defence and training. This afternoon and at other times it has been pointed out that the Canadian army did an excellent job in both world war I and world war II, and without a great deal of previous training. That is true. There are others who point out that a considerable time was needed between the day we entered the war and the time we had the troops trained, and we could not afford to be unprepared the next time.

I agree with that, but I do not agree with the ideas put forward for preparedness. I want to remind the committee that before world war II, and in the early part of the war, there were many people in this country and in Europe who thought the Mannerheim line and the Maginot lines were good forms of preparedness. But when they came to be attacked by a modern force they were entirely out of date and therefore the preparedness they represented was not preparedness at all. I have no doubt the Maginot line, as a line of fortifications, was well built and well equipped, if it represented all that the builders expected it to be, but it did not meet the needs of the blitzkrieg or the lightning warfare that came upon it at that time. It is equally possible that anything we may envisage now in the way of physical facilities would not be adequate if war came in 1959 or thereabouts. The kind of fitness and preparedness that is always in order is the physical and mental and moral fitness of our citizens. That is the most important fitness and preparedness that Canada can visualize. I believe the lack of that fitness was an important factor in our unpreparedness in the opening days of world war II. Time and again it has been stated that forty-seven per cent of those who submitted themselves for enlistment in our forces were physically unfit. Had those forty-seven per cent all been fit, as they should have been, and as a national plan before that would have made them, they would have been ready for their military duties much sooner and in greater numbers than they were. The same condition might have applied in our war and other industries if the same physical examination had taken place. The same weaknesses and unfitness might have been disclosed there. If they were there—and I believe they were—then undoubtedly Canadian productive industry, including agriculture, mining and all others, suffered to the extent that probably forty-seven per cent of the workers were in the same physical category as those who offered themselves for the armed services. If we are to have a well-coordinated and well-planned defence equipment in this country we must have it powered by men and women who are themselves physically fit. Everything that goes to make that military establishment an efficient machine for Canada's defence and every one of the other industries must be powered by men and women who are physically fit and able to attain all the skills and speeds necessary to do the job at that time.

This afternoon the hon. member for Regina City mentioned the fact that there is a tendency sometimes for our military authorities to decide, for reasons of their own, that it is necessary to move a body of troops from one place to another. I know there was a terrific movement in war time. I remember one sailor telling me that he had joined the navy at Esquimalt, had immediately been posted to Halifax away from his home in Esquimalt, and had served out of Halifax and saved up his leave, which I believe could be done then, so that he might have enough leave to spend a nice Christmas at Esquimalt. A couple of years after he finally achieved that leave which he had saved up for, and went across the continent on that leave thinking he was going to have a happy Christmas with his family. He just landed at Esquimalt when he received a wire from Halifax to report back to duty. He galloped back across the country and reported for duty; he marched in, saluted and said, "Here I am, sir, in accordance with the instructions in the telegram." He was immediately told that he had been reposted to a ship in Esquimalt; so back he went there again. I do not know whether that happened very often, but that was the story I heard.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: It was good for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. BENTLEY: If it is necessary in peace time, while troops are being trained and while we are building up this country for peace and for war, if war does come, instead of moving troops from one place to another by train, let the department organize and assemble all the necessary troops, working, engineering and others. If we are to take troops from a point "A" to a point "B" in Canada, let them build a road as they go along; then, when they get to "B" the road will be built, and from then on they will be able to get back and forth on it without using the railroads. And goodness knows, if we never again have a war, we still need plenty of roads. One could mention similar things all the way through, but I offer those suggestions for the minister's consideration in the hope that he will integrate some ideas like that in his new defence plan.

I want to ask the minister a question on his statement, in particular on point No. 10. As it appears in the paper—as I said before, I believe it is correct—it reads in this way:

Support for Canadian Arsenals Limited and a limited number of Canadian industries to maintain and increase skills in the design and manufacture of munitions and aircraft.

I am not questioning the minister's integrity in this. I am asking him why it says a limited number of Canadian industries? Would not all Canadian industries, in some form or another, be required in any kind of defence plan? I should like the minister to explain that to me. Then point No. 14 reads as follows:

Cooperation with the countries of the commonwealth—

With which I heartily agree.

—the United States and other like-minded countries in working out common standards, planning and training.

The phrase "like-minded countries" is a rather loose one. They are like us in some respects; we are like them in some respects; but we also differ in some respects. I should like us to be like-minded in many more things before we start to standardize our military equipment. I should like us to be so like-minded that we standardize our agricultural equipment, as a result of which every tractor combine, mowing machine or cream separator made here or in the United States, may have a screw or bolt bought for it which will fit in any place. That would be what I would call like-mindedness. I should also like them to let our wheat in there without the 42-cent tariff. I should like us to let their radios in here without any tariff on them. I should like many of those things to come about before we can say that we are like-minded to them or that they are like-minded to us. I do not think we should just plan for our defence equipment.

I know that, in the opinion of others, it might interfere with some of the profit industries of this country. But again I draw to the attention of the committee that if we, unfortunately, some day have to go to war again, then profit and all other privileges of citizens will have to take not only second place, but a place quite low down on the list in comparison with other national needs. Therefore, when we start to standardize, let us try to get others to be so friendly toward us and let us try to be so friendly toward them that we can forget some of our little past traditions of protected profit-making enterprise and have complete free trade and free exchange right across the border.

In conclusion, I wish to ask the minister a question which he was asked this afternoon but did not reply to. The hon. member for Regina City asked the minister this question about military properties which have been turned over to War Assets: To what extent have properties been turned over to War Assets Corporation and then others bought to replace those disposed of? There is a good deal of

feeling in parts of the country that too much of that sort of thing has gone on, that some individuals have reaped the benefit, and that the Canadian taxpayers must now replace those things which went for little, or certainly not enough, to private individuals and which must be replaced as military equipment.

Mr. CLAXTON: I shall reply at once to the hon. member for Swift Current with regard to his last question. Referring to the question asked by the hon. member for Regina City as to what properties had been turned over to War Assets Corporation and then other properties bought in order to replace them, I can answer, absolutely none by the Department of National Defence, and I do not know of any by any other government department.

The other question the hon. member asked, to which I think I should refer, was in relation to point No. 10 in the objectives I set out, which reads:

> Support for Canadian Arsenals Limited and a limited number of Canadian industries to maintain and increase skills in the design and manufacture of munitions and aircraft.

If I had not put in the word "limited" I am sure someone would have asked, how much support; for what industries; how can we support all industries; why should we support industries, and so on? The fact is there are a limited number of Canadian industries which have developed special skills in the production of munitions and aircraft which are not economic in peace time but which it is valuable to continue and which can be continued with a certain limited amount of assistance through orders, and the like; and we hope to be able to assist a very limited number of industries in the way I have indicated.

Mr. BENTLEY: Without being too critical, I think the minister might well have worded the paragraph a little more clearly. If he had said, "those industries which are especially equipped" in the way he has just described, we would have understood.

Mr. CLAXTON: I should think that would be understood by anyone.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I have no desire to make a speech, but I want to ask a question. In referring to that branch of the service which won both wars, my understanding of the answer given by the minister to the previous speaker was that a private in the army will receive the same pay as the corresponding rank in the air force. Is that correct?

Mr. CLAXTON: Right.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Then I want to ask the minister this question so that his answer will be on record. What pay does a private in the army receive? I do not know whether you have two ranks for privates in the army now, but I also want to know what pay is received by an L.A.C., which I believe is the correct term for the man in the air force. I have a couple more questions, the answers to which I want on record also. They slipped it over on the army during the war, and they are not going to do so in peace time if I have anything to say about the matter. I am an army man. I want to know what uniform the private or corresponding rank in the air force gets; what uniform and equipment the private in the army gets, and whether they get the same treatment in the army in regard to transportation as they get in the air force. In order to explain to the minister what I mean, during the war when a private was being taken across Canada he went in a colonist car, while an L.A.C. in the air force went in a tourist car. I have every respect for the air force, but no one can tell me that an air force man needs sheets more than an army man. I can tell the minister I am serious about this. I want to know definitely, and I want it on the record, what is the pay of every rank in the army and every rank in the air force? I am speaking of other ranks now, because when you get up to the generals and vice-admirals they are all air marshals or something like that, particularly when they want to be superannuated and get a pension. Is there any difference in any shape or form between the treatment given a private in the army and that given an L.A.C. in the air force? If so, what is the difference, and why?

Mr. CLAXTON: The pay of all equivalent ranks in the three services was put on exactly the same basis and at the same rates last year. The basic rate of pay for a private on entry is $50; for a trained private, $54; for a private first class, $61; after three years, $64, and after six years, $67. In addition there is a separation allowance and a marriage allowance, which are exactly the same for the three services. All other conditions of service I can think of, including pensions, are identical for the three services. The uniforms still have some differences—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Oh, yes.

Mr. CLAXTON: They are different uniforms.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: And the air force gets the best.

Mr. CLAXTON: The navy, the army and the air force do wear different uniforms; but there is a committee of the three services called the senior supply officers committee, and another one called the personnel members committee, of the top people of the three

services in those two fields, which have to clear all new provisions, and any existing differences are being worked out. I must say I share the view of the hon. member who has just spoken. I could see no reason why three Canadians who enlisted from the same house and who happened to wear the uniforms of the navy, the army and the air force, should have received during the war different rates of pay, different scales of rations and different uniforms. Except for the uniforms that are essential to the functioning of their services and in accordance with their traditions, our aim—and we are rapidly approaching it—is to have them on exactly the same basis for all three services. I believe that all three services are on exactly the same basis in every other particular.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Then will the minister answer my question as to the rates of pay? I understand that he has given them for the army?

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Now will he give me the rates of pay for members of the air force, so that there will be no misunderstanding?

Mr. CLAXTON: The ranks in the air force are aircraftman second class, equivalent to a private on entry; aircraftman first class, equivalent to a private, trained; leading aircraftman, equivalent to private first class. Exactly the same rates of pay prevail for the same service.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: In other words, there is no difference between a private in the army and a private in the air force, whatever he is called?

Mr. CLAXTON: An aircraftman; no.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Then suppose you are moving an army man from Camp Borden to the best camp you have in Canada, at Chilliwack, and you are also moving a man the same day from Camp Borden, where you have some air force men, in Patricia Bay; do they have the same accommodation on the trains, whether they are on leave or on duty; if so, when did that come into effect?

Mr. CLAXTON: For every equivalent rank in the three services the transportation allowance, living allowance and subsistence allowance while travelling are identical.

Mr. HARKNESS: I have been waiting so long to make a few remarks on this matter that if I had not a fairly good memory I would have completely forgotten what I was going to talk about. I am sorry I was not in the house this morning for the major portion of the minister's statement. However, from the report in the newspapers and the comment I have heard, together with the way in which he has answered the questions which have been asked this afternoon and this evening, I believe I must express my appreciation and, I am sure, the appreciation of a large number of other people for the marked increase over the past two years in the frankness and, I think I can say, the definiteness he has shown in giving parliament the general policy in regard to defence, and in answering questions. Perhaps this improvement may be due to the fact that the minister is an ex-gunner, as are a considerable number of members of the house, including myself, I am glad to say; and that as a result he learned to shoot straight and has not forgotten. However that may be, I hope it will not be taken as any reflection on any other service. I should like the hon. member for Fraser Valley particularly to remember that some two years ago I made a plea to make the pay of infantrymen in action the highest of any servicemen. I still believe that would be a reasonable move.

However I wish to speak chiefly about the reserve army. I believe the minister knows that for many years before the war I had and at the present time still have an interest in the reserve army. Between the last session of parliament and this one, I believe I saw and talked to, at various conferences, nearly every commanding officer of reserve units in Alberta. Among them I found a general feeling such as that expressed this afternoon by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard; it is a feeling of discouragement. In some instances the commanders of these reserve force units were ready to give up, and in each instance the cause of discouragement was that they found it extremely difficult to stir up interest among the younger men in their respective communities to get them to enlist in reserve force units.

They were almost universal in their belief that this lack of interest was due to the fact that the government had not stated a definite defence policy. However I believe the minister's statement of this afternoon will go some distance toward correcting that condition. They were further convinced of the fact that when such a statement of policy was made—and they believed it should be made immediately—it should be publicized and that the department should take means to bring home to the general citizens of Canada the fact that the reserve army is necessary, and that it is the duty of able-bodied young men to devote a certain amount of their time to reserve army, air force or naval training, as the case may be.

I believe these men, whose experience covered the province, were correct. I do not believe we shall have a successful reserve army, nor shall we be able to recruit our reserve force units up to any reasonable strength until steps are taken to impress upon the general public the fact that the defence army is necessary and that every encouragement should be given to people to join reserve units.

I was glad to hear the minister mention citizens' committees this afternoon which, I believe, were set up in every locality in Alberta to increase interest and to give support to the reserve units in their particular communities. I believe, however, the minister was under some slight misapprehension as to who started those committees. The man responsible for that was Colonel Eric Snow, who at that time was in command of military district No. 13. My information is that he evolved the idea and had some of the committees started. The idea seemed such a good one that General Worthington then introduced it into his whole command. I believe that since that time an effort has been made to make it effective throughout Canada. I would ask the minister to indicate what success the movement has had and to what extent citizens' committees have been established throughout Canada, because I believe they will prove, with proper support by way of publicity from the government, one of the most potent means of making our reserve army a success.

I believe the whole question of our reserve army policy should be given more thought. I am very doubtful, as are other reserve force officers, as to the possibilities of a six-division reserve force. The minister said this afternoon it was never intended that all the units of these six reserve force divisions would be brought up to full strength. However, so far I have been able to observe, an effort has been made to activate all or practically all those of any size. The result is that in a city like Calgary with a population of about 100,000 we have three regiments of artillery. It is true that the batteries of two of those regiments are scattered. Then, we have an infantry battalion, a tank regiment, a complete divisional army service corps set-up, or at least a lieutenant-colonel's command of army service corps. We have an engineers company, a field ambulance corps, an ordnance corps, a signals company and so on.

To bring those units up to strength would require, I should think, at least 7,000 men. There just are not 7,000 young men in Calgary, and there are not going to be—indeed I do not think there should be the hope that there would be—who will be willing to serve in the reserve army under anything like present circumstances. In addition, the navy and the air force are bidding for the services of these young men.

Considerable thought should be given to the whole scheme of a six-division reserve army. I do not believe Canada can possibly support it, and I do not believe we can get the men into it. We were not able to support six divisions during the last war, and had trouble to support five. It seems to me that the scheme is too ambitious, and should be recast to something which would be more capable of efficient operation. I offer that suggestion to the minister in the hope that it will be received in the spirit in which it has been offered, namely, one of sincere desire for the improvement and success of the reserve army.

There is one other observation by the minister with respect to the reserve army upon which I should like to comment. He said that in the past year an effort has been made to secure a training nucleus of officers, non-commissioned officers and staffs, with administrative and training officers in each unit. Theoretically that sounds all right; but from the practical point of view and from experience, let me tell the minister that if a group of officers and non-commissioned officers have no men to train they lose interest, because they have nothing to do. It is practically hopeless to attempt to bring down a group of officers and non-commissioned officers once or twice a week to have them go through a course of training when they have no men to train and to work with. In other words, in actual practice and from experience I know this just does not work out, although theoretically it may appear all right. If the minister expects the reserve army to be a success efforts must be made to get men into the reserve units. In fact, they must be got in, or the nucleus of officers and non-commissioned officers will disappear, so that we shall have nothing.

Somebody told me that the minister had said that there would be some sort of recruiting scheme carried on this fall. Will that be for the permanent force or for the reserve force as well?

Mr. CLAXTON: Both.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am glad to hear that. I should like the minister to tell the committee on what scale it is to be carried on and what form it will take. I do not want him to go into details, but perhaps he can give us a general idea of what is to be done along that line. It certainly is necessary. The

minister was to give some figures to the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard in regard to the numbers in a typical reserve army unit. When he is giving those figures, will he give the number of men in the reserve army by commands?

The reason I ask that is this. The people in Alberta are extremely interested in knowing what is the situation. Some six to eight months ago, when most of the commanding officers were discouraged over the situation, army officials were telling them that the situation in the reserve units in the west, particularly in Alberta, was the best in the dominion, that they were doing very well and to keep up the good work. They were told that they had more men than anywhere else in the dominion. The general idea among those men at that time was that if that was the case the reserve force was certainly in a bad way. Therefore I should like the minister to put those figures on the record.

There are one or two other points in connection with the permanent force brigade group matter which was brought up by the hon. member for Vancouver South. There is no doubt that in 1945 and 1946 we were assured that this brigade group would be an absolutely up-to-scratch force which would be trained for airborne operations and would be ready to move more or less on one or two days notice against any small attack which might be made. In other words, it was to be an up-to-the-minute force capable of immediate activity. We are now told that it has a strength of only some 2,000 men, that it is scattered all over the country and that there is no idea of bringing it together as a group. It seems to me that you have not a brigade group at all; you have not anything. All you have are men scattered here and there over the country who are not serving any useful purpose as a fighting force. They may be serving a useful purpose for training certain reserve units, for providing a training ground for permanent force officers and so on, but that is about all.

There is a disproportionate number of people, it seems to me, employed at national defence headquarters, on command staffs and so on. That number should be cut down a bit and this brigade group built up into a force of which we would be proud, into a fighting force. During the war it was found beneficial to switch men from staff duties to regimental duties. That policy was generally followed, and I would suggest to the minister that men be switched from the brigade group to staff jobs of various sorts and from staff jobs to the brigade group. I think that would be most beneficial as far as our permanent force is concerned.

Mr. CLAXTON: The hon. member must know that those kinds of changes go on steadily. For example, the commanding officer of one of the active force units at Calgary was recently moved to take a staff course. On the other point, there is no intention not to activate and form into one outfit this brigade group.

Mr. HARKNESS: I did not think there were enough in the brigade group to permit changes.

Mr. CLAXTON: It is coming along. With regard to the number of units, I carry the figure in my head. In order to constitute a six-division army out of 180,000 men of the reserve in Canada it would take about 2,000 units. At the present time we have somewhere in the neighbourhood of 650 units. My hon. friend will see that his idea is already being acted upon.

Mr. Harkness: It is mainly the larger units which have been activated, rather than the small units?

Mr. CLAXTON: In a country like Canada it is most important to have units where the population is. For example, a unit like the South Saskatchewan, which probably was not very active in peace time, was one of the best regiments we had in war-time. The fact that it had a nucleus in existence enabled it to mobilize and raise its officers and non-commissioned officers rapidly, so that it proved a useful thing to have.

The hon. member asked what success had attended the effort to have citizens' committees throughout the country. That is not a new thing. For years units have had committees back of them. What is new is that, possibly at Colonel Sims' suggestion, General Worthington made it universal throughout his whole command. As the hon. member said, that has been a great success, and I think it is spreading throughout other commands.

Mr. HARKNESS: To what extent has it been successful throughout the others?

Mr. CLAXTON: It has spread gradually as units can form committees or as committees can be formed for units. It has not been applied as an order, because this is the kind of thing which should grow spontaneously in the community under the encouragement of the G.O.C. of the command or the officers commanding the unit. It is being encouraged and worked on.

With the other remarks of the hon. member I have a great deal of sympathy, and I will give consideration to a great deal of what he has said. With regard to the general policy in connection with the reserve, the policy has been to form, first, a nucleus of officers and non-commissioned officers. That is following largely along the lines of the discussions we had with the reserve representatives. I can remember several of them saying that they had to get going on the basis of officers and non-commissioned officers and tradesmen strength before they could do very much with men. As the hon. member and all those familiar with this will agree, it is a question of timing. As soon as you get the officer and non-commissioned officer and unit organization working, then you must get the men for them to train. We are trying to work on that timing as well as we can.

Mr. LENNARD: Before saying a word on the Royal Canadian Sea Cadets, I should like to say that I was pleased to hear the minister state this morning that living quarters would soon be available for married personnel of the Royal Canadian Navy in the Halifax area. I know he knows that there are many cases where great hardship has been experienced. I have had several cases brought to my attention where families have had to live hundreds of miles from Halifax. I know of one case where the family needed fatherly discipline. The man was interested in his work in the navy but, because his family had to live hundreds of miles away, he became greatly dissatisfied with his situation. As I say, I was pleased to bear the minister state that that situation would soon be rectified.

Mr. CLAXTON: We are going to do our utmost to correct it as soon as we can.

Mr. LENNARD: In connection with the Royal Canadian Sea Cadets, as I said before in this house, I know of no movement in Canada over the past few years which has done so much for the youth of this country. It is not a flash in the pan. The Navy League of Canada has been operating for years. A great deal of the personnel of our Canadian navy of the past years was furnished and made available because of the Royal Canadian Sea Cadets movement. In that connection I should like to quote Frank S. Rutherford, deputy minister of education of Ontario. He was appointed a few months ago. He said in part:

> My association with the navy league sea cadet movement has convinced me that the training provided is essentially good, whether a young man enters the navy or civilian employment. Naval training presents opportunities for the use of mind and hand which are bound to be affected in any type of employment.

[Mr. Claxton.]

The associations which a young man will make in the sea cadets will be lasting and most helpful in the years to come.

I would go a step farther than that, and I believe the minister will agree with me. The Royal Canadian Sea Cadet Corps have within their ranks reserves for the navy of tomorrow or when they are desired. I would urge the minister to give every consideration to expanding that service. I know that a few months ago the cadet services were curtailed, and through negotiations with the navy league, I believe, certain adjustments were made. But there is one point I should like to draw to the minister's attention, which is one I brought up in the house some few months ago.

About a year ago, the sea cadet training officers were put on pay by the Department of National Defence. At that time I suggested that the remuneration should be in the form of clothing allowances and not as pay, because when it is given in the form of pay it is added to their income and the greater part of it is wiped out in income tax; it does not meet the purpose for which it was intended. Over the years, the sea cadets have given of their time and of their money. I know that, because I have been more or less actively engaged in the movement. They are constantly using their cars and different things to further the movement. When they are given pay it certainly does not go anywhere near recompensing them for the time and energy they put in the movement.

I should like to mention one other point. Certain curtailments were made in the size of corps, and there was also a restriction put on the units going to camp this year. Originally they were to go for one week. That was changed by the defence department and they were allowed the two weeks training as they had previously enjoyed, but the size of the unit that was allowed to go to camp was practically cut in half. One corps in which I am directly interested of one hundred cadets and officers was allowed to send to camp this year only forty cadets and two officers. I wish to bring that to the minister's attention, because it is discouraging to these boys, and especially to some of the boys who have worked hard all year in the hope that they would be selected to go to camp. It is a hardship; it is a discouragement to the officers and boys who are training. It should be considered and a change should be made, if not this year, next year to remedy the situation.

In closing, I wish to say that the sea cadet movement of Canada is one of the finest youth training schemes we have had. In its ranks you have the reserve navy of tomorrow.

Mr. FULTON: I wish to ask the minister a few questions with regard to cadet training in Canada, but before I do so I want to say a few words about the statement which he gave this morning which, as has already been said, is perhaps the first clear statement we have had since this parliament convened as to what would be our defence policy. Some of the things which were pointed out a short time ago by the hon. member for Swift Current as to bringing the training of our forces into a form which will make certain that they are attractive to all people of the country so that it will be realized there is a real career in the service for men of ability and activity, are important. They have been said before in the house. I shall not go over them, but I should like to emphasize what seems to me to be one of the most essential things today, and I hope that that aspect of the matter will be emphasized in the recruiting programme which the minister has indicated will be brought into effect this fall; giving our engineers practical work to do in the country which will make a contribution, not only to their training, but to the development of the country; giving the signal corps in the various services practical work in the construction of communication systems, which will not only be of value to them as training but be of value in building up the communication system of Canada. These things should be emphasized so that the training of our forces will equip them, in order that when they retire from the forces at the reduced age which is now in effect they will be able to take their place in the civilian life of the country on an equal footing with other persons who have not been in the forces, but who have perhaps been on a superior level because their training and experience will all have been practical.

With regard to the cadet programme for Canada, I should like to say at the outset, as has just been said by the hon. member for Wentworth with reference to the navy, the cadet corps in this country are certainly the pool from which normally one would expect the armed services to be drawn.

At the outset one should pay a tribute to the work which has been done by civilian personnel and by officers in connection with cadet training. It would not be proper to stop at that. One should also pay a tribute to the provinces in this field, and to the work of the ministries of education of the various provinces. We recall that during the war they were urged to try to bring up their cadet training programme so that practically one hundred per cent of those attending secondary schools would be receiving cadet training. It is a fact perhaps worth recording that in some of the provinces, in one at any rate, a programme was worked out by agreement with the Department of National Defence, so that one hundred per cent of those boys in secondary schools would receive cadet training. The importance of this is not only in the military value which those young men themselves will get from it, and therefore our armed forces will get, but the value to the whole country in training in citizenship which will follow and the contribution to the health and welfare of our youth. Perhaps these aspects are as important as the military value which can be derived from any cadet scheme.

In the light of these remarks I should like to refer briefly to an outline of the programme given by the minister on February 17, at which time he indicated to the house that, although certain reductions were contemplated, it was not intended actually to reduce the number of cadet corps in training in this country. The minister said that, following the end of the present school year, army cadet training would be organized in two types, open corps affiliated with reserve corps units and school corps sponsored by boards of education, some of which are also affiliated with reserve units. At the end of that statement on February 17 he said, as reported at page 506 of *Hansard:*

> There will be no reduction in the number of cadet corps of boys who fall within the classes I mentioned, aged fourteen to eighteen, provided that they are organized in corps of twenty or more.

Since that time there have been indications that there is a substantial reduction in the number of cadets authorized to receive training in our schools throughout the country. I suppose that might have been done partly as an economy measure. Certainly it was indicated that some saving was to be effected by it. We all realize that saving is essential; but it seems to me, since the major contribution to cadet training is made by the provinces in the schools in which the training is taken, the saving will be negligible. I think I could go so far as to say it is another typical case where the government is taking a step in the wrong direction and at the wrong time, because the value of this cadet training, in terms of citizenship and in increase in health and welfare in the country, cannot be measured in terms of the money expended on it. The saving itself is certainly negligible and far more than offset by the value that would be derived from a thoroughgoing scheme of cadet training.

I would ask the minister some questions with regard to the present programme. Were notices sent out by the Department of National Defence or the various headquarters or any of them in the country to school principals that they must reduce the number of cadets in training?

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes, certainly. The cadets in respect of whom the federal government would pay the grants would be cadets in schools who had entered in September, in the 9th grade, and were under eighteen years of age, and in open corps cadets between the ages of fourteen and eighteen. That was gone into fully in the house on February 17 when the same question was asked and the same answer given. As far as I know, it has been acted on.

Mr. FULTON: In the light of that statement I would ask whether any notice was given at that time to the provincial governments and the ministers of education concerned that this cut would be made.

Mr. CLAXTON: The question of defence is a federal matter. The designation of the cadets in respect of whom the federal government pays money voted by parliament for defence purposes is a federal matter. It always has been and I do not know why it should not be. The question of cadets regarding whom federal grants are paid has always been a matter for federal determination. The communication was issued, as far as I know, in exactly the same way as all other communications have been issued with regard to cadets.

Mr. FULTON: The point is that there was in effect in one province an agreement made with the Department of National Defence and approved by the then ministers of national defence, that they would train all their boys in secondary schools, and they were prepared to pay their share of the cost of doing that. It seems that, subsequent to that agreement, notices were sent out from various defence establishments in the country that they would be required to cut down the number of cadets in training. I would ask whether any arrangement was sought to be reached with the provincial governments in that connection, since the provincial governments made their contribution and their ministers of education were anxious to continue cadet training. It is unfortunate the attitude was taken that this is so exclusively a federal matter, that we had already reached an agreement with the provinces, that there should be unilateral action to vary that agreement without consultation with provinces which were anxious to continue such training.

[Mr. Fulton.]

Mr. CLAXTON: Notification was made in this case, as in all other cases where there have been changes. Agreements were made with all the provinces in 1911 under the Strathcona trust and during the thirty years since, the Department of National Defence, under various names, has made changes in accordance with the votes and provisions for training, and those changes have been notified as they have been made. I have never heard it suggested before that, prior to making any change, the Department of National Defence should secure the acquiescence or agreement of each of the nine provinces. That is a new notion.

Mr. FULTON: Perhaps not with each of the nine before the department makes any change in any one province; but certainly, inasmuch as cadets are trained in the secondary schools, if there is to be a change in the basis on which training is given, I should imagine the intention to make the change and the working out of the change would be a matter of consultation with the province.

Mr. CLAXTON: There are in every command cadet officers available for consultation, and they consult with the local educational officers.

Mr. FULTON: I recall that sometime earlier this year a public statement was made by the premier of one province to the effect that in that province they were willing and anxious to continue, and I believe he went so far as to say they would continue, cadet training in their secondary schools for all boys in those schools. I want to know whether the minister has received any official communications from any provincial minister of education asking that he reconsider the position and inquiring whether the department will not enter into consultation with the provinces to work out some scheme whereby universal cadet training in secondary schools can be continued.

Mr. CLAXTON: The only communication received from any provincial educational authority was one I received last week from the minister of education of Ontario. The communication was dated June 25. It was the first I had heard from a provincial minister with regard to this matter and I made a reply. The officers of the department of education concerned with cadets and the officers of the Department of National Defence were in communication back at the end of February and the beginning of March, but these direct communications were stopped, and this is the first I have heard about it since.

Mr. FULTON: The direct communications were stopped? That, I think, is unfortunate.

Mr. CLAXTON: I think it is very unfortunate. They were stopped by the province of Ontario.

Mr. FULTON: Well, the public statement made by the minister of education of Ontario was to the effect that they desired to continue 100 per cent cadet training in their schools.

Mr. CLAXTON: We shall be glad to cooperate with them on the terms we announced.

Mr. FULTON: What was the last communication received—June 25? Was that a request to reopen negotiations?

Mr. CLAXTON: I do not suppose I should table that letter without the consent of the premier. I certainly have no objection to tabling it, or yet my reply, but that letter was one in which he referred to a state of uncertainty in the province of Ontario with regard to this matter and to his own attitude. Until I secure some consent from him to tabling the letter, I probably should not go any farther. The fact is that the first sign of any difficulty that came to my attention as a result of the communication from the province of Ontario was this letter of June 25, which was just about four months after the announcement of policy I had made; a little more than four months.

Mr. FULTON: Is the minister considering a revision of the policy or some steps to enable—

Mr. CLAXTON: No. We have announced that we are not in favour of continuing junior cadets, and we propose to make federal grants from the federal treasury with respect to senior cadets; that is, cadets generally speaking in school cadet corps who enter the ninth grade on September 1, and who have not reached the age of eighteen, and in open corps who are between the ages of fourteen and eighteen. We do not propose any more to make grants in respect of junior cadets. That is a definite government and department policy arrived at, we think, for sound reasons, and we have no disposition whatever to change that. I do not think there is any desire on the part of the country that we should.

Mr. FULTON: Have the department any objections, or have they made any representations against the provinces continuing cadet training outside of the categories which the minister has just mentioned?

Mr. CLAXTON: I have not had any representations with regard to cadets from any province except Ontario, and the letter of the minister of education does not suggest extending the ages. He does not deal with the question of ages.

Mr. POULIOT: I hope my hon. friend opposite is through with his questions. I have only two questions to ask the minister, and they are clearcut, concise and precise. I hope the minister will be kind enough to give me a clear answer. In the first place, I want to know if the experts of his department believe that Canada will be the theatre of the next war. In the second place, I want to know if we can expect peace-time compulsory training this year, or if it has been put aside for some time.

Before the minister answers, I will draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the discussion has been going on for a whole day on item 551. There is another item, 552, in the demobilization and reconversion part of the estimates. Then at page 25 of the estimates there are ten other items which are as yet untouched. As I look at the list, I see that we still have quite a large number of items to pass. There is the auditor general, finance, part of fisheries, governor general and lieutenant governors, insurance, labour, legislation, mines and resources; all of national defence, all of labour, all of mines and resources, all of national revenue—

Mr. MacNICOL: Reconstruction.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes; and the Prime Minister's office, privy council office, reconstruction and supply, veterans affairs, loans and investments; and under demobilization and reconversion, auditor general, finance, fisheries, labour, mines and resources, national defence, privy council office, reconstruction and supply, trade and commerce and veterans affairs. There are several hundred items. If we do not catch a fast train, we shall stay here for a long time, and we can say good-bye to summer as we did last year. This is not a lecture to anyone; it is an olive branch that I show to all.

Mr. GREEN: The hon. member had better sit down.

Mr. POULIOT: As I say, it is an olive branch that I show to all, in the expectation that there will be a certain spirit of cooperation and that we shall all do our best to bring the session to an end. I may tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I had some very fine stuff about the brass hats, about the dealings of the Canadian Department of National Defence, the British government, the United States government, the United States army, the British army and so on; but I have put all that

aside, to think it over, and have not said a word about it. I asked two short questions about matters of general concern. I hope there will be more of a spirit of conciliation. Members may ask questions, as we have heard them ask them all day, but it will not change a single vote in the great old city of Halifax on Monday next. This must be kept in mind. While I am sure that hon. members have not that objective in view when they discuss the estimates, I will tell you what I have in view, Mr. Chairman. It is to get home as soon as possible.

Mr. GREEN: Then why does the hon. member not go?

Mr. POULIOT: I do not want to interfere with the fundamental freedom of speech of all hon. members.

Mr. MacINNIS: Eleven o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes; and I leave it at that. I wonder if it would not be possible to pass at least one estimate immediately after the minister has answered my question?

Mr. CLAXTON: To answer the first question, not possible for a good many years; to answer the second question, no.

Mr. POULIOT: Thank you very much.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Eleven o'clock.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, I have been in the public accounts committee since three o'clock, and I should like to ask a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Eleven o'clock.

Mr. STOKES: I should like to ask the minister a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Eleven o'clock.

Mr. CLAXTON: If the hon. member has only one question, could we not pass one item?

Mr. STOKES: I am not sure whether I am asking this question under the proper item or not. My question has to do with the moneys which were expended in the Belleville armouries, principally in regard to the laying of a concrete floor. This floor in the Belleville armouries was laid in 1945, and was relaid in the early part of this year. The returns which I have been furnished show the expense for laying the floor in 1945 to be $2,770; and this year $4,344 were spent to replace that floor.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. KNOWLES: It is eleven o'clock. We cannot get an item through. Why go on?

Mr. STOKES: It was an asphalt floor laid in 1945. My information is that the inspector of the work refused to pass it at the time. According to the return I have, the contractor was paid for the work, and the floor proved to be practically useless; it was going to pieces. During the early part of this year the floor was torn up and another asphalt floor was laid. The inference is that something was wrong with the first floor; and I understand that the inspector would not take the responsibility of passing the work.

Another question I should like to ask the minister is whether there is anything in these estimates for the erection of an armoury at Trenton, Ontario.

Mr. CLAXTON: No.

Mr. GREEN: What was the answer to the other question?

Mr. CLAXTON: In regard to the first question, return No. 286 was brought down in answer to order of the house on June 18, 1947. It shows expenditures of $683.09 for material and $169.32 for labour, and also $3,514.97 on the armoury to which the hon. member refers. I believe the information was given then. If the hon. member has any further questions I shall be glad to answer them directly.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): The question was whether the contractor was paid when the inspector did not approve the work. That is a simple question.

Mr. CLAXTON: I will have to look into the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Eleven o'clock.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Can we carry this one item?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. FRASER: I would not agree to this item being carried unless the minister would guarantee that I would be allowed to ask three questions on another item tomorrow.

Mr. CLAXTON: Very well; I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

It being five minutes after eleven o'clock, the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, July 10, 1947

The house met at eleven o'clock.

RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES

Fifth report of the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines—Mr. Breithaupt.

(Translation):

PRIVILEGE

MR. LACOMBE—LOOTERS IN THE CONSTITUENCY OF LAVAL-TWO MOUNTAINS—PROTECTION OF THE R.C.M.P.

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two Mountains): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. Looters have invaded my constituency, at Saint-Eustache. I request for my constituents the protection of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Those bandits are breaking into houses ravaged by the floods which have caused damages amounting to more than one million dollars. The Right Hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ilsley) will no doubt issue instructions accordingly.

(Text):

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

CONCURRENCE IN SECOND AND THIRD REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. DAVID CROLL (Spadina) moved that the second report of the standing committee on industrial relations, presented on Tuesday, July 8, be now concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion? Carried.

Mr. FLEMING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, does that not have to be a separate motion?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. MacKINNON: They are separate motions.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the procedure which is being followed. I have presented the motion which was that the second report of the standing committee on industrial relations be now concurred in. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion? Carried.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just a minute, Mr. Speaker. What is the motion, please? Is it that the second report be now concurred in?

Mr. SPEAKER: That the second report of the standing committee on industrial relations, presented on Tuesday, July 8, be now concurred in.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If there is no desire for a debate on the report, Mr. Speaker, I quite agree to its being concurred in at this moment. But if it is likely to give rise to a debate at this stage of the session I should like to point out certain reasons why concurrence should not be given at this time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. CROLL moved that the third report of the standing committee on industrial relations be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

CONCURRENCE IN FOURTH REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. D. F. BROWN (Essex West) presented the fourth report of the special joint committee on Indian Affairs, as follows:

Pursuant to orders of reference dated 13th February 1947, your committee has held 67 meetings and has heard 102 witnesses, including departmental officials, church dignitaries and Indian representatives from all provinces in Canada except the maritimes which were visited last autumn by a commission under the Inquiries Act, appointed by order in council PC. 3797, dated 11th October, 1946.

Embodied in the minutes of evidence, as appendices thereto, are 153 written briefs or submissions received by your committee from Indian bands or organizations and from other Canadian individuals or groups interested in the welfare and well-being of our natives of Indian descent. The minutes of proceedings and evidence cover approximately 2,500 pages.

Your committee was instructed to "continue and complete" the examination and consideration of the Indian Act. However, the actual recasting, or revision of that Act, which is long overdue, could not possibly be attempted until a full opportunity had been afforded to all interested parties to make representations in that regard.

Your committee is agreed that the joint committee on Indian Affairs which was appointed in 1946 was warranted, as it reported to parliament, in adopting a programme which envisaged the revision of the Indian Act only during the 1948 session of parliament.

The 1946 joint committee on Indian Affairs, on August 15th last, also reported:

> ...The hearing of departmental officials has disclosed the necessity for certain administrative improvements which can be effected without the revision of any existing legislation and which, when put into effect, will remove some of the causes out of which have arisen grievances and complaints of many Indians...

Your present committee notes with extreme regret that recommendation No. 8 of the said report of August 15th, 1946, which was concurred in by both houses of parliament, has not yet been implemented.

That recommendation was:

...8. That more direct methods be employed for the return of rentals collected on the behalf of Indian lessors.

Your committee, therefore, recommends:

1. That immediate steps be taken by all responsible officials to remove without further delay this long standing grievance with regard to rentals due to Indians,

and your committee further finds and recommends:

2. That a commission, in the nature of a claims commission, be set up with the least possible delay to inquire into the terms of all Indian treaties, in order to discover and determine such rights and obligations as may therein be involved, or any subsequent substitution therefor, and to appraise and settle in a just and equitable manner any claims or grievances arising thereunder;

3. That the questions involving band membership be left for definition and determination during the 1948 session when the Indian Act is next examined and considered;

4. That immediately parliament next reassembles a special joint committee be constituted with powers similar to those granted your committee on 13th February last;

5. That the matter of enfranchisement of Indians be left for further consideration when the Indian Act is under revision;

6. Certain Indian bands resident on "lands reserved for Indians", particularly in the province of Quebec, are compelled to pay taxes other than those imposed by dominion legislation. It is therefore recommended that a reference be made to the proper court to determine the legality of any taxation imposed on Indians;

7. That encroachments of persons other than Indian upon lands reserved for Indians are not reviewed with favour by either the members of the Indian band concerned nor by the Indian Affairs branch. It is recommended that the Indian Affairs branch take immediate steps, consistent with the wishes of the Indian bands concerned, to remove from Indian reserves all persons other than Indians who reside in, or carry on business on an Indian reserve;

8. That the whole matter of education of Indians be left over for further consideration. In the meantime, however, it is recommended that all educational matters, including the selection and appointment of teachers in Indian schools be placed under the direct and sole responsibility of the Indian Affairs branch;

9. That the administration of all aspects of Indian Affairs should be under one ministerial head.

10. The director of the Indian Affairs branch should be given the status, if not the rank, of deputy minister to permit him to have direct approach to his and other departmental heads; or, he should be named a commissioner who shall rank as a deputy minister and who shall have at least two assistant commissioners of whom one should be a Canadian of Indian descent;

11. That Indians who are qualified for any position in the administration of Indian Affairs, at any level, be given a preference for appointment to such positions within that administration for which they qualify or are suited;

12. That when the Director of Indian Affairs becomes aware that an Indian agent will shortly be leaving the service, he should, in ample time before the said agent retires, request that the Civil Service Commission select and appoint a successor to the said agent, so that there shall be no interruption in the carrying out of the duties of that most important office in Indian administration, that of Indian agent;

13. That the retiring leave of any agent or officer in Indian administration be granted to him simultaneously with the payment to him in a lump sum of his leave payments instead of retaining him on the payroll pending actual retirement. This in order that the position may be filled without delay by the person selected and appointed to succeed the retiring agent or officer;

14. That whenever possible a vacant position of Indian agent be filled by the promotion of an assistant agent who will have had the opportunity of receiving training in all the duties of an Indian agent;

15. That in view of the fact that Indian reserves are widely scattered across Canada, and in view of the diversity of the problems confronting those charged with the administration of Indian Affairs, the Indian Affairs branch should be decentralized and the regional directors be appointed to look after and to determine such matters as appropriately fall within this particular regional jurisdiction;

16. That the establishment for the Indian Affairs branch be increased to provide for the appointment of a sufficient number of Indian agents and Indian agents-at-large, to provide for the adequate and proper administration of Indian reserves.

17. That when a promotion from the staff of an agency is not possible, a promotion should, when practicable, be made from junior officers in the district who may desire promotion and who are suited and qualified for a senior post;

18. That when promotion within the staff of an agency is not feasible, the field of competition for applications from the general public should be made wide enough to ensure the selection and appointment of a fully qualified person;

19. That examinations, whenever possible, should be conducted by the district offices of the Civil Service Commission rather than at headquarters of the Civil Service Commission at Ottawa;

20. That Indian agents who have undergone a period of probation satisfactory to the Director of Indian Affairs should be made permanent civil servants at the end of such probationary period;

21. That, by order in council, appointments to the Indian affairs administration should no longer be subject to the "permanent quota" now in force, as imposed by treasury board regulations;

22. That the preference accorded to any veteran be consistently accorded with regard to all appointments to positions in the administration of Indian Affairs;

23. That future appointments of officials concerned with the administration of Indian Affairs should, where practicable, be re-

stricted to applicants who have had previous experience in the field. Field officers in the said administration should, from time to time, be posted to the divisional or headquarters office of such administration;

24. That in the best interest of the administration of Indian Affairs, if there be officials therein who are incompetent, or incapacitated, or for any reason unable to fulfil their duties, such officials should be superannuated or retired from the service, without undue delay;

25. That the project of building a central governmental hospital in northern Indian agencies, with nursing stations in far outlying districts be proceeded with at once; and

26. That some statutory provision be made for the adequate care of aged, infirm or blind Indians; and that in the meantime rations given to properly care for Indians should be sufficient in quantity and quality.

Whilst your committee would like to express due appreciation to all those individuals and organizations who have rendered valuable assistance to the deliberations of your committee, we feel that occasion must be taken to single out for special mention the very valuable contribution made by Mr. William Zimmerman, Jr., Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, U.S.A., who came to Ottawa to inform your committee with regard to the administration of Indian Affairs in the said United States of America.

A copy of the minutes of proceedings and evidence is tabled herewith.

Mr. BROWN moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, so far as the deputations which have appeared before this committee during the past two years are concerned, the committee was a great disappointment; it did not take the action which was requested. There is only one point they had to decide, namely, are the Indians citizens or not. They were here 186 years ahead of the British and French. Surely they are citizens; and if they are citizens they are entitled to all hospitalization and other services. It is really too bad that, after two years of talk and Cook's tours of the committee, nothing is done about it but talk.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that something ought to be said on this report before it is concurred in. I am not at all satisfied with the progress which is being made in dealing with our Indian problems in Canada. It seems to me that now is the time to register a protest. It looks to me as though all we as a parliament are endeavouring to do is to pass the buck, to use a common expression, in matters pertaining to the Indians. Last year we had a report from the committee on the Indian Act. It certainly was strong enough and certainly should have resulted in action this year, but no action has been forthcoming in any way commensurate with the recommendations of the committee. Now we have another report, and though I hesitate to say it, it looked to me as though the government had not even the interest in it to hear the report—

Mr. MacKINNON: Oh, no.

Mr. BLACKMORE: —because it was suggested that the reading of the report be dispensed with. Had that report been read, every member of the house would have been able to hear what the report was.

Mr. MacKINNON: That suggestion was not from the government side.

Mr. BLACKMORE: If this is an indication of the general attitude of the government to the Indian question, I think it is high time that the members of the house had a good deal to say about the matter.

Mr. MacKINNON: That did not come from the government side.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The hearings of the Indian Act committee, I believe, have filled all members of the committee with grave concern with regard to affairs pertaining to the Indians in Canada. There is a serious shortage of educational facilities for the Indians. The Indian's means of earning a livelihood are far too inadequate. Much needs to be done in regard to that. The housing situation for the Indians is almost intolerable and their health conditions are simply deplorable. There is widespread unhappiness among the Indians because of the fact that many of the treaty obligations into which this government entered with them have not been observed; in fact, they have been broken.

I am speaking only in a broad and general way in order to avoid taking up an undue amount of our time, but I think what I have said is serious enough. I would urge the government that before this parliament meets again they have a programme which will really come to grips with the problem of the Indians and deal with it. As I recall it, our committee last year recommended that the old age pension be given to the Indians. Yet notwithstanding that, the old age pension was not given to the Indians this year, although an amendment to the Old Age Pensions Act was brought in. That would seem to indicate that the government is prepared to flout the recommendations of the committee. All this indicates a serious situation, Mr. Speaker. I am not at all satisfied, and the Indians throughout this country are not satisfied.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. BLACKMORE: On division.

Motion agreed to.

ROYAL STYLE AND TITLES ACT

OMISSION OF WORDS "INDIAE IMPERATOR" AND "EMPEROR OF INDIA"

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 449, to provide for the alteration of His Majesty's royal style and titles.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise to a point of order in connection with this bill. It appears in the *Votes and Proceedings* today and it also appears on the order paper. If the Prime Minister wants the unanimous consent of the house, we are quite happy to give it; but unless that is done this procedure is irregular.

Mr. CHURCH: I am opposed to this change in the King's title, for the reasons I gave last Friday, *Hansard,* pages 5093-94. It will lead to civil war.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say I was surprised myself when I saw this bill on the order paper this morning. I had given the notice of the bill to be placed on the *Votes and Proceedings* yesterday afternoon. If the house will give its unanimous consent to introduce the bill now, I would be pleased, and I think there is everything to be gained and nothing to lose by having the measure introduced at once. May I take it that I have the leave of the house to introduce the bill?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hon. members will recall that in enumerating the measures which would be considered before the end of the session I was careful to say that some measures might come up of which I had no knowledge at the time I was referring to the remaining list of bills that would be brought in. This is a case in point. The request for the measure which I am now introducing came from the British government at the beginning of this week; I had no knowledge of any probability of this measure being introduced this session until I received the communication from his majesty's government in England with respect to what they hoped might take place before this session of parliament prorogued. For that reason I shall give the house immediately a more lengthy explanation in introducing the bill than otherwise might be necessary. The purpose of the bill is simply to delete the words "Indiae Imperator" and "Emperor of India" from the style and title of his majesty, but so that hon. members may see the significance of this proposal and also the necessity for it I will give the house some details as to the circumstances which have rendered it advisable to enact this proposal at this time.

[Mr. Blackmore.]

Last week the United Kingdom government introduced in the House of Commons at Westminster the India independence bill. This bill provides for the setting up in India of two independent members of the commonwealth, India and Pakistan. It will take effect on August 15. Full legislative power is conferred by this bill on the legislature of each of these countries and provisions comparable to those of the Statute of Westminster are applied to them.

When this bill becomes effective the relation of His Majesty to India and Pakistan will be the same as his relation to the other fully self-governing nations of the commonwealth. It follows from this that the title "Emperor of India" which was added to the royal style and titles in 1877 will not be appropriate.

There has been included in the India independence bill a clause declaring that the parliament of the United Kingdom assents to the omission from the royal style and titles of the words "Indiae Imperator" and "Emperor of India."

In accordance with the recitals set out in the preamble of the Statute of Westminster the consent of each parliament in the commonwealth is necessary for an alteration in the royal style and titles. The purpose of the legislation which I am introducing is to give the assent of the Canadian parliament to the deletion of the words in question.

The matter of the general revision of the royal style and titles, raised earlier in this house, is not raised either by this bill or by the bill introduced in the house at Westminster. It is to be expected that this matter will be discussed at the next meeting of commonwealth prime ministers.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall said bill be read the second time?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No; next sitting. The purpose in giving an explanation of such length this morning was to give hon. members an opportunity to see for themselves exactly what the measure amounts to before second reading.

Mr. POULIOT: If I am permitted, may I ask the Prime Minister what is the meaning of "royal style"? Is it the royal status, or what?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is a description, which speaks for itself; it is a style of address.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 444, for the relief of Joseph Edmond Gerard Santoire.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 445, for the relief of Alderic Gemme.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 446, for the relief of Pierre Behocaray.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 447, for the relief of Joseph Rosealphee Oderic Dussault.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 448, for the relief of Dan Alonzo Dwight Wright.—Mr. Maybank.

Some hon. MEMBERS: On division.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

WARTIME HOUSING—NORTH VANCOUVER

Mr. GREEN:

1. What costs, additional to contract price, were incurred through the allocations of material to the contractor, in the wartime housing project in the city of North Vancouver, under which approximately 695 houses were constructed?

2. Were roads, sewers, water mains and septic tanks put in by contract on such project?

3. If so, who were the contractors and what amounts were paid to each of them?

4. What was the cost of the re-survey of the area?

5. Who carried out such re-survey?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No additional costs were incurred through the allocation of material to the contractor in the wartime housing project in the city of North Vancouver in which approximately 750 houses were constructed.

2. Yes.

3. Smith Brothers & Wilson were the general contractors and were paid an amount of $447,746.03 for this work.

4. No resurvey of the area was made. Survey costs $589.34.

5. The survey was carried out by J. Rodger Burnes, dominion and British Columbia land surveyor, Vancouver, B.C.

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—J. E. SHIELDS

Mr. STOKES:

1. Has J. E. Shields, a solicitor of Kerrobert, Saskatchewan, during the years 1943 to date been retained by the wartime prices and trade board as prosecuting counsel?

2. If so, on how many cases?

3. What is the total amount of fees he has received in each of said years?

4. What was the amount of the accounts rendered by him during the said period and what was the total amount taxed off, if any, before payment?

5. Are there any outstanding bills of costs which have been rendered by him? If so, what amount?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. Yes.

2. Thirteen.

3. Fiscal Years—

1943-44	$ 60.00
1944-45	166.36
1945-46	206.10
1946-47	523.80

4. Total amounts of accounts rendered during the said period—$1,282.26.

Total amount taxed off before payment, $326.00.

5. Yes—$76.18.

PUBLIC WORKS—ACTING CHIEF ARCHITECT EXPENSES

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

What is the total amount paid for expenses incurred by C. G. Brault, acting chief architect, in the year ending March 31, 1947?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): $283.52 (travelling expenses).

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

INCOME TAX—PROSECUTIONS, ARREARS, ETC.—SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. TIMMINS:

1. How many income tax centres are there in Canada and where are they situated?

2. What officer is in charge of each income tax centre; what is the name of the officer second in charge; what are their respective salaries, and how long has each been in the public service?

3. For the years 1943, 1944, 1945 and 1946, what are the arrears of income taxes in each of the income tax centres?

4. How many income tax cases were tried in the exchequer court or any other court, for income tax arrears in each of the years, 1943, 1944, 1945 and 1946?

5. How many prosecutions were instituted in each of the years 1943 to 1946, inclusive, for non-payment of income taxes?

6. How many persons in Canada are making payments in respect to income tax arrears after having been prosecuted or sued for such tax arrears?

7. What is the aggregate amount of said arrears?

8. How many of these cases are subject to payment by instalments, pursuant to settlement arrived at with the Minister of National Revenue or the deputy minister of national revenue

or other departmental official, and what is the aggregate amount involved in such settlements?

9. How much money has been collected for succession duties, during each year since the Dominion Succession Duty Act came into force?

Mr. McCANN: Return tabled.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING ACT

AMENDMENT TO CREDIT TO CORPORATION GROSS PRIVATE RECEIVING AND BROADCASTING LICENCE FEES

Hon. J. J. McCANN (Minister of National Revenue) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a measure to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936, to provide that the Minister of Finance shall deposit to the credit of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation the gross amount of the moneys received in each year from licence fees in respect of private receiving licences and private station broadcasting licences without deducting therefrom any costs of collection or administration; with a consequent charge to the government for such costs of collection and administration.

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.

Mr. REID: On division.

Mr. CHURCH: It is one of the most mischievous corporations in Canada.

JAPANESE PEACE SETTLEMENT

CANADIAN DELEGATION TO COMMONWEALTH CONFERENCE AT CANBERRA

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief announcement with respect to the conference of commonwealth nations to be held at Canberra on August 26 next.

At the invitation of the Australian government a meeting of representatives of the governments of the British commonwealth is being held in Canberra commencing on August 26 to exchange views in an exploratory and noncommittal way on the forthcoming Japanese peace settlement. The Canadian government will be represented by Hon. Brooke Claxton, Minister of National Defence, assisted by Mr. K. A. Greene, high commissioner for Canada in Australia, Mr. E. H. Norman, head of the Canadian liaison mission in Japan, Mr. R. E. Collins, alternate Canadian member on the Far Eastern commission, Washington. The governments of Australia, United Kingdom, New Zealand and South Africa will, I understand, also be represented by cabinet ministers.

No decisions will be taken at this Canberra meeting which will affect the freedom of action of the Canadian government at the Japanese peace conference which is to be held, but it is thought that this preliminary exchange of views will be helpful to all the governments concerned.

COAL

INQUIRY AS TO SUBSIDIES TO DOMINION COAL COMPANY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. J. BROOKS (Royal): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply, based upon a statement made by President Arthur Cross of the Dominion Coal Company to a meeting of the shareholders of that company in Montreal. He is reported as having said:

Federal subsidies now being negotiated will be based on a fixed amount per ton, which will be gradually reduced as production per man increases.

Is the government negotiating the payment of subsidies to the Dominion Coal Company? If so, will other producers of coal in the maritime provinces receive the same consideration?

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction and Supply): Hon. members will recall that the royal commission on coal recommended an interim subsidy for the mines of Cape Breton island to permit remodelling of the operation in that area so it may become self-sustaining. The government at present is studying the operation of the mines on Cape Breton island, and is considering subsidy provisions which will extend not beyond the end of the calendar year and will be very modest in amount, but which it is hoped will bridge over the transition period.

The report of the royal commission made no reference to the mines in other areas in Canada. Therefore no consideration is being given to subsidies to other mines.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN

IMMIGRATION—DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources or the Secretary of State? On June 16 two orders for return standing in my name were approved by the house. The return to one was tabled today. When may I expect a return to the second?

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction and Supply): I shall be glad to look into it immediately and endeavour to bring it down this week.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS

ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCE TO GOVERNMENT AND OPPOSITION LEADERS IN SENATE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of Bill No. 443, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

He said: The purpose of this bill is to provide an allowance of $7,000 to the leader of the government in the Senate, and an allowance of $4,000 to the leader of the opposition in the Senate, in addition to the regular allowance made as sessional indemnity. May I say at once, as was mentioned yesterday by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), that this measure should be considered apart altogether from the personalities involved at the moment as leaders of the government and of the opposition in the Senate respectively. All hon. members will appreciate what was said yesterday by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to the effect that both leaders in the Senate are held in the highest regard and esteem by members not only of their own house but of this house as well.

The question to be considered at the moment is the particular question of whether a certain allowance should be made for the leader of the government in the other house and also for the leader of the opposition in the other house. So far as the principle of the measure is concerned, it has already met with acceptance in this house. I refer to the principle of giving to the leader of the opposition an additional allowance by statute for his service as leader of the opposition. The leader of the government, of course, receives a larger remuneration than ministers of the crown generally. That may be taken in part as a recognition of the duties which he has to perform as leader of the house as well as Prime Minister.

May I say a word first of the duties of the leader of the government in the other house. In most of the parliaments of the British commonwealth, the leader of the second chamber or upper chamber, whatever it may be called, is usually a member of the government who receives the salary of a minister of the crown. For example, in the United Kingdom, Lord Addison is a member of the House of Lords. He is also the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, and he receives the salary which goes with that important government position. In Australia, New Zealand and in South Africa I think the arrangement is often similar, that the leader of the upper house is a minister holding a portfolio in the government and receiving the larger salary which goes with the portfolio he holds. So far as the leaders of the opposition are concerned in other parliaments of the commonwealth, I think Australia is the only country which has made provision for the leader of the opposition in the upper house. I understand that a bill has just gone through making provision for the leader of the opposition in the upper house.

May I point out that both the positions are of great responsibility. They are on the side of the house to which they relate, the most responsible positions in the two houses, because the leaders have to do with carrying on the business of the house and their office efficiently and effectively. The purpose of this measure is solely that of enabling them to perform this public function and duty more effectively and efficiently than might otherwise be possible.

The present leader of the government in the Senate is a member of the government without portfolio. He has to give to his duties an amount of his time much greater than that of any other senator.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend says "hear, hear." I think everyone will agree with that. He has to give a greater amount of time to the business of the country than any other member of the Senate would be expected to give. In order to perform that duty efficiently the leader of the government in the Senate has to be familiar with the government's policy and programme in all particulars. To be familiar with the government's policy and programme he has to attend meetings of cabinet very regularly. He has to attend those meetings not only during the time when the Senate is in session but between sessions as well. If hon. members opposite ever come to have the experience of preparing a parliamentary programme they will realize that it involves a good deal of time and thought on the part of ministers, whether with or without portfolio, for some little time before parliament meets. That is but one of the official duties. I need not say to hon. members today how much more complicated the business of legislation is at this time than it has ever been heretofore. The best evidence of that is the length of the parliamentary sessions themselves. If parliaments held sessions of two, three, or

four months it might be expected that leaders might be found to take on these extra obligations without expecting to be in any way recompensed financially for that obligation; however when a parliamentary sessions lasts, as ours apparently are going to continue to last, and as they have been in the last few years, for half a year or more, it is imposing a very heavy obligation on any individual, both financially and otherwise, to expect him to be able to familiarize himself with the legislation that comes before the two houses in the course of a particular session, and to explain policy as well as particulars of legislation. The character of the legislation, as I have indicated, is much more intricate and comprehensive in every way than has been the case with legislation in the past.

This house is familiar with the amount of time that has been given this session to international questions. The Senate is perhaps in many ways in a better position to devote a great deal of its time to international problems than is this house. Every encouragement should be given to the members of the upper house to give a great deal of time and attention to all-important world problems. The leader of the government and the leader of the opposition in the Senate have to familiarize themselves with these problems. If they are to do that they will have to give a great deal of extra time to that particular work. There are also the individual measures that come from this house. The leader of the government has to make arrangements with members of his following, no matter in which house it is, to take charge of particular measures as they come up. To do that he himself has to be more or less familiar with the measures that are being brought forward. As I say, all of these things make the office of leader of the government in the other house a much more responsible one today than it has been at any previous time.

Here I think I might as well answer the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre at once about the strengthening of the Senate. He said yesterday he was surprised that a Liberal government, which has aimed at reforming the Senate, should bring in a measure of this kind. May I say I think what we are seeking to accomplish is a very necessary reform. We have been hearing a great deal—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friends of the C.C.F. group laugh; but may I tell them if that is their attitude it will be a very long time before they will have anything to do either with the government in the House of Commons or with the business in the Senate. If they took the business of the government as a whole more seriously they would begin to realize the force of what I am saying at the moment.

Mr. MacINNIS: The argument is getting pretty weak.

Mr. KNOWLES: And the Prime Minister knows it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The responsibility of the leader in the Senate is very great. As I was about to say when I was interrupted, hon. members are talking about not enough business being done in the Senate, about not enough bills coming from the Senate to this house. I say that that is largely the result of the fact that no leader, under the financial obligations which he must incur at this time, can, unless he is going to be compensated in some way for the extra time he will have to give to these questions, manage effectively the business of the Senate so as to ensure measures being introduced there in the first place, debated there and brought over to this house. The provision this bill seeks to make will help both the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition to give more of their time to the introduction of legislation in the other house and to careful discussion of it before it comes over to this house.

My hon. friend said that he was surprised that a Liberal government should introduce this measure, because we stood for democracy as well as for reform of the Senate. He argued that this was not a democratic measure. May I draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that we have pretty well reached the point so far as the Senate is concerned, and indeed so far as this house is concerned as well, where, unless the leaders are wealthy men, they are not going to be able to carry on the business of leadership. A measure of this kind will make it possible for any man, whether he be a man of means or one who is not too well off, if he is a leader to devote his time to the extent that it should be devoted to public business in the other house.

I attach a great deal of importance to that because I think one of the great reforms that has been made through the years has been that of recognizing that even members of parliament, who may not have any special obligations, have a right to expect a certain indemnity. But you cannot expect a person receiving only the ordinary indemnity, especially with taxation as it has come to be, to give as much time as he would like to be able to give, if he wishes to do his work effectively, in the position of leadership, with all that that involves at this time. So I

say to my hon. friend that this is a reform in that it will enable the Senate to function more effectively than it has up to the present, if on that score there is any exception to be taken. It will enable the leaders to organize the business of the upper house in a more effective way, and to that extent it will be assisting public business generally.

My hon. friend went on to say that the Senate was a useless institution. I think that was the phrase he used, or something to that effect. May I say that we are not debating the question at the moment whether the second house should be abolished, but I should be very surprised indeed if the people of Canada generally would not perhaps feel a greater need than ever for a second house if the C.C.F. ever got into power. I can assure them that they need have no anxiety over the attitude of the public toward this measure. If my hon. friends were in power the public would need no end of safeguards—

Mr. MacINNIS: Big business.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:—in the conducting of public business. It is not big business. May I say to my hon. friend who interrupts and to his acting leader: Do they think that they are the only righteous men in this country?

Mr. MacINNIS: To hear the Prime Minister speak one would think that he thinks he is the only one.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am getting tired of having hon. members of their group talk as though they were the only honest men in this country, as though they were the only men with ideas in this country, as though hon. members in other parts of the house had not as high ideals and purposes as any other group. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said, I think, that we were strengthening vested interests in helping to strengthen the position of the Senate. I would remind the hon. member that most of the members of the Senate came from the House of Commons. How did these hon. gentlemen get into the House of Commons other than by the support of the majority of the electors in their constituencies and with the confidence of the people of the constituency which they represented, and who knew them best.

Mr. KNOWLES: Many of them were beaten, and that is why they were sent over there.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not as many as the C.C.F.; there were 200 defeated in the last election.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The point I wish to make is this: so far as the other house is concerned, if one takes its complexion it is impossible to say that it is representative of the vested interests or the big interests, or is made up of wealthy men. When one has regard for the positions which those hon. members held in public life, whether they were appointed by this government or by previous governments, he will realize that in most cases the appointments to the Senate were made from members of this House of Commons, from those who had had great experience or extra experience as ministers of the crown, or long experience in conducting the affairs of government. They were appointed because the government of the day knew that they represented the will and the wishes of the people or they would never have got into this House of Commons. I say to my hon friend that he had better not seek to reflect either upon the characteristics or the callings of hon. members of the other house of this parliament.

I have spoken of the necessity of giving the leader of the government in the other house a salary. I have said very little about the position of the leader of the opposition. I would draw the attention of the house to the fact that at one time no salary was paid to the leader of the opposition in this house. Twenty years and more ago special provision was made for the position of the leader of the opposition in this house. Why was that done? It was done as a means of furthering the public interest by assigning to one leader the special obligation of watching the progress of legislation as it went through this house and continually guarding the public interest from the point of view of the opposition as well as of the government.

So far as the positions of leader of the opposition in the Senate and in this House of Commons are concerned, the difference is in degree not in kind. The leader of the opposition in the Senate has to give a great deal of extra time to studying the measures that come before that house, in making arrangements with the leader of the government in regard to the conduct of business from day to day, in associating himself with the work of committees, in meeting delegations and deputations. He has to meet the extra expense to which all leaders in public life are put. Unless we are going to have only wealthy men filling positions of high responsibility some additional remuneration will have to be given to the gentlemen who are in these responsible positions or else they will not be able to give as much of their time to them as otherwise would be the case.

I submit to the house that the time has come when, in the public interest and for the

more effective discharge of public business, some additional allowance should be made to both the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition in the other house. I repeat, the reasons are much the same as have governed in this house. The change in the times necessitates this as their duties grow greater and greater from day to day and from year to year. Some special provision, I submit, is imperative if we are to have public business done as the country expects it to be done in both houses of parliament.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, Bill No. 443, is a bill to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has said, in this bill the government proposes giving an additional allowance to the leader of the government and to the leader of the opposition in another place. In this discussion I am wondering whether one has to use that outmoded term or not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Mr. BRACKEN: I think it is time we got back to straight talk and spoke of this institution respectfully as what it is, the Senate of Canada.

The bringing forward of this bill indicates that the government feels that the position of both leaders in the Senate carries with it greater responsibilities, and on this ground they base the present proposal of giving them an additional allowance. As to greater responsibilities, I am sure there can be no question about that. The question that does arise is one of curiosity: Why, if greater responsibilities justify an increase to the men who now hold these positions, has an additional allowance not been given prior to this time? This government has been in office for twenty years or so, but has never before made any move in this direction. We have had confederation for eighty years, and no move has been made in this direction. The Prime Minister has indicated that at the moment greater responsibilities devolve upon us all. That is true. Yet the fact remains that in all these past years the men who occupy these positions in the Senate did carry greater responsibilities than their associates who were private members in that house.

In view of the statement which the Prime Minister has made and the statement made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) the other day I think perhaps I should take a moment to explain our position with reference to this measure. It can be briefly stated.

If the leaders in the other house have added responsibilities I think there is every justification for giving consideration to a larger allowance for them. How much that should be may be a matter of judgment. The government in its wisdom has indicated that the leader of the government in the Senate should get an additional allowance of $7,000 and the leader of the opposition an additional allowance of $4,000, making a total allowance to the leader of the government there of $13,000 and a total for the leader of the opposition of $10,000. I think on the basis of added responsibilities there is something to be said for making these greater allowances. If the Senate is an essential part of our government institutions we cannot just pass off a measure like this without giving it some reasonable consideration. On the other hand if that institution does require some reform and has not had it, and there is no proposal here that measures shall be taken to bring about reforms in the Senate that would be in the public welfare, there is some excuse for saying, as a measure of protest, that we do not want to take a position of supporting this institution in its present form by this action. I say there may be some justification for that.

As to greater responsibilities there can be no question. As to the essential place which this institution occupies in our government there can be no question. The only question is whether steps should not be taken for its reform.

Our position is briefly this: We believe in a second chamber. We do not believe in the abolition of the Senate. We do believe in its reform. We believe in maintaining that institution for several reasons, as a check against hasty and ill-considered legislation, as a protection for minorities, as a protection for the provinces in a federal system, and there may be other reasons. As I said, we are opposed to the abolition of the Senate. But we do think it should be reformed. I make no comment now on the various suggestions which have been made as to how it should be reformed. Some have said that its members should be elected by the people and not be appointed by a party government.

Mr. HARTT: Then I would have a better chance.

Mr. BRACKEN: The hon. member's chance will be good if he gets defeated in the next election.

Mr. MACKENZIE: There is no chance of that.

Mr. BRACKEN: One suggestion that has been made is that the members of the Senate

should be elected by the people rather than appointed by a party government. Another suggestion is that their term of office should be fixed, some have said at ten years, others for different terms, rather than that it should be a life appointment. Some have said that the provincial governments should be allowed in some way or other to choose some of the members of the Senate, and some have suggested that they should choose half of its membership. Some have said that the present incumbents in the Senate should not be disturbed. I am in some sympathy with each one of these proposals, but I make no comment on them now.

My suggestion is this, that there should be called together a joint committee, a representative body composed of representatives of this house and from the other place and representatives from the provinces, to consider the situation as it now exists in our parliamentary system and see what can be done to strengthen the Senate, having in mind nothing else but the welfare of the Canadian people. That is my proposal. That is our position, and in that position I have the support of some outstanding men in Canada. I want to read what one of them had to say at a time when he was a crusader for Senate reform and other kinds of reform. I am glad to know that at one time he supported the policy we now stand for. I am quoting from a paper which at that time was a strong supporter of the present government, known then as the *Globe*. This is from its issue of Monday, September 7, 1925, when the party opposite had a crusading spirit and progressive policies and when some of its members supported what I now advocate, and I hope when I sit down they will all support my proposal. This is what that great Liberal newspaper had to say, referring to the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King):

No declaration by the Prime Minister throughout the whole of his address was more enthusiastically received by the North York electors than that in which he declared for Senate reform. Loud "hear, hear" and applause which lasted nearly two minutes greeted his declaration: "We believe one of the great necessities of the time is Senate reform."

We have had this morning one evidence of his notion of senate reform. I do not know what others there have been in the intervening 21 or 22 years, but we have had one evidence this morning. The report goes on:

But the difficulty in consummating Senate reform, Premier King proceeded, lay in the fact that the Senate itself had to approve of any parliamentary measure to reform it, and its members could not be removed by any action of the people or the commons.

"Who appoints them?" demanded a member of the audience. "I am coming to that", replied the premier.

"Throw them out", demanded several others in chorus.

Then the report continues:

Proposed interprovincial conferences to discuss Senate reform, went on Mr. King, constitute at best an attempt to reform the Senate from without, whereas reform from within was the only effective way in which it could be brought about. He proposed reforming it from within by appointing hereafter only men pledged to carry out the policies of the Liberal government.

Now in so far as that particular reform is concerned, the Prime Minister has carried it out.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRACKEN: When he started there was a majority against him, I believe he said, of 23 or 24 or 25. Now he has 66 on his side and there are only 22 on the other side, so that he has been faithful in carrying out his policy in that respect. This report goes on to quote the Prime Minister. These words are a quotation and evidently they are his:

"We believe the effective way to reform the Senate is to take advantage of the opportunities as they arise," declared Mr. King,—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just what we have done.

Mr. BRACKEN:

"and to see that no one is appointed to the Senate who will not undertake to support the policy of the Liberal administration—"

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRACKEN: You applauded a little too soon that time. You did not give me a chance to finish the sentence:

"and to see that no one is appointed to the Senate who will not undertake to support the policy of the Liberal administration with respect to reform of the Senate."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRACKEN: This is a very enlightening document and one that supports the position I am taking. That is why I am reading it. To continue:

Responsible government had been threatened, he agreed, by the action of the senators in throwing out government legislation, and he was the last man who needed to be prodded into activity in the defence of responsible government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRACKEN:

Supposing last year he had dissolved parliament upon the Senate issue, he was not so sure, he said, that that issue would have been accepted throughout Canada as a major one. To-day the issue was more apparent.

Then the report goes on:

"In addition to that," he said, "the government of to-day—

Speaking of his own.

—is in the position to come before the people and give a guarantee of how it will be able to effect that Senate reform. When we came into office there were twenty-six of a majority in the Senate.

That is, I presume, twenty-six against him.

It was twenty-three, I think, the day before yesterday. Today the number has been reduced by ten, or will be within the next few days. The government has waited for the filling of the different vacancies until it could take the right moment to act. We have appointed to the Senate gentlemen to fill vacancies in eight out of ten vacancies—the other two will be appointed shortly, and every one of these men gets his appointment on the understanding that he stands for the policy of the Liberal government with respect to Senate reform,—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is democracy.

Mr. BRACKEN:

—and will fight for that policy in the Senate itself".

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

An hon. MEMBER: Très bien.

Mr. BRACKEN: I presume all the senators who have been appointed since that time have signed on the dotted line this requirement by the Prime Minister so that he can now have any kind of Senate reform that is desirable. I think that is a good position to have them in, but I would like to be assured by the Prime Minister that he has that assurance from them all, and I would like to have that verified by them all.

Now what is the situation, Mr. Speaker? Here is a body which is necessary to our form of government. It is filled by appointments from the parties that are in power. One party is in power a long time and gets many of its supporters there. At the present time there are 66 supporting the government and 22 against them, appointed on the regional basis. I believe there are 24 from the maritimes, 24 from each of the central provinces and 24 from the west. But it has resulted in a one-sided representation over there; it has resulted in failure to get anything like occupational representation.

I am the last to suggest that that should be the basis of representation in any parliamentary body, but at least there should be some approach to better occupational representation than there is today, because in that body, out of 96 members there are only 13 who can be classed as farmers and only one who can be called a labour man.

Our position, briefly, is this. Some justification can be made for paying men for additional work they do. We can approach this thing from the point of view of prejudice and say, "Well, there is popular prejudice against this institution and we will not do anything to help it". I do not think that is a constructive approach. We can approach it from another point of view also, and say, "We have done little for old age, the aged people in this country, giving them an increase of only $60 a year, and here we are going to give seven thousand to one man and so much to another.

I suggest that is not the statesmanlike approach to the matter. We are prepared to support the government in this measure provided they will give us some assurance that some steps along these lines will be taken to try to lay the foundation for reforming this institution so as to make it more useful for the people of Canada. If the government can give us that assurance we will support them in this measure even though at the moment it may not be the popular thing to do. If they cannot give us that assurance they must proceed with their measure without our support.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in just a sentence I should like to repeat the remark I made yesterday, that we approach this matter on its merits with regard to the principle at stake and not with reference to any personalities at all. I am grateful to the Prime Minister for echoing the sentiments I expressed yesterday with regard to the two men who would be immediately affected. I would like to go one step further and say that not only have I a high regard for the two men immediately affected, but I have had the privilege of meeting and getting to know a number of other senators, and I regard them as men who have rendered a distinguished public service, men to be held in high esteem. We are all agreed on that phase of the matter and on the fact that we are discussing this as a matter of principle.

I also wish to point out that the amount of money involved in this bill is, in terms of federal budgets, infinitesimal. The total amount of money to be added to the cost of government by this bill is only $11,000 a year. When one takes time to debate such a measure it is because a principle is at stake. I want to say that I agree with those who have said that work should be paid for. But I am not yet convinced that Their Honours in the other place are underpaid for the amount of

work which is given them to do. As for the suggestion of the Prime Minister that they should be given more work and that we start paying their leaders first in order to encourage them to take on more work, I submit that is contrary to the democratic approach and contrary to the whole aim at Senate reform which was in the crusading heart of the Prime Minister over twenty years ago. I know that during recent years from some quarters of this house there have been requests for more work to originate in the Senate, but they have not come from this group. We feel, as the Prime Minister felt twenty years ago, that the elected representatives of the people should have supremacy in matters of legislation. The Prime Minister's whole case for paying this extra money rests upon the assumption that the place of the Senate in our parliament set-up is a justifiable one.

I am not going into the arguments for abolition of the Senate at this time, because we who favour that course are in a minority in this house. But I feel, as the leader of the opposition did, that we have a right and duty to appeal to hon. members opposite to measure up, as the Prime Minister put it, to their own high ideals and purposes. I do not deny for one minute that hon. members opposite are just as high in their ideals and purposes as we in this group claim to be; and I am tired of these references to righteousness on the part of members in any quarter in this house. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as one reads the pages of *Hansard* in years gone by, and as one reads party platforms, he finds in Liberal literature the highest of idealism and purposes down across the years. But what bothers us is that they can hold those ideals for years and years and never do anything about them.

I observe, Mr. Speaker, that you have picked up the bill, no doubt as a suggestion that I should speak about it; and that is, in fact, what I propose to do. The bill before us is No. 443, an act to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act, to provide what the Prime Minister implies today is reform of the Senate. The Prime Minister used that very expression; he said he thought this was a reform which was long overdue. I cannot see that it is in any sense an expression of the kind of reform of the Senate for which the Liberal party has stood down across the years. I want to say something about the position of the Liberal party, as did the leader of the opposition. But before I do so, there are two other remarks of the Prime Minister to which I wish to make a brief answer.

First of all, I wish to point out to the Prime Minister that in my remarks yesterday I did not refer to individuals in the Senate as representing vested interests. What I said was that we were creating a vested interest in the Senate itself, by strengthening it in this way. The other point I wish to make in reply to what the Prime Minister said is to the effect that I think he let the cat out of the bag when he said that when the C.C.F. comes to power it might, in his opinion, be good for Canada still to have the Senate there. The implication there was that, after the people of Canada have decided in a democratic way that they want the C.C.F. in power, a Senate appointed by the Liberals, appointed largely by the Prime Minister himself, should, he thinks, still be there to block legislation which the people of this country had declared they wanted by putting this party in power. That is a far cry from the position the Prime Minister took in this House of Commons on July 19, 1924, which was a position similar to the one he took on a number of occasions during those early twenties when the majority in the Senate was against him. In that period of time, with his crusading spirit, he rose in this house time and time again and declared that this House of Commons should be supreme, that this House of Commons should have the right to enact the legislation which it was elected by the people of Canada to put on the statute books.

On July 19, 1924, the Senate had, by a certain device, rejected proposed amendments made by the House of Commons to the Pension Act, the act having to do with military pensions. The House of Commons was put in a jam; they had to accept the deletions made in the other place in order not to lose some of the benefits that were in the amendments to the Pension Act which had been passed by this house. After the house had faced the fact that it was in a jam and had to agree to it, the Prime Minister had this to say, as reported in *Hansard* of July 19, 1924, at page 4872:

> Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, having in mind the action of the second chamber with respect to the measure which has just been amended and also the fate of a number of bills adopted by the Commons and defeated in the Senate, I think hon. members will agree with me that the time has come when the Commons in Canada should seek to gain rights and privileges with respect to legislation originating in this chamber similar to those which have obtained by the House of Commons in the parliament at Westminster. I may say that the government had under consideration, prior to the opening of this session, legislation with this end in view, but we were anxious the public should feel fully convinced of the necessity before pressing it on the attention of parliament.

Later in that same statement—and remember that this is back in 1924, twenty-three years ago—he said:

I desire to assure the house that when parliament reassembles steps will be taken by the government to obtain, if possible, means whereby bills may be enacted by and with the advice and consent of the House of Commons under conditions similar in principle to those which have been sanctioned for the parliament of the United Kingdom.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if the principle that the Commons should be supreme was sound back in 1924, the Prime Minister should not alter that principle when he envisages the possibility of the C.C.F. being in power.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I never envisaged it. I was careful to say "if", not "when", they came in.

Mr. KNOWLES: Even on the Prime Minister's terms, he said that if that should happen it might be good for Canada to have the Senate there which he had appointed, to block—

Mr. MacINNIS: The will of the people.

Mr. KNOWLES: —the will of the people as expressed through a C.C.F. government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend is going too far when he says that I should like to see a Senate which will block what hon. gentlemen opposite might do should they ever come into power. I have never given an intimation of anything of the kind. I would hope that whatever party is in power in this house would get good support from the Senate so long as their measures did not involve going to such lengths in some as might seem to unsettle the Senate altogether.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, I will let the record speak for itself. I am not surprised the Prime Minister wanting to put what he said aright a bit, because it was pretty clear to us that he had let the cat out of the bag in the statement he made when he spoke a little earlier.

The Prime Minister objected to my remark of yesterday that this would have the effect of strengthening the Senate. I want to point out that this is exactly what it does; it crystallizes the Senate in its present form. I found it a bit difficult to follow the position taken by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), but I think I got it before he finished. I take it that he is not prepared to agree to this measure unless he gets an assurance from the Prime Minister that the Senate will be reformed somewhat along the lines he suggested. In view of the fact that these promises to reform the Senate have been made by the Prime Minister for twenty-three years, I would advise the leader of the opposition to demand that some of these reforms be made before he agrees to these increases. The assurance that it will be done puts it on a pretty long-range basis, from our experience with the Prime Minister. I think it is going about it the wrong way to say yes, we will agree to this now, but we do so on the understanding that next year or the year after you will bring in some Senate reforms. I think the leader of the opposition would be better advised to say to the Prime Minister—and I am talking on their terms, not ours—"We will oppose this measure until you bring it in as part of an over-all reform of the Senate."

Mr. BRACKEN: O ye of little faith!

Mr. KNOWLES: The leader of the opposition had faith in the Prime Minister for a good many years, until finally he decided he had better break his connections and get into another party. The hon. gentleman referred to pledges extracted by the Prime Minister from gentlemen he appointed to the Senate back in the twenties, to support Senate reform. I should like to add to the quotations given by the leader of the opposition. He quoted from a daily newspaper; I wish to quote from *Hansard* for July 12, 1926, at page 105. At that time Mr. C. W. Bell, then member for West Hamilton, quoted, without its being challenged, a statement made by the Prime Minister in London, Ontario, on October 16, 1925, while speaking in the rink in that city. This is the quotation:

Only a few days ago a number of senators were appointed. Every one has given me his pledged word he will be prepared, once a measure passes the Commons, to give it his support. Subsequent senators will be appointed with that understanding, and as Providence takes away a few of the older senators you will have a Senate pledged to bring about the reforms for which the administration stands.

Well, Providence has done its part; many of the older members have been taken away during the years that have intervened, and I wonder now if this is the kind of reform those members were pledged to support. Then on February 26, 1927, as recorded in volume 1 of *Hansard* for that year at page 355, the matter was made still more one of record by questions which were placed upon the order paper and answered by the Prime Minister. Let me read the questions:

Mr. Evans:

1. What is the form or wording of the pledge, if any, taken from those who have been appointed senators during the last two years with a view to Senate reform?

2. How many have been thus pledged?
Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King—

There can be no doubt about the authenticity of this. It is not a quotation from a newspaper; it is the Prime Minister's answer to questions placed upon *Hansard*:

Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King:

1. An assurance of support of such measure of Senate reform, in conformity with the requirements of the constitution, as may be introduced by the Liberal administration.
2. This assurance has been given by all who have accepted appointment to the Senate within the time mentioned.

I will not bother to reecho the comments which appear in *Hansard* of those days about the dictatorial methods involved, for as a matter of fact, holding the view I do of the Senate, I think in his crusading spirit the Prime Minister was doing a good job in those days to get these pledges and to tell the country that on the basis of those pledges the Senate would be reformed from within. But we have waited a long time; and, as the leader of the opposition says, he cannot recall any other reforms in recent years until now we get this one, to increase the salaries paid two members of the Senate.

Another interesting quotation, which is particularly appropriate in the dying days of a session, appears in *Hansard* for June 4, 1926, volume 4 of that year, at page 4030:

Senate Reform

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. Arthur Meighen (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Prime Minister if there is to be any action taken this session with respect to Senate reform? If not, when is the next move to be made in this direction and of what character?

This question reminds me very much of the suggestion made by the leader of the opposition today.

Mr. Jacobs: At the next sitting of the house.

Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (Prime Minister): I might say to my right hon. friend that the government would not like to prolong the session unduly by introducing the subject of Senate reform at this stage. My right hon. friend may be sure it will come up in due course.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may use the word, that is a honey. In 1926 it was thought by the Prime Minister unwise to prolong the session in its dying days by introducing a measure of Senate reform. In those days his idea of Senate reform was to clip the wings of the Senate. But now in 1947, when we are at the close of the session, it is perfectly all right to prolong the session by introducing this sort of measure of Senate reform, which instead of clipping their wings gives them a few more feathers. The leader of the opposition and I have been quoting an outstanding authority in the person of the Prime Minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am glad to note the retroactive support of hon. members opposite for the views the Prime Minister held over twenty years ago, and my appeal to them is to stand by those convictions even though the Prime Minister seems to have moved away from them. But we should not take all our cues from the Prime Minister in this matter; for there might be some other authorities. I am going to refer to one other. This quotation is from volume 1 of *Hansard* for 1935, at page 102. The speaker was Mr. Humphrey Mitchell, who was then a private member sitting over on this side. He said:

I believe it was the leader of the opposition who raised the discussion concerning the Senate. I am making reference to all these points because I believe one would do better to put his finger on the spot where the sand may be put into the machinery.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES: I take it that hon. gentlemen have no doubt this is a quotation from the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell).

The right hon. gentleman has said that we have a Tory Senate. If I gather anything from the temper of the Canadian people, and if it is the policy of the Senate to put sand into the machinery, then we will have to reform the Senate.

Then come these words, with particular meaning in view of the portfolio the minister now holds, and one of the branches of his department:

The time has long since passed when the Senate should be used as unemployment insurance for many of those in political life.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because of this long build-up with regard to the attitude of the Liberal party toward the Senate I quite sincerely suggest to the Prime Minister that he consider withdrawing this measure or at least letting it die on the order paper. We are near the end of the session; it is quite easy to do that. All he has to do is to have some hon. member move the adjournment of the debate and let it die when the session ends. I am sure if he does that he will have the support of many hon. members on his own side.

I do not profess to know too much about the attitude of supporters of the Liberal party in eastern Canada, but I know that Liberals in western Canada do not take kindly toward the unrepresentative, undemocratic character of the Senate, and they will find it very hard

to understand their Liberal representatives in parliament supporting a measure of this kind. If the Prime Minister will not withdraw it I suggest that he do the democratic thing and permit the house to take a free vote on this measure.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. KNOWLES: I hope it will be noted that the "hear, hears" come from the other side, which indicates that Liberal members would like to have that opportunity. I suggest to the Liberal members on this one occasion that to think they are willing to be misled by any suggestion that a defeat of this measure would bring on an election would be a ridiculous rumour to spread. The Prime Minister would never go to the country because of the defeat of this measure.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Don't be too sure.

Mr. KNOWLES: Well, if there were a chance of going to the country on the defeat of this measure, coming on top of such an unproductive session as we have had this year, we of this group would welcome it wholeheartedly.

I ask the private members of the Liberal party opposite to consider the difficulties they will have when they go back to their constituencies and try to explain this measure.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. KNOWLES: Nothing has been done about health; nothing has been done about housing.

Mr. MUTCH: Don't worry about us.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Wait until Monday evening in Halifax.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the principle of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, the motion before the house is that the house give second reading to Bill No. 443. It seems to me that gives me the right to discuss the circumstances in which that bill is introduced. I submit that coming at the end of a session which has failed the people, and which has failed to get many other things, but has provided a special pension for diplomats of $3,000 a year at the age of sixty-five to bring this thing in is adding insult to injury so far as hon. members opposite are concerned.

An hon. MEMBER: Speak for yourself.

Mr. PROBE: And reclassification of the civil service.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. KNOWLES: When the government of this country finds it possible to raise the old age pension by only $5, as the leader of the opposition said, and increase one man's salary from $6,000 to $13,000, I suggest with all respect to the leader of the opposition that it is not showing any feeling of prejudice to oppose that kind of thing. Hon. members come down here to fight for the interests of the people. That applies to hon. members opposite as it does to us. I know that, and I could name a number of them. All of us, government supporters and opposition supporters, find it difficult to go home and explain to our people that all kinds of things which are just and right for the ordinary people of this country cannot be done, because—

Mr. MARTIN: Why does the hon. member not tell the truth?

Mr. KNOWLES: —there is no time. When diplomats come into the service at sixty and need a pension at sixty-five, a special act can be brought in. When leaders of the Senate, in the opinion of the Prime Minister, are overworked, despite his arguments for reform across the years, a special act can be brought in. I submit that it is getting a long way from the concept of democracy that our people have. Our people feel that parliament represents the people and is here to do the things that are in their best interests. We hear a great deal of talk these days about threats to democracy. The threats to democracy are not so much the threats from without as the threats from within, such as the scale of values that the government brings before this parliament with respect to the kind of legislation that we have had this year. Therefore Mr. Speaker, throughout what I have had to say I have tried to argue on the basis of the position of the Liberal party. I go farther than they do and I admit quite openly that I feel the Senate should be abolished, but the Liberal party does not stand for that; it stands for reform and I am asking Liberal members to stand by their own principles.

By the way, the Prime Minister made some reference to the fact that there are extra payments for leaders in the upper houses in some other parts of the commonwealth. May I point out that in Australia the upper house is elected, which puts it on quite a different basis. If my information is correct, there are no salaries as such attached to membership in the House of Lords in the United Kingdom.

Mr. MARTIN: What about the Lord Chancellor? The sum of £5,000 is allowed to him.

Mr. KNOWLES: I stand corrected on that, but so far as the lords generally are concerned there is no salary associated with their job.

Mr. FLEMING: The Lord Chancellor does much more than lead the government in the House of Lords.

Mr. KNOWLES: As a matter of fact members of the cabinet in this parliament and in the legislature of the various provinces get these extra salaries not for their position as cabinet ministers, but because they head and administer a department. I submit that it is discrimination against cabinet ministers over there, who get extra salaries for the job they do the year around administering their departments, to give a similar extra amount to gentlemen who do not head departments.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): What about the leader of the opposition?

Mr. KNOWLES: The leader of the opposition here is a member of an elected institution. That is the underlying principle about this whole matter, which the Prime Minister has overlooked. He has made his argument about the Senate on the assumption that it plays a proper place in our parliamentary set-up. That is not the view he took back in the twenties.

Perhaps I had better bring my remarks to a close and say to hon. members opposite that I do not doubt they find this situation a difficult one. They know where their party has stood down across the years. On the other hand there is a sort of tradition that anything that comes from our side of the house must be opposed by them; but they know that the Prime Minister, despite what he said a few minutes ago, would not go to the country on this issue. I suggest that at least the vote on this matter might be delayed until the Liberal members have conferred with their leader to see if they could not find some way out. I appeal also to the leader of the opposition to realize that if he wants to get the side of the bargain he is interested in he had better hold off his support of this measure.

To sum up, and feeling that this measure should definitely be blocked so far as this session is concerned, I have pleasure in moving, seconded by the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Bowerman):

That the word "now" be left out, and the words "this day six months hence" be added at the end of the question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the house ready for the question?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I want to say just a word on the amendment. My hon. friend who has just moved this amendment has taken exception to the measure coming at this stage of the session. May I draw his attention to the fact that the notice of this bill has been on the order paper for a very considerable time. It was placed there so that hon. members would know the intention of the government with respect to the legislation of the session. It was left until this moment because there were more important measures which the government thought should have precedence.

Mr. KNOWLES: And there still are.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend will allow me, I should like to make my statement. The measures in which the government thought the house as a whole were most interested received precedence. I also tried to arrange matters in such a way as to leave to near the end any measure that was likely to prove controversial. I knew hon. gentlemen opposite were going to take the attitude they have, and I therefore gave precedence as far as I could to other measures in order that we might be sure of their getting through in plenty of time.

It is now about a quarter to one o'clock; I do not want to delay the vote, but I should like to answer one or two points that have been raised by hon. gentlemen opposite.

The leader of the opposition asked why this reform, as it has been called, has been delayed so long. May I say to him that the same argument could be applied to the question why no allowance was given to the leader of the opposition in this house for so long a time. My hon. friend went back to the days of confederation. As I remember, a Conservative government was in power most of the time from the days of confederation up to 1896, and during all that time they made no provision for any salary for the leader of the opposition. It was the leader of the Liberal administration who introduced that reform. I find that Sir Wilfrid Laurier introduced a bill to amend the act respecting the Senate and House of Commons on April 20, 1905, and section 2 of that bill reads:

To the member occupying the recognized position of leader of the opposition in the House of Commons there shall be payable an additional sessional allowance of seven thousand dollars.

That amount has since been increased.

I said a moment ago that I thought that had happened some twenty years or more ago. I do not think one should trust one's memory too much as one becomes older, because I find now that it was in 1905, forty-two years ago, that that measure was introduced by the Liberal administration of the day. As I say, the business of the country

has increased vastly with the years, and the obligations of the leaders have grown in the other house as well as in this. That is why we are asking for this increase in allowances.

Many quotations have been made from previous speeches of mine in regard to reforming the Senate. I must say that I feel highly complimented by the extent to which hon. gentlemen opposite are beginning to take so many of my teachings to heart. It is like the Senate itself; it has taken a long time to reform it, but there has been a tremendous reformation.

My hon. friends have read quotations of mine about democratic legislation having been thrown out whenever it went over to the other house. That was the condition when we came into office. There was very little chance in those days of getting through both houses measures of the type of social legislation we have since put through because it would be turned down in the other house. But what a change has taken place since that time. I promised that we would see that the Senate was reformed so that liberal measures that were being enacted would be put through. May I say that we have carried out that reform much more thoroughly and effectively than I ever believed would be possible at the time I made that statement. If we stay here much longer you may be sure that that reform will go on, and we will make doubly sure that democratic measures and social legislation passed by this house will get through the upper house.

I should like to correct one impression some hon. members appear to have. Apparently it is thought that the leader of the government in the Senate, as a cabinet minister without portfolio, receives a salary. May I say that he gets nothing at all as a minister without portfolio either in the way of salary or allowance. Being a member of the government and having to have a knowledge of government business, its programme, policy and the like, the leader of the government in the Senate is obliged to have a residence in this city practically the whole year round, and he is put to that additional expense.

These are things which I think it is only right should be known to hon. members. The provision being made by this bill is something that will govern through the years to come. Before I conclude, may I say this to my friends of the C.C.F. who suggest that Liberals in the Senate might be inclined to throw out some of their legislation should they come to power. If I am correctly informed, the president of the C.C.F. party in British Columbia made this statement:

> The first duty of this party when it comes to power is the bold and ruthless removal from private hands of the means of production.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

If there is anything like that, I can tell my hon. friends that it certainly will be thrown out by the Senate. If their idea is that they are going to bring measures before the house which will mean that no business can be carried on under private enterprise, I shall be very much mistaken if they might get it through either this or the other house at any time.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I shall detain the house for only a moment, to make clear the position of this group with respect to Bill No. 443. We have tried to consider it apart from the persons who occupy the two positions mentioned in the bill. I have a high regard for both those gentlemen, whom I know; and I have tried to keep, personalities completely out of my consideration of the matter.

We look upon the bill as one more evidence of the tendency of the government which has been demonstrated so many times during this session, that is, to raise the incomes and grant security to certain selected classes of people while neglecting to consider measures to increase adequately the incomes of substantial groups who are much more in need. When the government presents tangible evidence of a determination to make possible for the masses of the Canadian people a fair level of income and social security, then I will not hesitate to support the Prime Minister in his proposal to provide allowances for the leaders in the senate.

I suggest that when the government have given tangible evidence of a determination to make it possible for the masses of Canadians to have a fair level of income and social security, then the bill to provide allowances for the leaders of the senate ought to be brought in along with a general reform measure for the Senate. I believe that this house would have received this bill with much more grace and would have given it more favourable consideration had it been attached to a general reform measure. Under the circumstances our group will not support the Prime Minister's bill.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I think the few remarks I have to make can be completed before one o'clock. I would not have risen except for the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that the members of this group were not taking their duties in the house seriously. What is hurting the right hon. gentleman is not that we are not taking our duties seriously but that we are taking them too seriously. He knows that very well.

I have been here quite a long time now, and I have noticed that the Prime Minister is

becoming more and more impatient with opposition to his proposals. That is usually the result of a long period in power. So far as this group is concerned his impatience is not going to do him any good, because we are going to deal with questions as they arise regardless of what anyone may think.

What the Prime Minister thinks of the Senate should not be measured by what he said today, but by his action in 1945 when he brought in the first resolution to increase the indemnities of members of parliament. The members of the Senate were not included; consequently the Prime Minister must have felt that the senators if not overpaid, were at least paid enough without any increased indemnity. But finally they got that increase, and now, a very short time afterwards, a bill is brought down by the government to increase the allowances to the leaders of the two parties in the other place.

I wish to associate myself with other members who have said that in this matter personalities do not count at all. I know the leader of the official opposition in the Senate fairly well. He is a gentleman for whom I have a high regard. I know the government leader in the Senate not so well, but I think he is a great improvement over the senators who were in the Senate in 1926 when they were considering the first old age pension bill in the other place. My position, therefore, has nothing whatever to do with the personalities of the two gentlemen concerned.

I would draw attention again to a quotation made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), from page 105 of volume I of *Hansard,* January 12, 1926. Mr. C. W. Bell, the then member for Hamilton West, was speaking, and he said that the present Prime Minister, speaking in London on October 16, 1925, made this statement:

> Only a few days ago a number of senators were appointed. Every one has given me his pledged word he will be prepared, once a measure passes the Commons—

I want hon. members to note this:

> —once a measure passes the Commons, to give it his support. Subsequent senators will be appointed with that understanding, and as Providence takes away a few of the older members, you will have a Senate pledged to bring about the reforms for which the administration stands.

If that means anything, it means that if every one of these appointed to the Senate gave such a pledge, he gave a pledge that he would act as a rubber stamp for the Prime Minister in the Senate.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No, for the people of the country.

Mr. MacINNIS: My understanding of the duty of a public representative is that he will wait before making a decision until he has satisfied himself as to the facts in the case and then make his decision on the facts. A public representative who acts in any other way is merely a rubber stamp for somebody.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The will of the people.

Mr. MacINNIS: The will of the Prime Minister, not the will of the people. If there were no other argument against this measure and against perpetuating a condition of that kind, this argument in itself is so overwhelming that there is not a member of this house who has any regard for democratic institutions who should not oppose this bill.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to call it one o'clock.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): If you want to waste time you might as well waste it now.

Mr. HANSELL: It is two minutes to one o'clock and I wish to speak longer than two minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HANSELL: Then I will go on until one o'clock and perhaps can deliver my introduction in the two minutes remaining.

I have listened with tremendous interest to this debate today because it has been extremely interesting. I was almost spellbound as I listened to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) give our friends immediately to my right the sort of tongue lashing that it seemed to be at the time. I have rather regarded those two parties as carrying on a bit of a courtship over the last few years, and as the Prime Minister was speaking I thought perhaps the courtship was coming to an end. I have been somewhat accustomed to family squabbles, not in my own home, but by reason of my profession I have sometimes been called in to help out in such situations. I remember being called in once to a home where they had had a squabble; I tried diplomatically to lead things up to where I might be of some help, and the lady of the house said, "Mr. Hansell, you know we do have our spats and sometimes they are pretty bad, but it's great to kiss and make up again." I suggest that when a subsequent measure comes before the house, such as the radio bill, we may find those two parties kissing and making up again.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at two o'clock.

Mr. HANSELL: Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at one o'clock we were discussing Bill 443, an act to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act, and I had only nicely started my introduction. The bill proposes to increase the present allowances to the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition in the Senate. My first reaction is something like this. Of course, I am a social crediter, and my social credit conscience seems never to permit me to vote against giving something to somebody, especially when that person or those people contribute something to the country's welfare.

Even though I have sometimes perhaps expressed myself on increases in judges' salaries and increases in the salaries of those engaged in the diplomatic service, I always feel a little guilty if I oppose them, because it is only increasing the benefits to the individual, and why should I not want to increase the benefits accruing to people? But of course a principle is involved. While I am a social crediter I am not living in a social credit country. I am living in a country controlled by a party that believes in a policy which will not permit of my social credit instincts functioning. Therefore it boils down to this, that living as I am in this country, apparently to vote to give someone an additional financial benefit means in the net result voting to take something away from somebody else. That is the position in which I find myself.

I can quite understand, perhaps, my friends to my immediate right being so enthusiastic about their position in respect to this bill, because, as I understand that socialist philosophy, it is that in order that benefits may accrue to the substratum of society it is necessary to reduce the benefits from those who have more than others. I do not believe that has to be done; it would not if the country were handled properly. In other words, I do not believe that you have to tear the top fellow down in order to build up the fellow who is underneath. That is a wrong philosophy, it is a wrong mental attitude to take, and anyone who looks at a bill like this and says, "Well now, here these people in the other place, who are getting the same as we are getting, $6,000 a year, are to have another addition, which will mean that one will get $13,000 a year and the other less, and perhaps some other additions—well, I cannot stand for that; he is getting too much"; to such a person, I say, that mental attitude is wrong.

[Mr. Hansell.]

To my mind nobody gets too much provided he is not taking it from somebody else. There is my position. I am dealing now with a mental attitude, and I would like the house to think that through some time, particularly when members are suffering from insomnia and want something to think about.

As to what has been said about abolishing the Senate, I must confess that with my present knowledge of the entire parliamentary set-up, plus the history of parliamentary institutions, I personally would not be so bold as to say at the present time that I want the Senate abolished, that they are no good—what is the use of them. You hear that sort of talk, and I am inclined to think that underlying that attitude is another principle, and that is the desire that I must not be checked in what I am going to do. That too is a mental attitude. I do not know whether it would be the best thing for a government to be elected and have an absolutely free hand, without any check whatsoever, to do whatever they thought best on the spur of the moment. I can visualize a danger there. Governments are not always right, and if the Senate of Canada were what I think it should be, they would have an excellent opportunity of checking something that governments might do which in the end would be wrong.

I do not want to bring in my friends to my immediate right, but they were wrong in their attitude towards the war when the war broke out. There is no question that time proved they were wrong, just as wrong as anyone could ever be. Of course that was on a negative proposition; they did not want something done that was about to be done. But suppose they were in office and desired a positive thing that was just as wrong; I do not know why a properly functioning body in the other place would not be a good thing.

I am perhaps thinking out loud now when I mention those particular things. I can visualize, under this party system, a government being elected on a tremendous emotional appeal at a time when people's hearts and minds were tremendously confused and the country was being saddled with an irresponsible government. I am not now referring to my hon. friends opposite. They may or may not be. I do not care about that. I am visualizing a situation which might easily arise, where the country is confused and dissatisfied and a great emotional appeal is made to the people. They are fed up with what they have and they are taking a chance on something new, something of which perhaps they have little knowledge, and an irresponsible government is elected with no check whatever on what they do and the methods they take.

They may be well-meaning; they may have good intentions. They desire to reach a certain objective, but in trying to do so they pass legislation and devise methods of reaching their objective which might very well wreck this whole country. I say it might be as well if we had some little check through the medium of the Senate.

There is another point I should like to make here. There does seem to me to be some justification for increasing the salaries of the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition in the Senate. What I mean is this. I understand that they now receive the same remuneration as all other senators. It seems to me that their responsibilities are heavier and that they should receive something more than the other senators receive. I am not opposed to an increase. Whether the increase should be the amount provided, I am not prepared to say. When the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) spoke he pointed out that the leaders in the other house are under additional expense. Perhaps the government leader in the Senate has to maintain a residence in Ottawa. Those arguments are all right, and I am not opposing them; but the Prime Minister did not refer to another phase which I think is worthy of consideration, namely that under the present system all senators are appointed for life. One cannot compare them with the leader of the opposition in this house, for instance, or the Prime Minister, or any other minister, because their tenure of office may not be long. They do not know how long it will last, while the senators have economic security for the rest of their lives. That should be taken into consideration, I think, when an amount is determined.

There was another thing which struck me, and it was this. All that the Prime Minister said, even though we grant it to be true, has been true for the last thirty, forty or fifty years. I cannot quite understand why at this session the government has suddenly decided to increase the salaries of those two leaders. If they need that increase today, they needed it last year and they needed it twenty years ago. That is a point which I think is worthy of noting.

With respect to that part of the debate which has emphasized Senate reform, I have just a word or two to say. I certainly believe that we need Senate reform. I would go farther; I would say we certainly need parliamentary reform, and the Senate is part of parliament. I once said that I thought senators should be elected. I still think so, because upon their election they would be sent to the Senate to represent the will of the people. At the present time, when they are appointed by the government in office, they naturally feel that they must be loyal to those who appointed them. But they might be loyal to those who appointed them and not loyal to the people. If they are not elected I think that at least the provinces should have something to do with the appointments. Is it not passing strange, for instance, that although there is in Alberta a government which has been known as a Social Credit government, holding a different concept from that which the present Liberal administration holds, a Social Credit government which swept out all its opponents twelve years ago and has been in office ever since, yet the Liberal government here in Ottawa has been appointing Liberal senators from that province from that day twelve years ago up to the present.

Mr. KNOWLES: There has not been a Liberal government there for twenty-five years.

Mr. HANSELL: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre reminds me that there has not been a Liberal government in Alberta for twenty-five years.

Mr. MACKENZIE: There will be next time.

An hon. MEMBER: What a hope!

Mr. HANSELL: It is nice to dream about these things we should like to see happen. But let the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) come out there and do all he is able to do; I am afraid he will not have much effect. I have great regard for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner). Speaking of eloquence, he can really move the people. But a few days before the last election he was in my home town. After he had spoken—and the theatre in which he spoke was crowded to the doors—I went around the next day feeling I was surely defeated. But when the people went to the polls I received more votes from that section than from any other. So if the government wants to send the ministers out there again, it is all right with me.

I believe that Senate reform is essential. There is one thing I think we look to the Senate to do, and that is to protect the rights of the provinces. Yet it is possible for a province to have a government which is unalterably opposed to this government and still have no senators representing the views of that provincial government. I do not think that is right. I believe some body should be set up—first I thought of a joint parliamentary committee of both houses, and then in terms of a royal commission, but somehow or other

I do not rush too quickly into suggesting it should be a royal commission—for the purpose of going into parliamentary reform, with the specific view of bringing about such reforms as will ensure that at all times the will of the people is reflected. That is not what happens today; positively it is not. The other day we had a bill dealing with old age pensions. Would anyone say that the means test reflects the will of the people of Canada? It does not. So I say there is need for Senate reform.

In conclusion let me say that I do not like to oppose a reasonable bill. I am not saying I oppose an increase for these two public servants who sit in the Senate. However, I think my position will have to be that of the leader of this group; that what we want is a bill embracing the over-all picture of parliamentary reform. If that is done, and something of this sort is brought in, it will meet with more favour as far as I am concerned. I shall have to take the position my leader has well taken, and oppose the bill. I do so on these grounds, not necessarily because I do not believe in some further consideration being given these public servants.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): I have just one brief observation to make. It is well known that there are many members of this house who will never go to the Senate. We are all interested in social security; but I know of many hon. members who have passed through this house who have not even the hope of the old age pension. If we are to have social security then I believe that at another session some consideration should be given hon. members who serve in this house for a number of years just as faithfully as those who are appointed to the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the house for more than a very few minutes. Perhaps it is unwise for a man of my age to make an attack upon the Senate, because I should have hopes. I was thinking the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) might give me some consideration, which would be a great step toward the reformation of that institution. I do not know whether we should be discussing Senate reform in connection with this bill. If so, there are many things I should like to say, but I shall not trespass upon the time of the house by saying them now. However, I think we must go this far; that is, to say we are disappointed in the failure to do anything toward real reform of the Senate.

I want to express my disappointment at the attitude of the Prime Minister, particularly in regard to the slam he took at this group when he suggested it would be necessary for the Senate to remain to check legislation if the time ever should come when this party was in power. I think that was a gratuitous insult to this group. It was also a gratuitous insult to the people of Canada; because if ever we come to office we shall do so with exactly the same power the right hon. gentleman now possesses, and with the same right to exercise the authority of government that he has. To suggest that the Senate should be there to prevent the will of the people from being carried out seems to me an undemocratic attitude to take.

I should like to say one word about the Senate. I believe the strength of a democracy rests largely in the democratic organization of the people themselves throughout the country. I could mention scores, I am sure, if not hundreds of democratic organizations that keep democracy alive in this country. It is true that this is a democratic parliament, but if it were all that was democratic in this country we would have an awfully hard time to maintain democracy. I think of our labour unions, of our farm organizations, of our boards of trade, of our chambers of commerce, of our rotary clubs, of a hundred other organizations that are democratic and are working in the best interests of this nation. I shall not dispute that there may be some good reasons for having a second chamber in any system of government, but if we are to have it then I think it is reasonable to say that it should be democratically appointed or elected, and in some way should be responsible to the people of this country. I should like to see, then, a Senate composed of representatives appointed or elected by the various organized democratic groups within the nation. I would like to see so many senators allocated to the labour movement, so many to the farmers, so many to business organizations; let them do the electing, let them recall the senators when they think they are not doing their job, and when Providence intervenes let them elect another man. I should like to enlarge on that thought, but as I said I shall not trespass upon the time of the house by doing so just now.

I think it unfortunate that we should have to use a bill of this kind to make our protest, because I am sure no one in this house wants men in the other chamber or here to undertake tasks of public service for which they are not properly remunerated. I shall not say they should not be so remunerated; I think they should. If we are going to maintain

that second chamber, those who are called upon to serve there should be properly paid, and they should be responsible to the people of Canada.

The reform that has taken place so far is of a very suggestive type. As I understand the pledges which were signed by the appointees of the present Prime Minister, they were pledged to support the legislation passed by this government. If that is all they do, then there is no need for them, because this government can pass the legislation. If they are just to go in there and say "Me, too" then they are getting plenty now, if that is their function. Moreover, let me point out that if they are pledged to support only the legislation passed by the present administration, then by implication they are pledged to oppose legislation passed by another party which may come into power. This reveals the anti-democratic set-up of the present Senate.

However, I am not going to say any more about it except to ask the Prime Minister in the kindliest way, and with great respect, if he would not consider removing the party whips on this question and allowing hon. members to express their views. If this bill should be defeated on such a motion it will not be because we do not wish to pay responsible men in the other chamber, but it would say that if it is to be done we want proper Senate reform to be taken up immediately. I think that that is the point behind the opposition to this bill. I once more ask whether the Prime Minister will not give consideration to releasing the whips and allowing the house to vote on this question as it pleases.

Mr. JEAN FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I have just a word to say in reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Irvine) who has made as usual a delightful speech. He says that the Senate does not always reflect public opinion. It is a respectable view, but I think that my hon. friend is wrong, because in the Senate there are twelve or fifteen owners of newspapers. They establish public opinion, and therefore the views of the public must be in conformity with their own.

At first I was opposed to the Senate. I said to myself, so long as Senator Dandurand and Senator Aylesworth, dear Sir Allen, are there, I will not go further with the suggestion of abolishing the Senate. But if the government has not done much that has been seen in the reform of the Senate, the senators have taken it up themselves and they have reformed themselves to a great degree. We see that they are very active now and they show some independence. In the Senate we see some dignified old Conservatives and some Liberals who are really democrats. They unite together to make some profitable suggestions to the government.

I must say, sir, that I am honoured in counting amongst my friends some old gentlemen who sit in the Senate and who are just as worthy of sitting there as any hon. member is to sit here. The Senate has done no harm in the past, and now it is starting to do some good. The only thing is to warn the government to be very cautious about the appointment of a future leader in the Senate. The present one stated one day that the Prime Minister would lead the small nations at the peace conference, which was just flattery. It was not interesting, it was not worth listening to, and he got his place. But there are others who practise flattery in order to replace the present incumbent. I will name no one, but it is clear and evident that the practice is followed. The Prime Minister has too much experience of men not to read between the lines when something of that sort is said to him.

Even when I was opposed to the Senate because at the time they had not started their own reform I never complained bitterly about them as some of my hon. friends did today. The senators are able men who represent a good slice of mankind. They do not pretend that they are any better than the commoners but they live a life that is more boring when they wait for legislation that takes so much time to come from the House of Commons. They deserve our sympathy; they deserve our assistance; they deserve our help, and it is to be hoped that in the future the Senate will not be castigated by the House of Commons any more than the Senate does this house, but that there will be a spirit of cooperation between both houses. That spirit is highly desirable. It is unfortunate that at times there are closed walls between both houses. There should be more frequent communication and exchange of views between the senators and the members of the House of Commons. When that is done there will be no more complaint about the Senate.

This bill is a trivial matter; it is just to increase by a few thousand dollars the amount that is paid to the leaders of both parties. I am not very well acquainted with the leader of the government in the Senate. I believe that he is doing a good job in his

position; but I am well acquainted with the leader of the opposition in the Senate, who has been here for a very long time. He is a dignified old gentleman and works very hard. I remember that Senator Dandurand, although he was very old, used to wake up at four or five in the morning to start his day. As the Prime Minister said, he had no extra pay to lead the government in the Senate; it was quite meritorious of him to be up so early in the morning to start his day. I know some other senators who are public spirited just as much as any other member of any group in the house. They express independent views —perhaps because they are in the other house, I do not know; but they express independent views for the welfare of the community and on this account deserve highly from the country.

Mr. GREEN: This morning the leader of the opposition asked the Prime Minister if any plans were being made for the reform of the Senate. Is the Prime Minister not making any reply in closing the debate?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is an amendment before the house, and I have already spoken to it. I presume that I am precluded from speaking again on the amendment. If it is a question that is being asked, I would say to my hon. friend that I have had several conversations with the leader of the government in the Senate and with some of the senators as to the possibility of some immediate reforms being made which would enable the Senate to play a more important and effective part in the business of parliament. As a result of these conversations I understand that there has been consideration by hon. members of the Senate of some of the matters raised and that at the present time they are receiving favourable consideration by members of the Senate.

I might mention one question. I had suggested that I thought it would facilitate further cooperation between the two houses if ministers of the crown were granted permission to appear on the floor of the Senate chamber when important government measures were being presented and that they should have the right to participate in the debate and to answer any questions which might be asked. I believe that that reform would be most helpful and I have reason to believe that it is one which will be favourably entertained by the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLES: Would the ministers like it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not a question of who likes this or who likes that; it is a question of what will most effectively further public business. That is the purpose of the particular bill before the house. Many references have been made to the necessity of Senate reform beginning in the Senate itself. As hon. members know, all public bills have to pass both houses. It seems to me appropriate that the Senate should as far as possible initiate measures for the reform of the Senate.

Reference has been made to pledges exacted from members going to the Senate. The only reference in that connection that I can recall is the matter of senators being prepared to favour a shortening of the years during which service would be given in the Senate. Many Liberal members who went to the Senate after this government came into office gave their word that they would favour a shortening of the term, that is, instead of having a life term that some age limit would be fixed. That was not in the nature of making a rubber stamp out of the Senate; it was if anything to ensure that Liberal members who went to the Senate would be helpful in bringing about that reform. That was a mere understanding, a gentleman's agreement with some of those who went to the Senate at the beginning of my term of office as Prime Minister. Of late years I have not felt it was necessary to suggest this reform to any senator; I believe many already favour it.

I have always looked upon every member of parliament, whether he was in the Senate or in this house, as being independent in the matter of expressing his views, and I hope this measure will help to further that same independence.

Mr. STIRLING: I understood the leader of the opposition to indicate this morning that he would like the Prime Minister to state his views with regard to the suggestion made that a joint committee composed of members of the Commons and members of the Senate and representatives of the provinces be set up to consider the reform of the Senate. I further understood my leader to indicate that unless there was a probability that such a committee would be set up to examine the question of the reform of the Senate, this party would reconsider the decision which he expressed in favour of the bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not understand that the leader of the opposition was asking me to commit myself to the extent of agreeing to set up a committee of both houses to take up the question of Senate reform. If he had asked that question specifically I would have said, I have ro hesitation in say-

ing that I am wholly in favour of a committee to consider matters affecting Senate reform. My hon. friend brought in a reference to the provinces. I would wish to have the joint committee of the two houses consider for themselves whether the provinces should be brought in before that step was taken.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Knowles), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Adamson
Archibald
Barrett
Bentley
Blackmore
Blair
Boucher
Bowerman
Bracken
Bradshaw
Brooks
Bryce
Burton
Campbell
Charlton
Coyle
Daniel
Drope
Fair
Fleming
Fraser
Gagnon
Green
Hackett
Hansell
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Hazen
Herridge
Hodgson
Irvine
Jackman
Jaenicke
Kidd
Knowles
Kuhl
Lennard
Lockhart
Low
McCuaig
McCullough (Assiniboia)
Macdonnell (Muskoka-Ontario)
MacInnis
McKay
McMaster
MacNicol
Massey
Matthews (Kootenay East)
Merritt
Murphy
Probe
Quelch
Robinson (Bruce)
Ross (St. Paul's)
Rowe
Shaw
Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Stirling
Stokes
Strum, Mrs.
Thatcher
Timmins
Townley-Smith
Tustin
Webb
White (Middlesex East)
Wright
Wylie
Zaplitny—69.

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott
Arsenault
Beaudoin
Beaudry
Belzile
Benidickson
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Yukon)
Blanchette
Boivin
Bonnier
Bourget
Bradette
Breithaupt
Brown
Chevrier
Church
Claxton
Cloutier
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Coté (Verdun)
Cournoyer
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Emmerson
Eudes
Farquhar
Ferguson
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gariépy
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gladstone
Golding
Gour (Russell)
Gourd (Chapleau)
Grant
Hallé
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Hartt
Healy
Henderson
Héon
Howe
Ilsley
Jutras
King, Mackenzie
Kirk
LaCroix
Lafontaine
Langlois
Lapalme
Lapointe
Laurendeau
Leger
McCann
McCubbin
McCulloch (Pictou)
McGarry
McGregor
McIlraith
McIvor
Mackenzie
MacKinnon
MacLean
MacNaught
Maloney
Marier
Marquis
Matthews (Brandon)
Maybank
Mayhew
Menary
Michaud
Mitchell
Mullins
Mutch
Nixon
Picard
Pinard
Pouliot
Raymond (Wright)
Richard (Gloucester)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Rinfret
Robinson (Simcoe East)
Ross (Hamilton East)
St. Laurent
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Smith (York North)
Stuart (Charlotte)
Viau
Warren
Weir
White (Hastings-Peterborough)
Whitman
Winters—102.

Mr. MARTIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): I was paired with the hon. member for London (Mr. Manross). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. JEAN: I was paired with the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I was paired with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ASHBY: I was paired with the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Bridges). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. HLYNKA: I was paired with the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL: I was paired with the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare (Mr. Baker). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McLURE: I was paired with the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Dionne).

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the motion that the said bill be now read the second time. Shall the motion carry?

Mr. KNOWLES: On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—Additional allowance to the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition in the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, we accept the decision of the house in the matter and therefore will not take further time. We want to record our opposition to the measure at every stage.

Mr. CHURCH: I have just a few words to say on this bill. This is not the time to make any change in the constitution in the present state of the world. That is one of the reasons I have for supporting the bill. Second, the gentlemen in respect of whom this bill is being passed are both good men who are doing splendid work. I have a third reason, and it is this. I remember the time in this house, five or six years ago, when a measure was put through this house which would have had the effect of duplicating the tariff in Canada by means of indirect taxation, given to the provinces, because it gave the provinces the same powers that the dominion had to tax directly every article used by the consumer. That measure had the support of hon. gentlemen to my left and the result would have been to put an indirect provincial tax on every implement the farmer uses. It virtually gave the provinces the powers enjoyed by the dominion. The Senate threw it out, and that is one more reason why I am supporting this bill. There are other reasons, one of which is that I would like real Senate reform, but in my opinion this is not the time to make a change in the constitution.

Section agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I report the bill?

Mr. KNOWLES: On division.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the said bill be read a third time?

Mr. KNOWLES: Next sittting of the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Now.

[Mr. Marshall.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless there is unanimous consent the bill cannot be read the third time now.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Third reading. There is no amendment.

Mr. KNOWLES: Next sitting of the house.

Mr. ABBOTT: Cooperative as can be.

Mr. KNOWLES: Do you believe in the rules of the house?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Standing order 77.

Mr. ABBOTT: We believe in a little cooperation.

TAX AGREEMENTS

COMPENSATION TO PROVINCES IN LIEU OF INCOME AND OTHER TAXES

The house resumed from Wednesday, July 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. Abbott for the second reading of Bill No. 411, to authorize the government to enter into agreements with the governments of the provinces pursuant to which, in return for compensation, the provinces agree to refrain from levying certain taxes for a limited period.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, when this question was before the house last evening the Minister of Finance was good enough to allow the adjournment of the debate in order that I and others might have an opportunity of examining certain documents he asked to be placed on *Hansard* and which had not been seen. I am sure that all hon. members of the house have since seen those documents. The minister was good enough to let me have them last night. I have looked them over. They have to do only with the formulae for arriving at the amounts of money to be paid to the various provinces under varying conditions. I think they contain nothing more fundamental than that. As far as that point goes, the documents which the minister tabled I think added nothing new, except in detail, to the facts he presented last night and to other facts he had presented at other times. Since last night I have also had the opportunity of looking over the minister's remarks, and I think I can conclude my observations with respect to them in a very short time.

What the minister had to say only confirms our worst doubts and fears. He simply repaints the dismal picture of this government's calculated objective to get from the provinces certain taxation rights by any means and at any cost. The minister also made it plain that

the government is going to back away from its 1945 proposals because they are more burdensome than it can afford. In that respect the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin) a few days ago also gave us notice that he expects the provinces to assume a greater share of the cost of old age pensions. With respect to public investment, public works, unemployment and so on, those plans which were aimed not only at a greater measure of social security but also at lessening the prospect of a recession, there is nothing proposed. The minister makes it clear with respect to the minor taxes that while the government will bargain with respect to them, the dominion will abandon nothing. If all these things had been considered in a conference and an agreement had been achieved, the story would have been different and the effect would have been different. But this method of playing one province off against another, and playing some provinces off against others, is to be deplored. For that kind of procedure the government is deserving of the severest censure.

The question now is, what are we going to do about the bill? What is this bill? This bill is simply enabling legislation. Apparently seven provinces have assured the government that they are prepared to accept the government's plan. As I understand it, no agreements are signed. This is therefore an enabling bill to give the government power to enter arrangements with the provinces by which the provinces will give up the right to collect certain taxes and in return the government will make certain payments to the provinces. In that respect we do not intend to take the position that this agreement made between the government and several other governments cannot be signed. We therefore shall not vote against this bill. But we want it made clear that certain of the results of the method which the government has followed are objectionable, not only to us but, we think, objectionable to most Canadians.

Last night I stated my objections to the government's whole programme. It is now clear that the government has abandoned its social security, health and unemployment proposals as announced two years ago. Its policy does not embody in any real sense the principle of fiscal need. If the principle of fiscal need is in it, it is only incidental in this arrangement by which the government is proposing to extract from the taxpayers of this country a great deal of money and hand it over to the provinces to spend. It is virtually buying the provinces out of their taxation rights, and doing it with the money that the government is going to subtract from its own plans for social security, health and so-called public investment, as proposed two years ago. That is made clear by the minister's own statements here and elsewhere, which I shall put on the record in a moment. I am sure he will not object, because he repeated last night statements which he had made previously. He stated that to the extent these offers to the provinces are generous, to that extent will the provinces have to assume greater responsibility and to that extent will the dominion government do less in the way of carrying out its proposals of two years ago.

By way of summary, let me say this with respect to the criticisms I offered last night. I said the government's proposal goes a long way to promoting disunity. That must be apparent to anyone who reads the minister's address of yesterday. On page 7 of the typewritten address he let me have—and it is at page 5310 of *Hansard*—he put on the record the minimum amounts which would go to the different provinces in Canada if this scheme goes through, and the maximum amounts that might go to them on the basis of the year 1947. In the one case the amount is $206,000,000 odd; and in the other case it is $228,000,000 odd. When one looks at those figures he sees that the minimum amount that is going to the provinces, if the whole nine of them went into it, would be $206,000,000, and the amount going to the seven provinces which have indicated their willingness to sign is $83,000,000. I suppose two-thirds of that will be collected from the taxpayers of Ontario and Quebec, which provinces have not signed and are therefore left out of this arrangement. The province of Quebec was to receive $56,000,000 odd and the province of Ontario $67,000,000 odd, in minimum amounts, a total of about $123,000,000. So as a result of the government's policies we have seven provinces getting $83,000,000, two-thirds of which is collected from outside their boundaries, and the two provinces in which that two-thirds is collected getting nothing. In that there is not only cause for disunity, but we must also keep in mind that if this government does not pay the money to Ontario and Quebec, or if those provinces do not accept it, the taxpayers of Canada will have that much less to pay, and the budgetary problems of this government will be made that much easier.

I want to examine now the other table of payments that are based on the 1947 figures. This shows the total cost to be $228,000,000, with seven provinces getting $91,000,000 odd,

of which, as I say, two-thirds or more would be collected outside those provinces. The remaining two provinces would receive $137,000,000, in the case of Quebec $63,000,000 and in the case of Ontario $74,000,000, with the taxpayers of those two provinces being taxed to pay two-thirds of the money going to the other seven provinces while themselves getting nothing. My point there is that this method, whatever merit it may have, at least leads to disunity.

My second point is that in a federal state a procedure of this kind goes a long way toward centralizing the taxing power in one government. To the extent we go in that direction, to that extent we are leading to a unitary state; and to the extent that we become a unitary state we are simply saying good-bye to confederation as we have known it in this country.

My third point is that in a federal state the plan now before us fails to give the province any clear field of taxation. In that connection I want to read a brief statement from page 85 of book 2 of the report of the Rowell-Sirois commission, a report which I regard very highly and to which the minister paid a high compliment last evening. Dealing with the proposals brought forward which aimed to leave with the provinces certain of the minor fields of taxation, the report says:

It is implicit in the plan, but should be clearly stated, that the dominion will respect the tax fields left to the provinces. Adjustments in the joint dominion-provincial-municipal tax structure will undoubtedly be necessary and desirable from time to time. But the dominion can no longer consider itself a free and independent agent to take unilateral action to this end when it pleases. The essence of the plan is to leave provinces and municipalities with adequate, stable revenues, and this would clearly be defeated if the dominion should extend its taxation into fields already occupied by the provinces or on objects jointly taxed without making satisfactory compensatory adjustments. Such action would violate the whole spirit of the arrangement.

That was their statement with respect to minor taxes under their proposed settlement.

The fourth criticism I offered of this plan was that it has failed to achieve a continuance of plans for dominion-provincial discussions, which in my view is a serious matter in a federal state. Here it is important that we go to great lengths to try and get the maximum of cooperation between the central government and the other governments across the dominion. In my judgment the course the government is following will lead to the liquidation of the dominion-provincial conference system which has been inherent in our set-up since the first years of confederation.

[Mr. Bracken.]

My fifth criticism was that this procedure delays the bringing into effect of the social security, health, unemployment and other plans envisaged in what was spoken of two years ago as a great national plan. In that connection I want to read a statement made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) himself, and then to refer to his own words in closing his address last evening. Addressing the Toronto board of trade on January 27 of this year the Minister of Finance had this to say:

As a result of increased rental payments from the dominion—

That was after the dominion had proposed to increase its rental payments above the figures proposed in some earlier discussions.

—the provinces will be able to assume, and must expect to assume, a somewhat greater financial responsibility.

I commend the minister for his frankness. The dominion offered to give the provinces more, but to the extent that it gave them more it would do less itself. That should be clear to anyone examining the matter, but when we have the statement so frankly from the lips of the minister there can be no doubt as to the position. Then he went on:

The dominion government will be able, correspondingly, to reduce some of the burden it was prepared to assume for a public investment and social security programme.

Then last evening in this house, at page 5319 of *Hansard*, the minister had this to say:

The details of our original proposals may of course change as a result of further study or of developing public opinion or of discussion with provincial governments at a general conference which will be necessary before they can be implemented. The proposed contributions which the dominion may be able to make in the field of public investment and social security may, as I have said publicly and as I advised the provinces which were negotiating with us last winter, have to be revised—

In that case the word "revised" means "reduced".

—to take into account the substantial increase in the financial payments which the dominion has now undertaken to make as rental for the tax fields in question.

My point in reading these quotations is this. The government made certain proposals to the provinces that it would undertake a great national programme. In its negotiations with the provinces it had to increase the size of its offers. This it did, as the minister frankly said, on two or three occasions. He said that having increased the government's contribution to the provinces, the provinces can now expect less from the government in the future.

My sixth criticism last night was that this plan brought forward by the government abandons the principle of fiscal need. I think the minister's statement last night on fiscal need was a specious argument. There is one way to give fiscal need, and no other, namely to recognize the periodic, or in some cases, I am afraid, the permanent, inability of some provinces to provide adequate standards of social services. That is one of two reasons given in justification of the kind of measure by which the dominion collects taxes from the people and gives some of it to provincial governments to spend. I support the government to a degree in that policy. But I agree with the Prime Minister's statement of past years that to go beyond that is a vicious principle.

There is one other thing I might have said, which I shall say now, it is this: This proposal or these related proposals are not charity, not merely taking from a wealthy section of Canada and having the money distributed in needy sections. It is not that only. In this federal state of ours, with nine provinces, the people in all these provinces contribute to the wealth made by large institutions, which by circumstances find themselves located in the larger centres of population in the central parts of the country. The net result of that is that the taxing capacity of the outlying sections is reduced, and the taxing capacity of the central sections is increased. To the extent that that is so, any state is warranted in taking taxes where they can be obtained and allowing a part of them to be spent where they are needed. I did not mention this aspect last night; I am sure it was not necessary. I mention it now only because one might take from the discussion that this was wholly a charitable arrangement—one by which money was collected in the wealthy sections of our economy and spent in other sections. It is not wholly that. Some of the wealthiest sections of our economy have been made such by wealth made in business done in other sections of the nation. It is entirely defensible to use some of that to help correct in a small way the inequities that result.

Let me conclude by this one statement. In my judgment the course the government is following means the liquidation of the dominion-provincial conference system which has been inherent in our confederation system since its inception. Certain provinces need help. That is granted. And help to a degree can be justified . But the procedure the government has followed has brought about serious criticism. It is resulting in disunity and all the other objections I have raised. Certain provinces having undertaken to come into this arrangement, we ought not to deny them that right. We can defend it to a point. Beyond that it is unsound policy.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, this party does not intend to make any long debate on this measure. In our opinion it is not a measure that one can get particularly hot about either way. We regret exceedingly that the dominion-provincial conference which was called in August, 1945, broke down and that now the arrangements between the dominion and the provinces are on a province-to-province basis. I can agree with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) that that is a bad aspect of our dominion-provincial relations.

I should like to draw attention to the fact that the dominion-provincial conference was called by the dominion government. The impression is abroad that the conference broke up because certain premiers were, to use the language of the street, playing politics. But even if that were so I do not think the dominion government is in a strong position when it refuses to call the conference together again. Because of the position of the dominion government, where it has an over-all view of the needs of Canada, knows what the needs are in every part of the dominion, in fact knows that the provinces as a whole constitute the dominion and that there is no dominion of Canada outside the provinces, it should pocket its pride and, regardless of what the attitude of any provincial premier had been or might be in another provincial conference, call a new conference.

In my opinion the dominion government has all the trumps in this game, and it would be the easiest thing in the world to expose any provincial premier who tries to disrupt the over-all programme that the dominion government is attempting to put into effect. Therefore I do not believe the dominion government can be excused for the failure to call a dominion-provincial conference after the last one broke up in April or May of 1946.

Let me read two short paragraphs from the statement made by the Prime Minister on the first day of the conference, August 6, 1945. On page 6 of the proceedings of the plenary session of that date, the Prime Minister said:

> Above all, we aim at the maintenance of a high level of employment and income. In no field are the interests of dominion and provinces more thoroughly one than in the maintenance at all times of a high level of employment. The fear of war is undoubtedly the worst of all fears in the minds of men today. But next to the fear of war, the greatest fear for most men is the fear of unemployment. There are men and women who almost dreaded the

coming of victory because they feared that depression and unemployment might come in victory's train. That fear we must all seek, in close cooperation, to remove.

I agree with every word the Prime Minister said. The fear of unemployment cannot be removed by the arrangements that are now being made between government and government. That fear is just as prominent in the minds of the Canadian people in 1947 as it was in 1945. The Prime Minister went on to say:

Finally, our proposals are designed to make possible a comprehensive system of social insurance, partially federal and partially provincial, through which the community will share with the individual in meeting the variations of income and expense to which the rise and fall of business activity, natural disasters, accident, ill health and old age render all of us liable. Improved standards of nutrition, housing, health and social amenities, for both urban and rural populations, are also objectives of our reconstruction policy. Of these housing is a most urgent need in the period of reconstruction.

I would like to ask the Minister of Finance or any member of the government: Have any of the problems mentioned by the Prime Minister in that paragraph been solved by any agreement that has been made up to date or that can be made under the present policy? Obviously the answer is no.

There is a little background to this whole question of which we should not lose sight. I am old enough to remember what happened at the end of world war I as well as at the end of world war II. At the end of both wars people had come to the conclusion, because of what we were able to do during those wars in the matter of production, that never again would we go back to the haphazard, unplanned way of providing for our needs. They felt that there had to be more planning and, as the Prime Minister so well said, a sharing by individuals who were in good circumstances with other individuals who were not. What we need is an over-all policy where the rich provinces will share with the poor provinces because all together are Canada.

I found some difficulty in following the reasoning of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), but that may be my fault and not his. I had the same difficulty last night and my difficulty was not decreased today. At page 5321 of yesterday's *Hansard* the leader of the opposition referred to the way in which the amounts needed by the provinces had been increased step by step. He said it was $40 million under the Rowell-Sirois commission; it was $117 million under the 1942 tax arrangements; it was $138 million under the 1945 proposal, $198 million under the 1946 proposal, and it is $228 million at the present time.

[Mr. MacInnis.]

Mr. ABBOTT: A minimum of $206 million.

Mr. MacINNIS: Last night he said $228 million.

Mr. BRACKEN: $206 million was the minimum.

Mr. MacINNIS: Then he referred to the statement made a few evenings ago by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin), that the proposals outlined in the 1945 proposals would cost at the present time from $500 million to $600 million a year. He then went on to say:

I have not seen certain of the calculations and figures which the minister put on the record tonight, but I am going to refer to them in a moment. But in so far as this measure provides fiscal need for the provinces of Canada, it will receive our support. In so far as it fails to provide fiscal need, the bill is weak and should be remedied. In so far as it provides more than fiscal need, it is not a sound method of financing in Canada. Does this proposal meet fiscal needs?

Then he continued:

If in the 1945 proposals the government was planning to meet the fiscal needs of the provinces by providing $138 million, certainly it is paying enough to meet the fiscal needs of the provinces now by providing $228 million which is $92 million more. On that basis I do not think there can be any question but that this plan does meet the fiscal needs of the weaker provinces.

If I understood him aright today, he said that these plans did not provide for the fiscal needs of the poorer provinces. I am simply stating how it appeared to me after listening to the hon. member.

Mr. BRACKEN: I did not mean to say that today.

Mr. MacINNIS: I think that is what my hon. friend said. However, I am not going to refer to it any more. I am in a quandary, now and I was in a quandary last night as to whether he was supporting or opposing this measure. I am wondering now just where he stands. I hope when I finish I shall not be in the same boat.

I should like to know what is meant by fiscal need. Does fiscal need mean the programme of social services and public investment which was mentioned in the 1945 proposals? In my opinion fiscal need means just that. Let us see what was in that programme. I shall refer only to the headings. There was a national health programme for all the provinces. There was provision for old age pensions to those seventy years of age and over, for which the dominion government would assume full responsibility without a means test. That would mean that everyone over seventy would automatically get a pen-

sion. If he had income over and above the maximum amount of the income tax exemption, then the tax would take it away. For those old age pensioners between the ages of sixty-five and sixty-nine years the government would go fifty-fifty with the provinces on a means test basis.

Then there was provision for unemployment assistance benefits. I have not looked this up recently, but my memory is that those benefits were to cover persons not covered by unemployment insurance or who had exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits. Then there was a policy of public investment. After a social security programme I think that a policy of public investment which would provide employment, which would increase the wealth of the country, is of equal importance to a social security programme under which benefits would be paid. In the one case benefits are paid, and in the other case we enable people to provide incomes for themselves. Of course the kind of social security programme that we would be able ultimately to provide for ourselves would depend upon the amount of wealth produced and the national income created by that wealth.

My criticism of the government's policy is that it does, as the leader of the opposition says, throw overboard the whole social security and public investment programme. I am inclined to believe that the government was pleased rather than otherwise that the conference broke down, because the psychology in favour of cooperation and state assistance in 1946 was not as strong as it was in 1945 and in the last years of the war. In 1946 the psychology of private enterprise was on the make—take what you can and the devil take the hindmost. I believe that the government had come to doubt its own programme and was glad when the premiers of two of the central provinces broke up the conference in 1946.

The leader of the opposition several times referred to the fact that the federal government in its taxing arrangements was encroaching upon provincial tax fields to such an extent that no field of taxation was now clear for the provinces. Let us take a look at that picture.

The Canadian constitution provides for a distribution of powers and responsibilities as between the dominion and the provinces. We found that during the depression years, with all the taxing powers that they had ever had, most of the provinces found themselves in a position where they could not discharge the responsibilities given to them under the British North America Act, and the federal government had to come to their assistance. That being so, I think it is far more important to the provinces that they should have sufficient income to enable them to discharge the responsibilities that they now have, regardless of where the money is to come from, than that they should have taxation fields which will not provide them with sufficient revenue to discharge those responsibilities. I do not believe that any province should be greatly disturbed if the dominion is collecting all the taxes, because the people who are paying the taxes are all Canadian citizens and they are the same people whether it is the dominion or the province that collects the tax. If there are two sets of tax collectors there will be two expense accounts to pay.

What is required is that the dominion and the provinces should come to an arrangement whereby each province would be provided with sufficient revenue to discharge the responsibilities that it assumed under whatever arrangement it entered into with the federal government. The present arrangements do not do that; they do not provide for social security services, and while we may get along without those services at the present time, perhaps in a few more years, maybe sooner, we shall be in the position in which we found ourselves between 1930 and 1939, when seven of the provinces of this dominion were not able to discharge the responsibilities assigned to them under the constitution.

In conclusion I would urge the government at the earliest possible moment to call the dominion-provincial conference. If pride deters them, let them throw it overboard. Big people are not deterred by a little pride. When the conference is called together, if any premier of any province begins to use that conference as a political platform I am satisfied that the dominion government, if it wishes to go ahead with the programme outlined in the green book, has sufficient material to expose that individual and bring him to time. The people of his province will repudiate him if he puts them in such a position that they are not able to take advantage of benefits which they could enjoy if he accepted a reasonable arrangement with the dominion.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I think I should say just a word to place on record the position of my group with respect to these agreements. I certainly shall not take long because I would not want to thresh old straw or to cover any territory that has been so well covered thus far this afternoon.

I must agree with a good deal that has been said by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) and follow much the same line that

he did. There were some things in the speech of the hon. member who just preceded me (Mr. MacInnis) with which I can also agree.

As is well known, Mr. Speaker, our group has always taken a strong position against centralization. We do so now. We feel that this is a move for centralizing control in the federal government. We do not think that that is in the interests of Canada and its strength, and in due course I am satisfied that whatever government may be in power at the time, it will come to recognize that centralization is not the answer and will take steps to see that Canada is strengthened by a decentralizing move. However, that is not what I wanted to develop at any length, except to place our position on record as strongly against centralization.

The agreements seem to be based on quite reasonable terms, at least in relation to conditions at the present time. I have no particular objection to the terms. But it must not be overlooked that the money which is being paid back in these increased grants to the provincial governments is collected out of taxes which come from the very people to whom the grants are being paid.

It is not a question of the provinces getting a better deal than they have ever had. It is simply a question of the provinces receiving from a central collection agency taxes which they could very well collect for themselves if they wished to tax their people that heavily. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, what the dominion government would do should another disastrous unemployment situation arise. I went through that sort of thing in Alberta in the thirties and I know what it means to a province with limited revenues. It was not during that time a question whether we could collect taxes to take care of unemployment and the needs of hungry people. It was not that at all. The money just was not there. There were plenty of goods and services that could have been made available, but the money was not there. There was only one authority in this dominion of Canada that could have made that money available, but they did not do it.

Now I am wondering if, under the terms of this agreement, the federal government might not back out of the picture in case of the development of a serious unemployment situation and say to the provinces: We have provided for all that in this agreement, and it is your responsibility from now on; take it.

I protest against that most vehemently. I think the provinces will have to guard themselves against such a possibility and I hope they will. I can do no better, Mr. Speaker, than to put on the record a statement made by the Hon. Mr. Manning, premier of Alberta, in his budget speech delivered on March 7, 1947, in the Alberta legislature. This sums up his attitude towards the whole agreement. It is the stand that we in this group will take in this house, because it is the stand that we have consistently followed. Mr. Manning said:

> The government of Alberta is convinced that the accumulating force of circumstances will continue to add still further emphasis to the impossibility of a satisfactory permanent solution to the problem of dominion-provincial relations until three basic factors are recognized and acted upon. First, there must be a redefining and, if necessary, a reallocation of the rights and responsibilities of the respective governments in the light of conditions as they exist today.

Not as they existed, Mr. Speaker, back in 1867, but as they exist today.

> Second, each government must be assured adequate revenue under its own unfettered jurisdiction to enable it to discharge fully its constitutional responsibilities and provide adequately for the just requirements of its people. Third, to make this possible the Canadian monetary system must be reformed in the manner necessary to permit the monetization of the entire national production and the use of the financial credit thereby created to supplement and progressively to replace excessive taxation as a means of providing public revenue. The Alberta government will continue to do everything in its power to secure recognition of these basic factors to the end that this important problem, ultimately, will be solved in a manner satisfactory to the dominion and all the provinces, and on a basis that will assure the Canadian people the national and provincial economic stability which they desire and to which they are justly entitled.

That is the attitude of the government of my province with respect to these agreements. They do not look upon the arrangement as in any sense a permanent one. I think they are quite well satisfied at present with the terms of the agreements, but I think too that I should emphasize that they signed the agreement with the reservation that it would be for a preliminary five-year period, and also on the understanding—I believe an undertaking was given by this government that would lend credence to their understanding—that one year prior to the termination of these contracts another conference would be held at which further efforts would be made to reach a permanent solution that would be satisfactory in the interests of all concerned.

In conclusion let me say this. I quite recognize the importance of social security measures and of public investment possibilities. I do not think, however, that it would be possible to conceive a better programme of social security and public investment than that which is embodied within the terms of the

statement which Mr. Manning made, particularly in the third provision, which I quote once more:

To make this possible, the Canadian monetary system must be reformed in the manner necessary to permit the monetization of the entire national production and the use of the financial credit thereby created to supplement and progressively to replace excessive taxation as a means of providing public revenue.

There you have the answer to our calls and demands for public investment and for social security agreements. The provinces, if given their rights under a proper monetary system, can provide their own social security, and they will not have to come here on their stomachs with hat in hand asking the federal governmet to help them. They can provide their own public investment programme and take care of their own people if this government will sit down with them and work out a definition and perhaps an allocation of powers that will enable the provinces to discharge fully the responsibilities that are placed upon them under the terms of our constitution. I wanted to emphasize that as our position.

Mr. JEAN FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which has been discussed at other times and which is of the utmost importance to the country. I appreciate the fact that everyone has spoken in a friendly disposition and with a view to trying to help the community by making suggestions.

When we discuss any matter we must have the same basis for discussion. The leader of the opposition said yesterday that the dominion government and the provincial governments have certain responsibilities and certain taxing powers. He should have said that they have the right to impose taxation within their respective jurisdictions. The hon. member used the word "jurisdiction" later on in this speech, and he knows very well that the meaning and scope of the word "jurisdiction" is entirely different from that of responsibility. He added at page 5319:

In other words, the dominion government in this bill asks the provinces to refrain from taxing in certain fields, and for that concession the dominion government undertakes to pay money to the provinces.

This is the main issue. Speaking of the Rowell-Sirois commission, he described it as the fullest and most valuable statement on dominion-provincial affairs made since confederation. It was certainly the fullest, considering the size of the books that were published; but when he concludes that it was the most valuable report, distinctions should be made. It was an orgy of words. It was the fiesta of the intelligentsia, and all the clever brains from all over the country were invited to do something to make that report thicker. I remember hearing one of these super-brains in a broadcast in 1940 or 1941—1941 I believe— say that the time had come when Canada should no longer be an amalgamation of several small countries but should become one great country, meaning that the provincial legislatures should disappear in order to make room for a larger dominion parliament. He seemed to be embarrassed when he said that over the radio, but he went on and finally finished the sentence. I was down home and I heard him over CBL, Toronto.

Mr. IRVINE: Who said that?

Mr. POULIOT: He was a professor at Queens, and with regard to the book he had published for the commission he was praised by the editor of *Saturday Night* who sat in the press gallery for some time and was a civil servant on many occasions but described himself as a reporter even when he was in government pay.

The issue is that of giving uncontrolled power to the intelligentsia. I have seen it from that angle from the start. Ten years ago I wrote articles in a Montreal paper to the same effect. It is my deep conviction.

In this matter of dominion-provincial relations I have formed my own views, and to me it is a matter of paramount importance to all Canadians. Because one expresses a certain view, he should not be described as a supporter of Mr. So-and-So here in Ottawa, or Mr. So-and-So in Quebec city, or Mr. So-and-So in Toronto. In a discussion I seldom consider a subjective reason. To do this is referred to as the use of the argument *ad hominem*—recalling the past sayings of a man to show his contradiction in certain statements. I am reluctant to do that, but I shall be bound to do it in a minute. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we all should consider any matter objectively. Because Mr. So-and-So has said a certain thing, we should not be bound to fall in line with him, and we should not be considered as bad Canadians whether we do or do not think as he does.

In the first place, I must say that I have deep sympathy for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) because he has inherited a heavy legacy from the war. I cannot understand the controversy between the various parties and groups with regard to dominion-provincial relations, for this reason: if we have to bear such a heavy burden of taxation now, it is precisely on account of war finance, on account of the loans and gifts which were made to other countries, and on account of the expenditures which were not scrutinized

by any party during the war. I remember that Mr. Hanson, the predecessor of the present leader of the opposition, used to say, "Well, I close my eyes during the war; but after the war is over, we shall see to it."

Mr. MacNICOL: That was too late.

Mr. POULIOT: We see that very well. But I am in sympathy with the present minister because he has shown determination not to fall into the trap as often as his predecessor did every time some country asked something of him.

An hon. MEMBER: Give him time.

Mr. POULIOT: He deserves a great deal of praise for that. During the war, when a handful of members of parliament were pointing out the results of that nonsensical crazy extravagance, everybody was saying, "It is all right." In spite of what was said, the money was voted blindly just the same as if we were never to face a situation as the one which now confronts us.

The leader of the opposition has been frank in his utterances, and that is possibly the best explanation for his contradiction. I give him credit for his sincerity. Everyone knows that he was one of the instigators of the Rowell commission. It was initiated by the Sanhedrin of Winnipeg, as is well known, and one of the members for a time was the late Judge Hudson, who was a personal friend of mine but with whom I never had any business dealings. There were some other members; some of them are still alive. It is known as the Sanhedrin, and when I mention it to the leader of the opposition he will know whom I mean in Winnipeg. The Sanhedrin controls the spirit of the Winnipeg *Free Press,* and the Winnipeg *Free Press* in flesh and bone was John W. Dafoe. Mr. Dafoe was self-educated, but perhaps not absolutely enough. He could not give to his own brain the last finishing touch. But he was there and he probably wanted to organize something for the benefit of the prairie provinces. If ever anyone had the personal ways and, to use a royal expression, the personal style, to canvass the readers of his newspaper, he had. There was Mr. Rowell, and there was also Senator Crerar, a delightful man, who was then the Manitoba minister in the dominion government. My hon friend the leader of the opposition was then premier of the province which was so ably represented in the dominion cabinet by Mr. Crerar. So we have Mr. Crerar, Mr. Dafoe and Mr. Bracken. Naturally they wanted to have the whole scheme promoted by a premier of one of the nine provinces, and they could not find any better man than the premier of their own province, who is now leader of the opposition.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is that the whole of the Sanhedrin?

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, no.

Mr. KNOWLES: There have to be seventy members.

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, no; there are the big grain merchants, too.

Mr. KNOWLES: The Sanhedrin has to have seventy men in it.

Mr. POULIOT: I cannot count them, but my hon. friend knows I am on my way to truth.

Mr. BENTLEY: We can count them for you.

Mr. POULIOT: Before that the dominion was most generous with the western provinces. They used to come here with a top hat asking for just a guarantee. Then they came with a homburg for a loan. Finally they came bareheaded, like the burghers of Calais, for a gift. The guarantee became a loan; the loan became a gift, and then everybody had to pay for it. I asked some questions of Mr. Dunning at the time; but the western provinces have always been the spoiled children of the government, just as in a large family the children who are of a weak disposition are more loved than the others.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. POULIOT: If my hon. friend does not belong to that category it is because he was born in Halifax.

Mr. LOW: These tough guys from the central provinces!

Mr. POULIOT: But it is the true story. Then the Sanhedrin wanted a judge to preside over the commission, a man who would be entirely disinterested; and according to the official figures I obtained he was well looked after. At the time he was not a judge; he was not a cabinet minister; he was not a member of parliament; he was not a civil servant, but in the ten years from 1927 to 1937 he received from the dominion government $168,332.51. In addition, from November 20, 1926, to June 14, 1928, he received an amount of $48,641.63 for services, travelling expenses, expenses, allocations and so on, not taking into account what was paid by other departments than justice and national revenue. So he received $216,000 in that period of ten years. He was full of disinterest. He was there as chairman of the commission; he had

Mr. Dafoe sitting with him and another French-Canadian judge who was there for a time but who became sick—probably he became sick of it, though he was not in such bad health as the second chairman, who died not long after he was appointed. It was impossible to live in that atmosphere. It was babel at its worst. It was indeed a fiesta of the intelligentsia. They came from all over the world, a caravan of learned fellows with thick glasses, bringing statistics in brief cases which were well loaded with important documents. It was not paper they wanted; it was straw to make nests and feather to make pillows. They wanted to make themselves comfortable in the fine atmosphere of Ottawa.

Mr. IRVINE: There was no gurgling sound from the brief cases?

Mr. POULIOT: No; it was all generosity, abnegation and the spirit of sacrifice, and they forgot themselves completely. They were coming here to serve the country, this gentleman who had been paid $216,000 in ten years and all the rest. It was self-sacrificing abnegation. Then they organized that scheme, and we saw a mountain of reports. It was the Rowell commission. Strangely enough they recommended exactly what the Minister of Finance, Mr. Dunning, had suggested after the election in 1935—to take over succession duties and that sort of thing, which I opposed many years ago when the matter was brought before the house.

The leader of the opposition has admirably summarized the recommendations contained in the report of the Rowell-Sirois commission: that the central government should collect taxes wherever they can be obtained, and that the provinces suffering from a poor economy should be benefited on the basis of fiscal need, that is, to the extent of the amount necessary to enable those provinces to have the same levels of public services as the other provinces without having to apply a higher level of taxation. His suggestion was that some provinces which he considered richer because they were not his own would have to be called upon to pay for the other provinces that were supposed to be not so fortunate; but the hon. gentleman also said the basic recommendation of that commission was that the provinces of Canada should be aided by the central government on the basis of fiscal need. It is very difficult to establish that; and the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) asked for some information from the leader of the opposition, who also said, "In fact there are vast differences, so that we find in this nation six different major types of economy". I wonder if he perhaps missed a page in which those six different major types of economy were described. I am very anxious to know what they are, and I hope that when the bill is in committee the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to tell us.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, it was stated that some of these provinces have not been able to secure as high a standard of living or of public services as the others. Those mentioned have been the prairie provinces and the maritimes. When it comes to helping any Canadian, whether he is from the east or from the west, there should be no objection. But there should be order in government, and the only way to have order in government is to have the same treatment for all. If some provinces both east and west have difficulty in making ends meet it is precisely because they do not have the powers of taxation that have been given them by the constitution. That constitution has been in force for eighty years, and until ten years ago there was no difficulty. At that time the difficulty came about not in the east but in the prairie provinces, and due to drought and other reasons, some of which may perhaps have been good reasons. They were given a palliative, just as though the government were ashamed to act properly toward the western provinces. Instead of saying, "You need something, and we will fix you up", it was always given by the back door. After a certain time the prairie provinces were most generously treated, especially after the Bennett regime went out. They were better treated than the eastern provinces; but the government seemed to be ashamed to do anything in the open. There was always a screen and a reason to hide what had been done. I had to ask special questions to get full information from the then Minister of Finance, Mr. Dunning, who seemed reluctant to give a true picture of what had been done for the western provinces.

What has been said about the inferiority of the maritime and the prairie provinces is an insult to the population of these provinces. The propaganda is to the effect that the older provinces, Ontario especially and Quebec, will have to pay the system of social security for the whole country. It seems that if the taxes had been adjusted properly there would be no difficulty about social security in any part of the country.

When the motion to appoint the Rowell commission was brought before the house I remember that I uttered thunderous "hear, hears", and it was struck out from *Hansard*. The purpose of the motion was to bring some order in the relations between the dominion and the provinces. The purpose was

excellent. If it was falsified by those who wanted to serve certain areas at the expense of the rest of the country. Mr. Speaker, you would be astonished to see the fabulous sums that have been paid for the Rowell-Sirois report, about half a million dollars at the time. But that is nothing compared with what we have to pay now.

In the summary of the report it is said that Ottawa will be able to collect more taxes than the provinces ever could. That is one of the arguments that have been brought out by the commission. But, sir, the reason that I am opposed to it is that I consider that the collection of taxes is something most unpleasant and it should be left to those who spend the money. I do not see why Ottawa should have the opprobrium of collecting taxes and pass the amount over to the provinces. That is one reason. Besides that it is an occasion for red tape to show up. There are many reasons why I cannot understand that policy, and I wonder whether all the difficulties which have been raised in regard to dominion-provincial relations have not been caused by the bureaucrats who have taken advantage of the Rowell-Sirois report to fatten themselves at the expense of the public treasury. You know very well, sir, that it is most difficult to make some people who have been appointed on a temporary basis understand that as soon as their time is ended they will have to go. When someone is employed as a temporary in Ottawa it is for the duration of his life. What we see now is the old struggle. It is not a fight between the provinces and Ottawa; it is the old struggle between the taxpayer and the bureaucrat, and the bureaucrats are much more numerous here than they are in the provinces.

Why not consider the question objectively? Those who made the report wanted to make it big and thick to impress those who would never read it. It is a well known fact that not one out of ten thousand people has read the full report of the Rowell-Sirois commission. But when the report is so big it creates a deep impression on the people, even on those who do not know how to read and write. It would have been much better for this country if some of the university professors and journalists who worked on the report had never been taught how to read and write. Therefore, sir, I have always agreed with the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in his statements of 1929 and 1930 when he said, as was quoted by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bracken):

> That it was a thoroughly vicious system to have one body raise taxes and another body expend the money thus secured.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

On February 5 of this year, I offered my services as an intermediary between the dominion and the provinces to try to get them to come to an understanding so that we would have order in this country and so that grants which are made to the provinces should no longer be considered as bribes but given as due. If we look at the British North America Act we shall see the equal treatment which was given the first four provinces at confederation. Naturally each province did not have as much, but the proportion was the same for all, and so long as the same proportion of money is paid to all provinces it is difficult to have an objection to it, although it is much better and economically sounder to give the provinces the opportunity to collect their own taxes and to do what they think they have to do with their own money. It is a question of decentralization. Decentralization is a Liberal principle. It is the principle of giving the same opportunity to all in every part of the country. That is the way in which the country was governed at the time of Alexander Mackenzie, at the time of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and at the time of Mackenzie King before Bennett came to power. I remember those happy days when the country was fortunate and when everybody seemed to be prosperous even in spite of the crash of 1929.

If I took the trouble to speak about this today it was not with the expectation to convert anybody right now, but it was to afford all hon. members the opportunity to think over what has been said. I may be right; I may be wrong. I am not prejudiced, but I hope that in the near future the quarrels between some provinces and Ottawa will stop. I find it a disgrace. The provinces are considered wrong because they do not accept the views of this government, because they are not ready to accept what has been cooked up in the Rowell-Sirois report.

It is not a question of so many more millions to be given by Ottawa, because I submit that the provinces have a right to expect that the same proportion will be paid to all. When it is done to all the provinces there can be no question of bribing. I can remember that not later than last year the question came up of giving other countries some large gifts which would have to be paid out of taxes. Members of parliament were told, "If you do not vote for this, you will not have family allowances any longer." If that is not blackmail, I do not know what blackmail is. That was not said by the present minister; it was said by someone else who was putting undue pressure.

That is not the way to act with the provinces. The provinces have a right to be

proud and dignified because they have exclusive rights within their jurisdiction under the British North America Act. I need not refer hon. members to the various provisions of that imperial statute because they know that the provinces on the one hand, and the dominion on the other have exclusive jurisdiction respectively. That means that the provinces are the equal of the dominion in their respective fields. The dominion is asking the provinces to make a concession in connection with taxing powers and in return the provinces will be given the returns from the collection of those taxes. It cannot go on like that. Let the provinces be independent; let Ottawa be independent, but let us all be friendly. I hope that in the near future, with the fine disposition of the Minister of Finance who is open-minded and broadminded, and with the equally fine disposition of the premiers who have not accepted the proposals, there will be a complete revision of what has been done with seven provinces. This should be done at the earliest possible opportunity in order that all the provinces can be treated fairly and squarely.

If the leader of the opposition has reached this conclusion, I congratulate him. I do not know how he will vote. His speech was based on the false principle of gifts. I am against gifts to provinces as I am against gifts to other countries. The provinces should be given the right to maintain themselves through their own taxation.

Mr. JOHN T. HACKETT (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, the title of the bill is rather long but it is fully descriptive. It is styled:

An act to authorize the government of Canada to enter into agreements with the governments of the provinces pursuant to which, in return for compensation, the provinces agree to refrain from levying certain taxes for a limited period.

As its title indicates, this bill entails the surrender by the provinces to the dominion, for a period at least, of certain constitutional rights. It suggests that among some of the provinces there are necessities which should be met. As a preface to what I have to say, I should like to make two definite statements. The first is that I believe that, as a civilized community, it behooves Canada so to administer its affairs, in conjunction with the provinces, that need may be relieved where it exists. I do not wish anything I say to be interpreted as hostile to a revision of taxing rights and to a reallocation between the dominion and the provinces of the revenue of those taxes. The next statement is that these questions are not free from controversy. It is possible for men to hold divergent views, to hold them in good faith and with some degree of enlightenment. For that reason I was sorry to hear the acting leader of the C.C.F. group state this afternoon that two premiers—there were three a short time ago—

Mr. MICHAUD: There will not be any before long.

Mr. HACKETT: My hon. friend would be prophetic; if he were better acquainted with the attachment to principle of the people of the province in which is located the county I represent, he would not be quite as certain of the accuracy of the allegation he has made. Be that as it may, I am sorry that the hon. gentleman who leads the C.C.F. group found it necessary to characterize the attitude of two or three premiers as political. If my ears did not mislead me, he said that they had been playing politics. I would be loath to make that suggestion in view of the sound arguments which were advanced by each of those gentlemen at the conference and, forsooth, because of many convictions which I hold myself. One of the characteristics of this chamber and of our political institutions is that a man may state views which may not be universally accepted, without his motives being challenged.

This bill, if enacted, will enable the federal government to pay to the provinces the sums of money stated in the bill, the consideration being that the provinces yield for a period of time their right to levy certain taxes. The policy of taxing by one authority and spending by another is false in principle and wasteful in practice. It has been condemned by all authorities, including Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and by none more roundly, more completely, more forcefully and more eloquently, than by the right hon. gentleman who leads this house.

We are told that agreements have been entered into separately with seven of the nine provinces. In several instances these agreements have been renegotiated because a province, finding that some other province had subsequently to its arrangement with the dominion, received better terms, came back and insisted that it be given terms as satisfactory as those conceded to the last province with which the dominion had dealt.

I should like to make it quite clear that my objection to this method of dealing with the provinces rests on what I believe to be a principle. This country's genesis, this country's beginning, this country's origin as a confederation rests on conference, on agreements arrived at in the open, and if we are to put an end to the era of conference and agreement which makes it obligatory that all the provinces should be treated in a way which is satisfactory to all, then I fear that we have come upon very sad days for this dominion.

How are we to deal with each of these provinces separately? What are we contending for; what is the group which sits to my immediate left contending for as well as other groups in the house in the field of labour? It is that everybody should have complete freedom of bargaining. Is one to believe that a province whose necessities are extremely urgent has the same freedom of bargaining the same power and capacity to bargain with respect to its own interests as a province which has a relatively larger revenue?

To take a case, let us take that of Nova Scotia; let us remember that only a short time ago an announcement was made in the house that the province of Nova Scotia had finally accepted the offer which had been made to it by the dominion. Here are the words of the premier of Nova Scotia only a little over a year ago. At page 419 of the Dominion and Provincial Submissions and Plenary Conference Discussions he said this:

In return we are asked to surrender our rights to collect income and corporation taxes, two fields which, as I said, yielded last year something in excess of one and a half billion dollars. We have then to surrender the rights to collect income and corporation tax, two fields which I said last year yielded something over one billion and a half dollars. That is the position which the provinces are asked to take. Let me ask you, Mr. Chairman, and the delegates here, whether they represent the dominion government or the provinces, let me ask anyone who is within sound of my voice, let me ask that greater body to which we as public servants are all accountable, the citizens of our provinces or of Canada, let me ask any of those people whether they think that is a fair or honourable or dignified position in which to place the provinces in this dominion. Provincial autonomy will be gone. Provincial independence will vanish. Provincial dignity will disappear. Provincial governments will become mere annuitants of Ottawa. Provincial public life—and I do not think these words are too strong—will be debased and degraded. I cannot think that such a state of affairs is desired by the representatives of the government of Canada here today, my one-time colleagues. I am sure that they have no wish or desire to see such a state of affairs come to pass in this country, nor can I believe that such a state of affairs is desired by the people of this country.

Yet the same hon. gentleman, if we are to believe what has been stated in the house, has signed an agreement with the dominion. He has had to yield up the dignity of provincial life. He has had to foreswear the autonomy in which he believed. Why? Because he and his people have been starved into that acquiescence. I say, Mr. Speaker, that agreements which rest upon a basis of that kind are insecure; they are not durable, and they will not bring about a happy, contented or prosperous Canada.

[Mr. Hackett.]

The taxing powers under the constitution have been divided between the federal and the provincial authorities. It is now sought so to divide them that the federal government may collect the taxes and pay over large sums to the provinces. That system is subversive of the whole idea of confederation and it will make, as has been said by the premier of Nova Scotia, vassals of the provinces. I submit that it is far better that a dominion-provincial conference be called together and that an arrangement be arrived at with all the provinces whereby each province, retaining its right to tax within the terms of the constitution, shall provide by direct taxation for its own needs.

How did this difficulty come about? We have heard this afternoon something said about the Rowell-Sirois report. At the time that study was undertaken the provinces were in the greatest distress. That situation has been modified. The party that now needs money most urgently is the dominion. The dominion, having acquired taxing rights from the provinces for a period of time, having enjoyed them for the duration and for the purpose only of winning the war, directed them to another purpose. It used them to win an election. It used the proceeds of the taxing rights conceded to it by the provinces for the purpose of winning the war for the purpose of providing family allowances. Family allowances are an excellent thing. Dishonesty is not a virtue. When a government is in possession of certain borrowed taxing rights and revenues for a specific purpose and it diverts them to another purpose, it seems to me it is nothing short of dishonest. Filial piety is a fine thing itself, but were a young man to break into the home of a neighbour and take away a large sum of money and, with a portion of it, buy an armchair or an automobile for his parents, his conduct would hardly be lauded.

That is exactly what has happened here. But that is not all. At the end of the period, when the time came to return to the provinces their taxing rights, the dominion said: We cannot do that because, if we do, we shall not be able to continue these social services, social services which were excellent in themselves but which, in reality were within the jurisdiction of the provinces, which, upon a proper reallocation of the taxing privileges, were better equipped and better able to provide those services than was the dominion itself.

We have found that the dominion received something over $2 billion from the exercise of these taxation rights. It paid out to the provinces, as the leader of my party said last

night, about $117 million per annum during the war, keeping the balance for its own purpose. The amount has increased rapidly since that time. It was $117 million during the war, $138 million in 1945, $198 million in 1946, and according to the table which the Minister of Finance put on *Hansard* last night, it will be $228 million for 1947. There is evidence of the unsatisfactory result following the method which the government has pursued. It has made a secret arrangement with one province and another secret arrangement with another province, and when the first province has found out what has happened it has required a larger amount of money.

An hon. MEMBER: How were they secret?

Mr. ABBOTT: There were no secret arrangements made with anyone.

Mr. MACKENZIE: We are not a Tory party.

Mr. HACKETT: As to the secrecy, they were not made openly in public conference; they were not made with the knowledge of all the provinces; and the point I am endeavouring to make, Mr. Speaker, is that any arrangement with a province which is made outside, the knowledge of all the provinces, any arrangement which is made in the absence of any member of the family, is a secret arrangement and one which tends to undermine the very basis of confederation, one which makes for rivalries and jealousies and for misunderstanding throughout the country.

We have just about emerged from a period of sordid division which has prevailed throughout the land since the first great war. It is not my intention to go into all the details of that sad story which grew out of the question of where Canada's duty lay with regard to defence. You know, Mr. Speaker, that the situation was such that a large element, a very respectable and intelligent element in one section of the country was told and told frequently that it had no duty to serve anywhere unless this country were attacked. We are through with that. The fallacy of those statements has been brought home to those who made them. It was only the other day that we enacted in this house legislation to provide for tribunals before which members of visiting forces who had misconducted themselves might be haled, meaning, if it meant anything, that visiting forces would come to Canada for the purpose of coordinating their military endeavour with our own, so that our country might be, if not immune from attack, made strong in resisting it.

Now we are at last free from the divisions which arose out of enforced military service, are we to be injected into a new era of division in the economic area by permitting the government again to rule by means of dividing? Are we to permit the government to make arrangements with individual provinces? Is each province to be put on the block and to be bid in according to its necessity or the whim of him who has the moneybag?

This whole idea of centralizing taxation is bringing to Canada a theory and practice which are entirely contrary to the scheme of government which was developed and enacted eighty years ago; and if we are to continue, as my leader said, to permit the centralizing of the taxing power and of the spending agencies in Ottawa we are imperilling confederation. The interests of this country are too diverse. Our origins, our outlook, our hopes are so far apart that they cannot find expression in a unitary form of government. We can only hope to exist if complete and continuing provincial autonomy be preserved in this country.

We have been led astray to some extent, I think, by the use of words. I noticed that the minister last night referred to the "rental of fields of taxation". That is not exactly a new phrase. It is rather a glittering one, and it is certainly a loose one. It is not unlike that other term used by a master of words, "lend-lease", which was really an aphorism to describe acts of war, while the semblance of peace was maintained. I say again that the words "rental of fields of taxation" are misleading. We are witnessing the transfer of provincial rights to the dominion. It is all very well to talk of it in terms of rental; but, once an act of this description is perpetrated, it is difficult to undo it. In my hand I have the report of the royal commission on dominion-provincial relations, and the last words found in the first volume—which is really the last volume, because it is the report—indicate the aim of the transfer and make clear how final is the step that will be taken if this bill be passed. Here are the words found at page 259:

> Where legislative power over a particular subject matter is divided, it is ordinarily desirable that these powers should be pooled under the control of a single government in order to secure unified effort in administration.

And on the same page in a preceding paragraph we find these words:

> Thus the dominion must always hesitate long before withdrawing a grant. The provinces know this and they are not seriously impressed by threats of such action. The power to withdraw the grant is not an effective sanction except against the most flagrant of abuses.

So that we can draw but small consolation from the fact that this is only a five-year agreement. When these moneys have been paid and this method of dealing with the provinces has been established we shall, I fear, have gone just one step farther toward complete centralization of administration and centralizing of taxation in this dominion. The result will mean rivalry, dissatisfaction and waste; it will mean that the provinces will be weakened and will be forced, as Nova Scotia was forced, to accept the terms of the dictator, the centralizer, the powerful totalitarian who holds the purse strings.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ABBOTT: What nonsense!

Mr. HACKETT: I hear hon. gentlemen opposite dissenting. I naturally do not wish and cannot hope to force my views on anyone. I merely wish to express them. But when that dissent comes from hon. gentlemen from my own province, I marvel at their temerity; because if there is an element in this country which is interested in the maintenance of the integrity of the constitution, if there is an element in this country which needs the British North America Act and needs the power given to it by the constitution to develop its own institutions, to advance its own culture, to interpret its own soul, it is the element represented by the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite. I for one would feel remiss in the duty which is vested in me by my electors did I not say these few words against the terms of the bill and against the philosophy which underlies it.

I say again that our constitution found its genesis in understanding and in conference. Everyone who knows the story of Canada will recall that in 1866 only the two Canadas and Nova Scotia seemed willing to come into confederation. New Brunswick was not interested then. It was not until after what were called the Fenian raids, after the fear of invasion had arisen, that the latter province changed its mind and decided that it would participate in the strength and power which come from brotherhood, understanding and complete disclosure. Could confederation ever have been achieved if the fathers had gone about knocking at one door of each province? This dominion could never have been born had it not been for the endless conferences and a fathomless spirit of trust and faith which the various provinces placed in each other.

I want to say just one word before I take my seat. No one has greater awareness than I of the transcendant abilities of the right hon. gentleman who leads this parliament. But when his story is told, free from all propaganda and all prejudice, I think it will be said that his genius—his sorry genius at times—has found expression in the creation of situations which the Canadian people were frequently unable to resist, although these situations were neither helpful to nor healthy for them. I reiterate what I said a moment ago about family allowances. The people wanted family allowances; to get them they had to sacrifice provincial autonomy and accept centralized authority in this government.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Why did the hon. member vote for them?

Mr. HACKETT: That is a pertinent question. I am not going to vote for the bill which is now before the house, if it comes to a vote. I did not vote for family allowances, and I would not have voted for them had I been here because I believe it was a mistake in principle to introduce them as they were introduced, a mistake that will cost all the provinces of this country dearly, and none more than the province of Quebec. Only a short time ago this house was asked to pass a resolution, which resulted in an amendment to the constitution. Thus was another situation created! The good province of Quebec was to have eight more seats in this house than it had before; and for that mess of pottage the members opposite consented, by a mere expression of party whim, by a mere parliamentary majority, that that sacred thing, the constitution, might be torn up.

I will point out one other instance in which a situation was created that men just could not resist. Possibly some hon. members will remember the plebiscite. What was that plebiscite? The people of Quebec—not the people of Canada—had been promised there would be no war.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HACKETT: The people of Quebec were promised there would be no participation in war. The people of Quebec were promised there would be no overseas service.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Never.

Mr. HACKETT: When the war came, what happened? Quebec was not asked to relieve the government from its promise; the whole dominion was asked, to which no promise had ever been made. Quebec refused to relieve the government from the promise which had been made to it; the plebiscite sought relief from the whole dominion.

An hon. MEMBER: What has that to do with the bill?

Mr. HACKETT: It has this to do with it, that one situation after another has been created which, I suggest with all respect, are as cynical as they seem to be irresistible. They have been hostile to the interests of the people; yet, as in this instance, there are provinces in need, and their need is so great that they are being forced, as it were, into surrendering their autonomy, which is the genesis and the basis of confederation. Once provincial autonomy disappears, of necessity the dominion will dissolve, because there is not sufficient identity between the different elements of the country for them to submit to an all-pervading and unitary government.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am not intervening in the debate at all, but I should like to ascertain the wish of the house in regard to this evening's procedure. It was our intention to ask that private bills be called at seven o'clock, but notice was not given. Therefore, if the house would prefer to have them deferred until tomorrow evening at seven o'clock that will be quite satisfactory. I should not like to call them at seven o'clock this evening without unanimous consent. There are several on the order paper.

Mr. BRACKEN: We will be disposed to accept the judgment of the acting leader of the government in the matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Then we will call them at seven o'clock this evening, with the consent of the house.

Mr. BENTLEY: From seven to eight?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not later than eight o'clock.

(Translation):

Mr. GEORGES H. HEON (Argenteuil): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the government should have waited until the last days of an already quite long session to introduce this bill. As a matter of fact, I feel that none of the measures which have been put forward during the session now nearing its end, was more important than the one which is before us today. This bill, if it is favourably considered by the house, will enable the central government to enter into agreements with the provincial governments, pursuant to which the provinces, for a consideration, will sell their already limited direct taxation powers, with a redemption right apparently exercisable after five years. The language of the bill is by no means clear, because of the ambiguity of the definition of the "value of gross national product"—which will apparently be the value as estimated by the dominion statistician by "methods generally recognized as the accepted statistical techniques"—and because of the highly intricate calculations by means of which the compensation to be paid will be determined. I doubt whether the Canadian ratepayers who, after all, will once again have to pay for the proposed compensations, as they always have, will, unless they are well up in mathematics be able to make or understand the complicated calculations whereby they will take with one hand what they afterwards will give away with the other.

However, if the proposed measure is difficult to understand as regards definitions and figures, it suddenly becomes quite clear when enumerating the constitutional rights which the provinces will have to relinquish if they want to obtain further subsidies. To put it briefly, the measure requires the provinces to renounce their definite constitutional right to levy personal income taxes, corporation income taxes, and, in the language of the bill itself "corporation taxes as defined in the agreement", as well as their right to levy succession duties, if they want to obtain further subsidies. Moreover, while that is not stated in the bill, we may easily conclude or at least surmise, that the provinces unwilling to accept the proposed bargain can expect the central government to keep on levying the taxes which the provinces are required to give up, but without any compensation for the latter. Anyone familiar with the more or less satisfactory financial position of some provinces whose taxation revenue is far from large, can understand that the temptation to barter their constitutional prerogatives for gold is too great to be long resisted. To those who believe in a greater fiscal and economic centralization, in cyclic finance, in ever-increasing subsidies, the proposed measure appears most advisable. I do not question in the least the good faith or the sincerity of those who hold such views; however, I do not agree with that doctrine as I have frequently indicated by my speeches and my votes in this house, because I believe, in the first place, that centralization, even if based on the best grounds cannot, if continually extended, but lead to socialism, which, as we know, does not favour overmuch private initiative and free enterprise. We can easily imagine where such a centralizing policy would lead, should our socialist friends assume power, as they so often think they will some day.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe in decentralization, both legislative and administrative, owing to our immense territory, the multiplicity and diversity of our natural resources, the particular needs of our ethnical group, settled mainly in the province of Quebec, with its praiseworthy and distinctive culture and traditions; because I also especially believe

that provincial rights, already restricted by our constitution and encroached upon to a considerable extent during two wars, must be protected instead of being auctioned off to the highest bidder. I see in this piece of legislation, another serious menace: the present policy is the clever but far-reaching continuation of a policy initiated during the first world war, by which the dominion government, at a slow though deliberate pace infringes more and more upon provincial sources of revenue. Should this policy be pursued any longer—and it will seemingly be perpetuated in spite of everything—the provinces, some having almost reached that point already, would be completely at the mercy of the dominion government in the matter of fiscal needs.

To my mind, such is not the spirit and even less the basis of the federal pact. Our authorities in constitutional law, in the Quebec universities, at any rate, have always taught, and our courts have often emphasized that our constitution rests on the autonomy of the provinces in their own spheres. Some people, knowing that the fiscal rights of the provinces are limited to direct taxation and that incomes and profits are the main sources of this method of taxation, realize that the surrender of these sources to the dominion government, even at a huge price, can neither be approved nor promoted by supporters of autonomy and decentralization. I do not hesitate to state that I have always belonged to that school of thought, even before I entered parliament and before the Hon. Mr. Duplessis became premier of my province.

For Quebec particularly, each constitutional right surrendered represents a real danger, perhaps not so much for the time being as for the future. In fact, considering the new ideas afloat, which lead almost inevitably to absolute socialism and the omnipotent state taking over all economic and financial activities, considering also the veiled hostility forever smouldering in certain quarters against Quebec and French Canadians, do we know what the future has in store for us, and more especially, what will be the complexion of future dominion governments?

I have already said and take pleasure in repeating that personally, at any rate, I prefer the guarantees and rights granted by our constitution to the good will and possible sympathy of future dominion governments. Mr. Speaker, six provinces, after months of bargaining and overbidding, felt that they ought to sign an agreement based on the surrender of their rights: no doubt they acted after serious consideration, free from all compulsion, I hope, and convinced that they had taken the right course. Although I am indeed most happy that, by holding back, they finally secured tidy sums of money, I cannot approve of the methods, tactics and procedures followed with respect to the presentation and signing of the agreements.

However, one should not conclude from what I have said that I am opposed to the payment of new and more substantial subsidies to needy provinces. I have a great deal of admiration and respect for Canadians of all racial origins who have settled in the west, and also for the courageous maritimers who have played a most glorious part in the history of our country. I readily agree that they were treated unfairly in the past and despite the fact that their population is smaller and their sources of taxation less numerous, they are nevertheless entitled to the same social security, the same full employment, and the same general services as the provinces whose population and revenues are larger. I would approve with much pleasure and satisfaction an agreement under which the dominion government and the more favoured provinces would agree to pay to provinces actually in need subsidies which they could justify, after collecting all the taxes they reasonably can. Every Canadian will approve the payment of additional subsidies to those provinces which can show their real need for them; however, I cannot agree that those same provinces should be placed in a situation where they have to sell, surrender, loan or rent acquired and fundamental rights in order to obtain that to which they are inalienably entitled.

Mr. Speaker, La Chambre de Commerce de Montréal, which no one can, in good faith, charge with electoral propaganda or partiality, submitted through sheer patriotism and a sincere desire to help the government, a brief on the ticklish matter of dominion-provincial fiscal relations. The report had been previously unanimously adopted by the executive council of the chamber on April 2, 1947. I wish to stress the fact that I agree with the recommendations set forth in the report, and that my views on the legislation under consideration are practically the same as those of the Chambre de Commerce. For instance, on pages 3 and 4 of section No. 1 of the brief, the Chambre de Commerce states the following:

La Chambre de Commerce is of the opinion that the present dominion proposals would entail too large an economic and fiscal centralization. However, it considers that it would be urgent to put forth clear proposals satisfactory to all concerned, governments and taxpayers.

And further:

The present legislative procedure constitutes, by its definition, at least partial centralization, not only with respect to collection of taxes, but also to legislative initiative in the field of taxation, which hinders the free use of the rights guaranteed the provinces by the constitution. One must not forget that the constitution limits the powers of the provinces to direct taxation and that a direct taxation policy rests upon the right to tax income and profits. For the above reasons, the Chambre de Commerce is opposed to such centralization.

And I conclude with another quotation from the same brief:

Unfortunately, it is impossible to ensure sufficiently uniform conditions as between one province and another without a certain contribution of subsidies, but the Chambre de Commerce is of the opinion that it should be restricted as much as possible.

Any province which has not yet decided to relinquish all taxation powers in the fields covered by the agreements should not authorize the carrying out of a federal permanent plan on economic control and social security, if, in order to maintain its constitutional rights it must, five years later, withdraw from and thereby disorganize such a plan.

On page 5 of the same section, the brief suggests the following basis of negotiations:

Both federal and provincial governments should come to an agreement which would clearly define their respective fields of direct taxation, according to their respective rights and needs, on the basis of the following fundamental principles—

(a) Each government to keep the power of initiating legislation in the taxation fields granted to it by the constitution, which is the only system consistent with the exercise of the rights pertaining to their respective jurisdictions;

(b) Provincial governments, being confined to the field of direct taxation, should be given the assurance that they may cultivate it according to their needs.

(c) The various governments should devise means to simplify tax collection and to exchange information on ways and means of simplifying or standardizing legislation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I ask my hon. friends to the left as well as to the right not to interpret my attitude as being prompted by picayune electioneering motives. I am not voting against this measure because it is brought down by a Liberal federal administration, nor, despite what some hon. members may think, because the Quebec provincial administration, under the leadership of Premier Duplessis, takes a definite stand on provincial autonomy, but for the simple and only reason that I have always looked upon legislative and fiscal decentralization as the policy best suited to serve and to protect the interests of the people in the future. I would oppose this bill, were it presented by a Conservative or other federal administration. I would be on the side of any Liberal provincial administration which would advocate the policy of decentralization and autonomy in which I believe. After these remarks, no one doubts, I hope, that I shall vote against the bill.

(Translation):

Mr. J. I. HAMEL (St. Maurice-Lafleche): Mr. Speaker, the bill now being considered is, in my opinion, one of the most important of the whole session and probably of the present parliament, since it relates to the powers of the various legislative bodies of the country. I deem it my duty to state the reasons on which I shall base my vote.

First, in my humble opinion, the bill is unconstitutional and ultra vires. A legislation is ultra vires and unconstitutional when it is contrary to the basic principles of the constitution. To my mind, the present measure infringes upon the fundamental principles of the Canadian constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that this bill is a violation of the British North America Act for two main reasons.

First, (a) it empowers the federal government to collect direct taxes for provincial objects. But the levying of direct taxes for provincial objects is an exclusive privilege of the provincial legislatures. The British North America Act is positive on this matter and section 92 reads as follows:

(Text):

In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say,—

2. Direct taxation within the province in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial purposes.

(Translation):

Who will dare claim that such revenues are not wholly or largely levied for provincial purposes, inasmuch as the bill provides that, by means and out of these revenues, the federal government will grant provinces subsidies possibly in excess of $200,000,000 a year?

(b) It infringes upon the constitution because it despoils the provinces—or some of them at least—of their powers of direct taxation. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it does despoil them for not only does it exhaust all reasonable possibilities in this field but, in addition, it penalizes provinces for refusing; in the case of the province of Quebec, it does so to the tune of $40,000,000 a year.

Second, besides violating the constitution, the bill marks a dangerous departure from the sound economic principle that taxpayers' money should be spent by the same legislative body that levies taxes.

Third, the centralization entailed by the bill, will only multiply the iniquities already suffered by my compatriots, by further extending, at their prejudice, the federal government's sphere of influence.

Fourth, the refusal by the two central provinces to surrender rights guaranteed by the constitution, unfairly penalizes them to the extent of $100,000,000 a year. I see no alternative for those two provinces—which, according to the 1941 census, hold 64 per cent of the population of this country—but jointly to consider the possibilities and desirability of secession. Unless the central government agrees to reconsider the matter, I wonder what other choice is left open to those two provinces.

Fifth and last, because of the many uncertainties I mentioned in the debate on the budget, which are far from being cleared up by the bill, I shall cast my vote against its second reading.

(Text):

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, on the second reading of this bill I wish to call the attention of the house and the minister to the fact that, although it provides for compensation for the nine provinces of Canada in consideration of their refraining from levying income and other taxes, there is no mention of remuneration or compensation for Yukon. Yukon levied personal and corporation income taxes, but under agreement with the federal government it refrained and still refrains from levying income taxes. For a few years, Yukon received a grant of money in compensation for that, but that was discontinued and has not been resumed. The reason given by the federal government for not resuming compensation to Yukon is that the territory makes a profit on the sale of liquor. It is true that Yukon makes a few thousand dollars on the sale of liquor in which the federal government generously shares, but where Yukon makes thousands, the provinces make millions and they still get their compensation. I wonder if the minister could tell me why Yukon has been overlooked in this legislation and whether he has any plan in mind for compensating Yukon in some other way for not levying income tax.

Mr. ABBOTT: Perhaps I could answer the hon. member at the committee stage if that would be convenient.

On motion of Mr. Bentley the debate was adjourned.

[Mr. Hamel.]

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1947-48

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting supplementary estimates for the financial year ending March 31, 1948, was presented by Hon. Douglas Abbott (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the house, and referred to the committee of supply.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at seven o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SENATE BILLS—FIRST AND SECOND READING

Bill No. 450, for the relief of Elrick Montgomery Barton—Mr. Maybank.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 432 for the relief of Pierre-Ben-Danais Warren.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 433, for the relief of Ethel Florence Rhodes Pompetti, otherwise known as Ethel Florence Crowdy Pompetti.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 434, for the relief of Elisa Jamoul Hull.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 435, for the relief of Ernest Stanley Rundell.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 436, for the relief of Thelma Lillian Dalton Hilger, otherwise known as Thelma Lillian Dalton Goerner.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 437, for the relief of Mary Alice Berrigan Hamelin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 438, for the relief of Dorothy Mary Boyce Jackson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 439, for the relief of Edith Oberfeld Mintz.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 440, for the relief of Roger Lebeau. —Mr. Maybank.

Bill 441, for the relief of Shelia Marcus Issenman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 442, for the relief of Zenobia Perrow Broadbent Emond.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 273, for the relief of Eileen Maude Gardner Richards.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 274, for the relief of Frances Audrey Gray Lacaille.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 275, for the relief of Aline Theoret Larose.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 276, for the relief of Margaret Betty Rollings Burman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 277, for the relief of Beatrice Dorothy Pountney Alker.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 278, for the relief of Margaret Jean Duff Dorval.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 279, for the relief of George Somerville Blackie Begg.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 280, for the relief of Lillian Guerasio Galardo.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 281, for the relief of Stewart Davidson Myles.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 282, for the relief of Dorothy Bradford Hurley.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 283, for the relief of Elsie McCormick Albers.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 284, for the relief of George Wilson Dyce.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 285, for the relief of Rita Johnson Cherrier.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 286, for the relief of Esther Cole Zeesman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 287, for the relief of Celia Yaffe Dubinsky.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 288, for the relief of Elsie Marlyn Garayt Johnson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 289, for the relief of Leone Rhea Leduc Metcalf.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 290, for the relief of James Arthur Ablett.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 291, for the relief of Goldie Slovinsky Tkatch.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 292, for the relief of Harold Fassett Staniforth.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 293, for the relief of Claire Morgan Lockner Middleton-Hope.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 295, for the relief of Rose Nemerofsky Silverstein.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 296, for the relief of James Albert Carruthers, otherwise known as James Albert Fell.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 297, for the relief of Ronald Edwin George.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 298, for the relief of Margaret Lena Bertha Dasen Scheffer.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 299, for the relief of Ethel Mary McKenzie Cramp.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 300, for the relief of Evelyn Alice Howard Smart.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 301, for the relief of Mary Margaret Tibbins Gogo.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 302, for the relief of Alfred Nelson Nickle.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 303, for the relief of Arthur Haigh MacGill.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 304, for the relief of Clinton Leslie Dobson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 305, for the relief of Bernard Stanley Bailey.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 306, for the relief of Archie William Young.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 307, for the relief of Olive Lever Sanborn Lead.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 308, for the relief of John Mackie.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 309, for the relief of Isabel Mercer Leboeuf.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 310, for the relief of Hilda Irene Gordon Lazarus.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 311, for the relief of Mary Margaret Bernice Walker Kennedy.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 312, for the relief of Gertie Rabin Bard.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 313, for the relief of Ruth Morrison Henderson Sidders.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 314, for the relief of Philip Berger.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 315, for the relief of Harold Swann.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 316, for the relief of Margaret Isabelle Curry.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 317, for the relief of Rosamond Edith Bean Crease.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 318, for the relief of Alma Mary Hanway Eccles.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 319, for the relief of Alberta Dorothy Olson Colby.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 320, for the relief of Clair Reginald McLaughlin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 321, for the relief of Eugene Klein.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 322, for the relief of Daniel Hudson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 323, for the relief of Eileen Edna Paget Bray Dundas.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 324, for the relief of Jessie Goodis Markis.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 325, for the relief of Julia Luella Audrey Cleroux Babbage.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 326, for the relief of Mile Kristo Yoja, otherwise known as Stanley Vadic.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 327, for the relief of Anthony Wavroch.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 328, for the relief of Mary Magee Glasheen.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 329, for the relief of Mary Ann Clorenda Archer Richardson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 330, for the relief of Gladys May Kay Oliver.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 331, for the relief of Henry Thomas Matthews.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 332, for the relief of Ivy Stapleton Brown.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 333, for the relief of John William Sydney Jordan.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 334, for the relief of Pamela Mary Gottschalk Muckell.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 335, for the relief of Winnifred Doris Cleaver Wooley.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 341, for the relief of Eileen Francis Murphy Kerson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 342, for the relief of Joyce Kathleen Reynolds Swards.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 343, for the relief of Anne Fishman Minsk.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 344, for the relief of Muriel Alice Goddard Perkins.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 345, for the relief of Irene Elizabeth Burke Robinson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 346, for the relief of Gardner Hinkley Prescott.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 347, for the relief of Joseph Amedee Alexis Cousineau.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 348, for the relief of Mildred Verna Ruth Schnaufer Case.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 349, for the relief of Robert Ralph Tripp.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 350, for the relief of Charles James Langevin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 351, for the relief of Edward Frank Fulton.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 352, for the relief of Pauline Bertha Marwick Dallison.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 353, for the relief of Evelyn May McNaught Grandison.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 354, for the relief of Margaret Turner Shaw Ward.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 355, for the relief of Olivier Pierre Bernard Laguex.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 356, for the relief of Hazel Mair Grant Rubin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 357, for the relief of Doris Louise Dickson McMurray.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 358, for the relief of Ethel Florence Barr Shiells.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 359, for the relief of Gabrielle Augustine Gilberte Desmarais Creelman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 360, for the relief of Christos C. Koukouvelis.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 361, for the relief of Aime Bibeau. Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 367, for the relief of Henry Eaton. —Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 368, for the relief of Lodie Kadei Nakel.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 369, for the relief of Margaret Sophie Bolenski Dubeau.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 370, for the relief of Marion Mapes Harvey Allinson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 371, for the relief of Frances Alice Egg Johnston, otherwise known as Frances Alice Egg Willey Johnston.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 372, for the relief of Selden Grant Stoddard.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 373, for the relief of Elmon Parker Law.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 374, for the relief of James Dewey, junior.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 375, for the relief of Peggy Alicia Stilwell Kneeland.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 376, for the relief of Alexander Monteith.—Mr. Croll.

Bill No. 379, for the relief of Evelyn Clara Woods Cross.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 380, for the relief of Minnie Braimaster Kazarensky.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 381, for the relief of Peter Moroz, otherwise known as Peter Morris.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 382, for the relief of Lorne Earl Barth.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 383, for the relief of Thomas Wynn Hayes, junior.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 384, for the relief of Claire Black Wolfe.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 385, for the relief of Anna Lovannah Theoret Wilson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 386, for the relief of Norma Lorraine Desrosiers.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 387, for the relief of Rose Jacobson Greenberg.—Mr. Maybank.

Bil No. 388, for the relief of Guido Corbo. —Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 389, for the relief of Harold Ashton Hugh Roberts.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 390, for the relief of Mary Kalichman Pulver.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 391, for the relief of Gaston Dorval Lachance.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 392, for the relief of Donat St. Jean.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 393, for the relief of Sheila Sydney Doner Gordon.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 394, for the relief of Thomas Walter John Moon.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 397, for the relief of Edward Charles Barron.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 398, for the relief of Violet Eileen Lepine Tickner.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 399, for the relief of Jean Lawrence Ritchie.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 400, for the relief of Livio Quintino Fantacci.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 401, for the relief of Bertha Bercovici Hamer.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 402, for the relief of Ann Bogdanof Millichamp.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 403, for the relief of Beatrice Elman Perlman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 404, for the relief of Grace Emily Dawes Matheson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 405, for the relief of Gabriel Burszan.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 406, for the relief of Doris Phoebe Potter Potts.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 407, for the relief of Richard Andrew Frame.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 408, for the relief of William Page. —Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 409, for the relief of Louis Gerstman.—Mr. Maybank.

THIRD READING

Bill No. 395, to incorporate the Canada Permanent Trust Company.—Mr. Cleaver.

TAX AGREEMENTS

COMPENSATION TO PROVINCES IN LIEU OF INCOME AND OTHER TAXES

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Abbott for the second reading of Bill No. 411, to authorize the government to enter into agreements with the governments of the provinces pursuant to which, in return for compensation, the provinces agree to refrain from levying certain taxes for a limited period.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. CHURCH: I wish to speak for just five or ten minutes on this section. I intended to say something on the second reading, but perhaps I can express my views on this clause. First of all, I should like to point out two or three facts in connection with this subject. The bill before the committee is one of considerable importance to me, representing as I do a city which is a large tax-paying corporation in Canada. This bill empowers the government to enter into agreements with the governments of the provinces, pursuant to which agreements, in return for compensation, the provinces agree to refrain from levying certain taxes for a limited period.

This whole problem of taxation was covered by the British North America Act. At that time there were no motor cars and no telephones; there was no radio; there was nothing of that kind, and the British North America Act was looked upon then as something after the fashion of the law of the Medes and Persians. It could not be changed. At confederation certain powers were vested in the provinces, and the municipal systems that came into being then were, one might say, almost an afterthought of the intentions of the founders of confederation. As a result of the system adopted then, we have overgovernment and overtaxation in the country now. We have a duplicate system, provincial and municipal, foisted on the country, with taxing powers. As a matter of fact, we have a triplicate system, federal, provincial and municipal. The bill we have before us tonight indicates the necessity for constitutional reform. This was admitted in all the discussions that led to the appointment of the Rowell-Sirois commission. I may say that I introduced a motion dealing with parliamentary, cabinet and constitutional reform, and the minister of justice of that day arose and said that he would appoint a royal commission. Such a commission was appointed with Chief Justice Rowell as its first chairman; later on he was succeeded by Mr. Sirois, and that commission, which has come to be known as the Rowell-Sirois commission, functioned for two or three years.

If this bill is to be the law for a short period; if this legislation is temporary, in my opinion it sounds the death-knell of the provincial system. We are virtually empowering the provinces to impose taxation, but we are also taking away from them certain powers they have. It gives Ontario only $67 million.

From confederation down to the year 1917, income tax was the exclusive prerogative of the municipalities, and many federal burdens, following confederation, were placed upon the municipalities which the fathers of confederation had not intended. The result was that the municipalities had that form of taxation down to 1917, when Sir Thomas White was Minister of Finance, and they objected to the dominion invading their field at the time. But they were told it was just to be for a year or two during the war and when the war was over it was intended to be the end of it. But they still hung on to it.

We now come to the province. There was no income tax in the province before. It was the exclusive field of the municipality. But after the action taken by the dominion government with regard to income tax in 1917, the province came along and imposed a tax of a mill on the dollar of assessment on the municipalities and raised a large sum of money in our city at the time. It was a burden on real estate from 1917 to 1921. I want to point out in connection with this item that we must be careful that we do not adopt the principle which caused the separation of the American colonies from the mother country, namely, taxation without representation. That is a principle which is largely wrapped up in this bill. What I wish to see is the policy of confederation with regard to taxation. I believe, for confederation, in the old Cornish battle-cry, "Each for all and all for each." I believe that in this bill there has been the greatest invasion of the rights of the municipalities and the provinces. Ontario seems to be the forgotten province.

In connection with the merits of this bill, the allotment of the province is $67,000,000. When you look at the return of the Minister of National Revenue in the blue book, at pages 24 and 25, and see the returns from the income and excise taxes, it is a large sum of money running into $423 million. In connection with income tax the tables are set out at pages 897,

898 and 899 of the last issue of the Canada Year Book. I will not read the figures. The province of Ontario has been discriminated against. The taxation clauses of the Sirois report are unfair to our province and to Quebec. According to a return I saw, those two provinces pay about seventy per cent of the total taxes of the whole dominion. There are certain provinces which one might call "have" provinces and there are two of them. Then there are certain provinces one might call 'have not" provinces. The "have not" provinces have been given a large share of the funds of this bill. I wish to say that Ontario is the forgotten province.

In conclusion, may I say in connection with these agreements that I hope they will be only temporary. They are interfering with all the municipalities. The municipalities are starving. They cannot have any money left under the system of taxation we have, which is a system which I described as that of robbing Peter to pay Paul, and under which the finances of the "have not" provinces are loaded on to the "have" provinces. How the municipalities are to live, I do not know. They are all having a hard fight. There are high taxes on real estate and on personal property. When you see that form of taxation which the municipalities have relied upon in order to get public buildings roads and public utilities, libraries, more schools and many social services, being assessed for social services by the dominion and province, it is a heavy burden. If it is only temporary, it is another matter. But on behalf of a large tax-paying city I protest against this way of handing out moneys and dealing with agreements. There are two forms of agreement in the bill. One is a statutory agreement under the British North America Act, with statutory subsidies paid. Then you add on to that what you might call politics. Politics is the science of government. A large number of others have been added on by statute from time to time regarding Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, provincial subsidies, Alberta natural resources, Railway Act, Manitoba resources, Saskatchewan and the maritimes. Our province seems to be the forgotten one when it comes to this.

I believe that charity should begin at home and that the two industrial provinces should have enough to live on. At the present time they have not; nor have the municipalities. The result is that taxes are a burden on industry, labour and capital. There should be some way of lessening that. We should be able to adopt a better system than the one we have, which is a haphazard system of handing out in some form varying amounts of money, with no standard agreement and no equality of treatment.

[Mr. Church.]

(Translation):

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Chairman, I shall take but a few minutes. The bill now under consideration is of such importance that I would be remiss in my duties were I to refrain from taking part in the debate.

How often have I objected to such intrusion of the federal government in exclusively provincial matters. Why have the government declined to call another conference with the provinces?

Because they knew full well that they were at fault. There are lawyers of great renown in the cabinet. They also know that the provinces enjoy rights guaranteed by the constitution. Why not respect the provincial jurisdiction and privileges recognized by constitutional law?

The federal government is ready to pay the price for ensuring the betrayal of the provinces. Only Judas is capable of such a foul deed. I fearlessly say that the hon. Maurice Duplessis had ample reason to state that he would not permit his province to be crucified, were it on a golden cross.

On July 21 next, the Huntingdon constituency will vindicate the hon. prime minister of the province of Quebec for his devotedness, his loyalty, his straightforward, energetic and splendid attitude toward his province. I have spoken.

(Text):

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

On section 7—Payments respecting income tax on specified corporations.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but this has been going a little bit more rapidly than I had dared to hope. I have an amendment to section 7 which I shall have to introduce or ask one of my colleagues to move. I think it will be here in a moment, but in the meantime I might avail myself of this opportunity to answer one or two points which were made in the course of the debate this afternoon. Perhaps we might do that under clause 6, which is the clause now under consideration.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are on section 7.

Mr. ABBOTT: Then, under section 7, although what I have to say has no relevance to section 7. That clause is something which is apart from the agreement. However, perhaps the committee will allow me to make these general remarks under section 7.

In the course of the debate a number of points were raised by some of the members who spoke, in particular the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Stanstead who is not in his seat at the moment, with which I should perhaps deal briefly. I should like to deal, first, with a point which was raised by the hon. member for Stanstead when he said that the negotiations which had led up to these agreements were secret negotiations and that the attitude of the dominion governmen in presenting these proposals—and I am paraphrasing his words—was characterized by cynicism. I take strong exception to that description. There has been no secrecy about the negotiations with the seven provinces which have so far evinced their intention of signing agreements with the dominion. In my explanatory statement last evening on the second reading of the bill I outlined in considerable detail and in chronological order the various steps which led up to the conclusion of these agreements. Any discussions with any particular province have been promptly made known to the other provinces with which the dominion was negotiating, and, moreover, have been made known promptly to all provinces, even those which up to the present time have evinced no particular desire to enter into agreements with the dominion. I could refer particularly, of course, to the negotiations which took place last December with the premier of British Columbia, in which he placed before the dominion government the views of his province with respect to these agreements and following which, speaking broadly, it was decided that we would extend to that province the benefit of the escalator clause which had been made available to the other provinces. That understanding or agreement was conditional upon the provinces which had already evidenced their desire to enter into agreements on the basis of the original budget proposals being prepared to agree; and that offer was promptly made known to those other provinces. As I stated last night, they put forward the view that under those circumstances they felt their position should be reconsidered. It was reconsidered and in January—I have not the exact date before me—the new formula or new formulae which we worked out were made known to all the provinces.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that there have been no secret, hole-in-the-corner negotiations with anyone. The circumstances which made it necessary for the dominion to make an offer to the provinces in the budget speech of last year on an individual basis have been fully outlined, and there is no reason for me to review them now. But there has been no concealment, no secrecy, and no attitude of cynicism on the part of the dominion government in presenting these proposals to the provinces.

As I listened to the hon. member for Stanstead, knowing the interest he has in history I thought to myself there is nothing new under the sun. I remembered a letter which had been written by Sir John A. Macdonald to Hon. Joseph Howe in 1869, at the time confederation was being worked out and when agreements were being made between the various provinces. I sent out a note to the librarian, asking him to send me the letters of Sir John as collected by Joseph Pope; and I think it might be of passing interest if I were to quote from a letter written on January 12, 1869. I need not read the whole letter; some of it relates to other matters, but it does have to do with the negotiations which were going on at that time concerning financial arrangements between the provinces of the new confederation of Canada. This is the third paragraph of the letter. The letter itself is a very interesting document, and I commend it to all hon. members. It is to be found at page 83 of the "Correspondence of Sir John Macdonald, 1840-1891", as collected by Sir Joseph Pope. He is referring to Sir John Rose, who was then Minister of Finance.

> Rose, who will give you this, will meet you with a strong and sincere desire to come to some satisfactory arrangement. I need not, however, caution an experienced statesman like yourself, not to ask for too much. We shall have our own difficulties with the general parliament in carrying any concessions. Already has George Brown, through the *Globe*, protested against any pecuniary advantages being given to Nova Scotia, beyond those secured to them by the Union Act. This course will not at all deter us here from agreeing to what is reasonable, and staking our existence upon it in the legislature.
>
> The province of Quebec, whose government is the reverse of economical, will, we fear, attempt to put on the screws for additional pecuniary aid if it is granted to you. So you see that we must take great care as to every step we take.
>
> I have no doubt that you and Rose will find common standing ground, but whatever you agree upon must be kept strictly a secret. If divulged prematurely, the opposition press in Ontario will protest against any additional charges being put upon the people of that province, which, it is alleged, from its greater wealth, already bears more than its fair share of the public burdens. In Quebec, the united press will demand a slice for that province, and all the anti-papers in Nova Scotia will denounce the arrangement as being altogether insufficient and unsatisfactory, and you will have the usual charge brought aganst you of "selling your heritage for a mess of pottage," etc.
>
> It will be very difficult I know, for you, on your return, to resist the pressure of your friends to disclose the arrangement; but the answer should be satisfactory, that any arrangement with the government is of no value until

sanctioned by parliament, and that we, having the responsibility of carrying it, should have the opportunity of submitting it to the public and parliament at our own time, and in our own way.

I quote from that letter only to show that things have not changed a great deal in the last eighty years. As the French say, "Plus cela change, plus c'est la même chose"; and I just suggest to the hon. member for Stanstead that in these proposals to the provinces we have been at least as frank and open as was that great statesman and leader of the party of which the hon. gentleman is a distinguished member, Sir John Macdonald.

In the course of his speech last evening and today the leader of the opposition raised a number of points with which I should like to deal briefly. First, he made the point that he approves fiscal need grants, but that he would not be prepared to agree to anything which went beyond the requirements of fiscal need. The hon. member for Vancouver East asked what he meant by fiscal need. Of course he did not have an opportunity of replying and I do not suppose the hon. member particularly wished that he should. Well, I have no intention of defining fiscal need, either, but my understanding has always been that a grant to cover fiscal need would be a grant to enable a particular province or particular organization, whatever it might be, to balance its budget, and that no matter how extravagant the administration of the province might be.

Mr. BRACKEN: I would not agree with that definition.

Mr. ABBOTT: Well, that is one suggestion. Another might be that it would be a grant or an allocation to a province which would enable that province to maintain an average standard of services without imposing higher than average rates of provincial taxation. But whatever basis one may take, I suppose the broad principle is that the grant or allocation should be sufficient to enable the particular government, provincial or municipal, to discharge its legitimate responsibilities. Later in his speech the leader of the opposition questioned how long we could go on making payments to the less favoured provinces from money collected largely in the two most favoured provinces. Well, I found it hard to understand that position, because it seemed to me that the two attitudes were contradictory. How can you have fiscal need subsidies unless money which is collected in more favourable provinces is spent in less favoured areas? Then he went on to say, as I mentioned a moment ago, that he favoured payments to the extent that they met real fiscal need but not to the extent that they exceeded fiscal need; and he contrasted the payments of approximately $40,000,000 under the Sirois proposals with the $226,000,000, roughly, under the 1947 agreements. The first point I wish to make is that that comparison in itself—and I think my hon. friend will agree—is misleading, because the Sirois plan envisaged the assumption by the dominion of servicing provincial debts in addition to fiscal need subsidies. The total outlay for net debt service and sinking fund estimated for 1940 was $73 million. So if you add that to the $40 million contemplated by the Sirois report you have something like $120 million.

I think the committee would agree that since 1940 the practical value of taxation fields which are to be turned over to the dominion, or which it was suggested in the Sirois report should be turned over, have been greatly increased. The proposed 1947 agreement was made up of the statutory subsidies plus annual rentals for tax fields now occupied by the provinces.

I believe that on a moment's reflection the committee will agree that the rental for those taxation fields had to be high enough to compensate the so-called more favoured provinces for the tax sources which they were renting, and the rent, of course, is higher than the value of the tax fields in the less favoured provinces. The difference, I suggest to the committee, provides a convenient and, in fact, a largely automatic measure of the economic disadvantage and consequently the fiscal need of the less favoured provinces.

As I listened to the leader of the opposition I thought I should ask him if he considers that British Columbia, for example, is getting a higher rental than the tax fields are worth to that province. Does he believe that the payments to Manitoba and Nova Scotia are in excess of the fiscal needs of those provinces?

Then the leader of the opposition took exception, as did the hon. member for Stanstead, to the method of making agreements with the provinces individually. Well, I spent some time yesterday evening and I have spent considerable time on other occasions in outlining in some detail the efforts which were made by the dominion government through a series of conferences to arrive at a mutually satisfactory agreement with all the provinces. I see little purpose in my reiterating tonight what I have said on that score.

But I wish to make this observation, that a desire for agreement on both sides is necessary to arrive at an agreement. I do not wish to impute motives to anyone, and indeed I am not doing so, but what has taken place does

not convince me that there is a genuine desire on the part of all provinces to arrive at agreement. The budget speech of my predecessor in office, the present Minister of Justice, shows what the dominion was willing to offer. Seven of the provinces have now indicated that they are prepared to accept that. Since that budget only a little over a year ago, the governments of two provinces, Quebec and Ontario, have consistently failed to indicate on what terms they would be prepared to confer. It never seemed to me that there was much use in calling a conference without some kind of agenda to work on. Seven provinces have already evinced their desire to enter into an agreement, and there is little to confer on so far as taxing matters are concerned.

I want to repeat what I said before, that the dominion has repeatedly expressed its willingness to confer with all the provinces, and to confer with Ontario and Quebec if they would indicate some specific basis for conference.

I know I am not permitted to quote from a previous debate, and I do not intend to do so, but what was said by the Prime Minister as it is reported at pages 69 and 70 as to what Canada did in 1946 and 1947 is exactly what the leader of the opposition recommended in 1941 when he was Premier of Manitoba, namely not to permit one or two provinces to obstruct essential action to give justice to less favoured provinces.

Another point which the leader of the opposition made was that the proposed agreements make for centralization of taxing power. I say the dominion is not asking for the slightest abatement of the constitutional powers of any of the provinces. Their taxing powers remain intact. We are merely seeking to rent—and I use that term, although I know the hon. member for Stanstead took exception to it—taxation fields, which the Sirois report suggested should be exclusively and permanently federal.

Mr. HACKETT: After amendment.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is why I find it so difficult to understand the attitude of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, who was a staunch supporter of the Sirois report. It was the Sirois report which recommended that these powers be exclusively and permanently assigned to the dominion.

I am not going to quote from the speech of the leader of the opposition which was made at the conference of 1941, but I would point out that he strongly endorsed the permanent surrender of income and corporation taxes and succession duties to the dominion.

I do not suggest for one moment that the proposals which we put forward now are the most desirable. We had hoped that, as a result of a general conference, we could arrive at a general over-all understanding. They are perhaps not the best, but certainly in my judgment they are better than nothing at all. And it was no fault of the dominion government, may I say, that we were driven to this particular method.

There are one or two further points. The leader of the opposition referred to the well known statement made by the Prime Minister in 1929 and 1930 to the effect that the raising of money by one government to make grants to be spent by another government was a vicious principle. Neither the Prime Minister nor anybody else has ever disputed the truth of that. But this statement was taken from its context. It referred to unemployment relief grants and to other grants in aid where the provinces had control of expenditures and the dominion made grants in proportion to the expenditures, the full size of which it could not possibly control.

What is vicious, of course, about such grants is that they are open-ended commitments. The dominion has no possible means of controlling the extent of its liability. But the payments under the present agreements are not grants in aid. They are contractual payments in the form of rents for the use of taxation fields. The rent is determined by an objective and well known formula; the grant does not increase and the province can get no more if its administration is lax or if it is extravagant. I think the principle of a grant is vicious when there is an incentive to extravagance or inefficiency. But that is not true of the payments proposed under this agreement, because if the provinces inflate their budgets they still have to raise money by provincial taxation to balance them.

I believe I have covered most of the points raised. I must say I was not entirely clear, after listening to the leader of the opposition, whether he was for or against these agreements. I gathered, however, that on balance he was for them. He did make one other statement to which I would refer. He said we were backing away from the 1945 proposals. I covered that point yesterday evening in my statement upon introducing the bill. My hon. friend was good enough to quote what I said and, he having quoted it, I wondered how he could justify his stand that we are backing away.

I am going to repeat this evening what I said as it appears at page 5319 of *Hansard:*

> The details of our original proposals may of course change as a result of further study or of developing public opinion or of discussion with provincial governments at a general conference which will be necessary before they can be implemented. The proposed contributions which the dominion may be able to make in the field of public investment and social security may, as I have said publicly and as I advised the provinces which were negotiating with us last winter, have to be revised to take into account the substantial increase in the financial payments which the dominion has now undertaken to make as a rental for the tax fields in question.

Then I emphasized these words which he did not quote this afternoon:

> But the main objectives expressed in those proposals remain the guiding objectives of this government.

I leave it to the sense of the committee to decide whether or not the dominion government is backing away from those proposals.

Mr. BENTLEY: I do not know whether I am going to be able to make a speech at this stage. I have become a little confused within the last week or two with regard to the rules of the house and I find myself even more confused at the present time. Just before six o'clock I rose to speak and the minister requested the remaining time in order to introduce another matter which was important to the government and to the house. Therefore I adjourned the debate. It happened that during the dinner hour I had to attend the final meeting of the radio committee. Knowing that private bills were to come on at seven o'clock and would continue until eight o'clock if necessary, I did not think there was any great rush to get back and I was a little late in entering the chamber.

Mr. ABBOTT: I was in the same position.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The speech which the minister made was not strictly in order, but I think the committee was anxious to hear his statement. While it may not be strictly in order to make a general speech on this clause, I think with the permission of the committee the hon. member should be permitted to say what he wants to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. BENTLEY: I am not sorry that the slight irregularity occurred, even though it might have prevented my speaking, because I was interested in hearing the minister's statement. I had hoped to hear it in the proper place. I was afraid, Mr. Chairman, that possibly you might consider he was closing the debate and therefore I was diffident about asking your permission to speak. Before I proceed I want to say that I would have supported the principle of the bill if I had been here when it carried. But that does not mean that I agree with all that has been done.

This afternoon I listened to a couple of speeches which were most interesting, one by the versatile and amiable hon. member for Temiscouata. The hon. member went through quite a lengthy series of legal or mental gymnastics to arrive at a conclusion I would have arrived at through another process, one with which I would agree no matter what process was used. He argued that it was necessary for the dominion and the provincial governments to be independent, but that they should be friendly. I do not think anyone will dispute that conclusion.

Then the hon. member for Stanstead, not quite as versatile, but quite as earnest and a little ponderous, surprised me somewhat with his argument. One of his main arguments was that, while this agreement would be only for five years, it would be difficult to change it at the end of that period and therefore he was opposed to it. He said that it was different from what had happened eighty years ago. After eighty years he now opposes any change whatsoever, and yet in the same breath he says that we would not be able to make a change at the end of five years. I was unable to follow the hon. member in that line of reasoning, but otherwise he was interesting.

One of the things he referred to was that the provinces are responsible for their own position. Speaking for Saskatchewan, I want to say that we would not hesitate to accept that responsibility if all other things were equal. I think I can say the same thing for our sister prairie provinces. In order to do that we would have to turn back the pages of history and start somewhat differently. I shall not take advantage of this opportunity to review the history of Saskatchewan and make a political speech, but I want to remind the committee that it would be possible to do so and make out a good case.

When the dominion government insists upon interfering with the work or the decisions of a provincial government in order to prevent that provincial government from doing something which the dominion feels is within its field, it seems obvious to me that the dominion government has some responsibility. I am going to refer to two things to illustrate what I mean, one having occurred in Alberta and the other in Saskatchewan. I do not sit with the hon. gentlemen of the Social Credit group, so that obviously there are points of disagreement between us, but there is one point of agreement between us. If the people of a province by a democratic election have

elected a government on a programme which those who sought their votes claimed they could put into effect, then they should be allowed to do it. Whether social credit will work in Alberta we shall never know until it is tried and this government deliberately prevented them from making the experiment. Canada is poorer for not knowing the results of that experience. Having interfered with the democratic decision of the people of Alberta, this government owes that province the necessary fiscal aid to carry out its social services, regardless of what might have been said eighty years ago at the time of confederation.

Recently a new government was elected in Saskatchewan on a somewhat different ticket but through the same democratic process. That government was elected because a majority of the voters felt that their programme was good. One piece of legislation which they passed to carry out their election promises was the farm security act. Because one of the clauses of that act might, through some obscure method of reasoning, be considered to interfere with interest on capital, which this government claims was its exclusive field, the dominion government took steps to see that that particular legislation was disallowed.

Mr. ILSLEY: Not at all; correct that statement.

Mr. BENTLEY: The minister can correct it any time he cares to.

Mr. ILSLEY: I will do so now. The dominion government referred the legislation to the courts. That is all they did; they did not disallow the legislation.

Mr. BENTLEY: The dominion government did not need to refer it to the courts. The dominion government could have allowed the private companies concerned to refer it to the courts and not taken any hand in it whatsoever. I still say that the dominion government interfered unnecessarily in that arrangement.

Mr. ILSLEY: Does the hon. gentleman think it is a good thing to have ultra vires legislation on the statute books?

Mr. BENTLEY: I am not asking for ultra vires legislation; I am simply saying that when the dominion government is determined to retain in its possession certain powers, then it must accept certain responsibilities, and one of those responsibilities is to see that the fiscal needs of the province are taken care of. That is the point I am making. I am not going to criticize the government in this debate for what they did—I may do it at some other time, but not today; I am simply citing this as an illustration of what took place and in order to show that in my belief this government has a responsibility along with these powers.

When the Rowell-Sirois commission presented their report some years ago many of us in Saskatchewan—and this was before the C.C.F. government was elected in that province—felt that there was a great deal of good in that report. I remember going to a meeting at which the former member for my constituency, a supporter of the present administration, gave an exposition of the report to the voters of our city, and I remember being very much interested and listening carefully to his explanation. He indicated complete support for the report at that time. The premier of Saskatchewan at that time was a Liberal, and he also supported the report, as I believe the premier of Manitoba did. Some others did not. But I did not feel the disappointment over these disagreements that many seemed to feel because, when a report on so complex a subject is presented, it is only natural to expect that, until the report has been studied and discussed and mental changes have taken place in consequence, some people will not agree with the report right off the bat. The discussions went on, and finally we had the dominion government's offer to the provinces. Many of us considered that a good thing, and I commend the government for having made those proposals. I think the government deserves commendation for its offer at that time. I go farther and say that the government and the Minister of Finance deserve commendation for the adjustments they have made and for the flexibility of their arrangements in arriving at agreements with the different provinces.

The hon. member for Temiscouata this afternoon said he was sympathetic with the Minister of Finance because of the heavy load he carries. I am not a bit sympathetic with an able man who is well able to carry the load. His bearing of the load will make him an even better man than he is at present, and he is very good. So I waste no sympathy on him because he does not need it. I give him all possible commendation for having been capable of arriving at some kind of solution with seven of the provinces.

But I would point out to the government that Saskatchewan, through its previous and its present administration, indicated its willingness to enter into these taxation agreements, knowing well, from the history of Saskatchewan and considering the way in which we got stuck and our not having industrial organizations which would stand the taxation load which would be required to meet

the fiscal needs of the province, that we would have to call on the rest of our sister provinces who are more favourably situated in that regard for their contributions. We have the same situation within the province itself because there we have some good areas, some not so good, and some very poor, and we have to ask the good areas to make a larger contribution, so that our social, educational, and welfare services will be better equalized for the men, women and children of the province. We expect the same type of cooperation from our sister provinces. Even though two provinces of this dominion have not yet decided to enter into this kind of agreement, we feel that, even at that, we should have had implemented in our province the full amount of the government's original proposals. We have not yet got the sixty per cent of the medical, health and welfare proposals of the dominion government. We have not got the full amount of old age pensions and assistance for the employable unemployed assumed by the dominion government, as well as a number of other things. We believe that we should have those things in the province of Saskatchewan.

I want now to say something that is not quite so commendatory of the government. The provinces of Quebec and Ontario through their premiers—I believe that they are called prime ministers down here—have indicated an unwillingness at the present time to enter into this kind of agreement, for reasons of their own, and they are being headlined in the press. Not for one moment am I supporting either one of these gentlemen. I deplore the attitude they are taking, but I do not think they, as only two corners of the triangle, are entirely to blame. While they are being blamed in the press and elsewhere, I feel that the government here has not done all that it might have done to resolve some of these differences and to have brought about a better understanding with these two provinces; and if our situation in Saskatchewan is to depend upon the provinces of Ontario and Quebec entering into agreements with the dominion government I think the dominion government should be infinitely more energetic in trying to bring that about. I do not agree it is the proper attitude for this government to take, to say that what is done for Saskatchewan must depend on Ontario and Quebec entering into an agreement with the dominion government. I think the dominion government should deal with Saskatchewan on the basis of its original proposals, and similarly with any other province willing to enter into an agreement. But if the dominion government will not carry out its original proposals until all the provinces have entered into an agreement, the dominion government should be infinitely more vigorous in trying to bring that about and should carry its share, at least one-third of the blame for these agreements not having been arrived at up to the present time.

(Translation):

Mr. LaCROIX: I had intended to say a few words but owing to the lightning speed with which second reading was proceeded with, I have had no chance to do so.

Here is what I have to say with regard to Bill No. 411, authorizing the government of Canada to enter into agreements with the governments of the provinces, pursuant to which, in return for compensation, the provinces agree to refrain from levying certain taxes for a limited period. May I be permitted to say, at the outset, that while I do not support the stand of the government headed by Mr. Duplessis, who left the conference even before its conclusion, and who has submitted no counterproposal with a view to working out some kind of agreement, I cannot, nevertheless, understand how individual agreements could be entered into with the provinces without the cooperation and outside the presence of the province of Quebec, because in my humble opinion it is contrary to the spirit of the British North America Act that separate agreements should be entered into with the provinces in that respect without the consent of all.

You may tell me, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the stand taken by Duplessis, no agreement can be reached with Quebec. My answer is that above Duplessis there is the province of Quebec to consider, and that, to my mind, it would have been preferable to enter into no separate agreement with the provinces as long as the possibility of negotiations existed. Indeed, I feel that the economic depression which those agreements are supposed to ward off, will not be prevented if the two richest provinces of this country have no part in them.

It is unthinkable that the province of Quebec, which pays a large part of the taxes, should not be a party to those agreements, from which the western provinces will greatly benefit.

I wish you would bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that I am not discussing the merits of the proposals submitted by the dominion to the Quebec government; I am dealing exclusively with the fact that such separate agreements are likely to undermine the very foundations of confederation and to foster a principle fraught with danger, so that their implement-

ing may contribute to lead us farther and farther from our greatest objective, Canadian unity.

I have already had an opportunity to explain in this house what I consider as the reason for the aloofness of Messrs. Duplessis and Drew, and the selfish grounds on which they have taken their stand. I still hold that view, but I deem it my duty to oppose agreements entered into separately with the provincial governments, without Quebec being a party to them.

In concluding, I wish to express the hope that Messrs. Drew and Duplessis may change their stand, because otherwise we shall have a system of double taxation detrimental to all Quebec taxpayers.

(Text):

Mr. ABBOTT: I have an amendment to move to section 7, that subsection 2 of section 7 be amended by deleting the phrase "twenty-fourth day of June, nineteen hundred and forty", which will be found in lines 32 and 33 on page 6 of the bill, and substituting therefor the words "first day of July, nineteen hundred and forty seven", and by adding after the word municipality, in line 3 on page 7, the words "which in the opinion of the said minister are not part of a sales tax of general application". By way of explanation, I may say that this is the appropriation section which will enable the dominion to pay to the government of any province half of the receipts from income tax derived from companies selling electricity, steam, gas and the like as defined in the section. It was found that it would be more appropriate to put July 1, 1947, which was the day before this bill was introduced, than the 24th day of June, 1940, and the words which have been added to line 3 on page 7 relieve the requirement of deducting a sales tax, which is part of a general sales tax and not a concealed corporation tax.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

WESTERN PROVINCES

ADJUSTMENT OF INDEBTEDNESS—NATURAL RESOURCES CLAIMS

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a bill to make provision for the refunding and adjustment of the liability of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia to the government of Canada, in respect of loans made to them by the government of Canada to finance expenditures on direct and agricultural relief and other purposes during the nineteen-thirties; and for the final settlement in full of claims of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan against the government of Canada in respect of the administration and control by the said government of natural resources in those provinces before the transfer thereof to the provinces.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

Mr. BRACKEN: I presume the minister will make a full statement.

Mr. ABBOTT: I would hope that the committee might be willing to follow the procedure we have adopted in the last week of permitting the main debate on the measure to take place on the second reading of the bill. Briefly, as the committee knows, the bill which will be founded on the resolution will authorize the dominion government to complete settlements already arrived at with the western provinces and British Columbia respecting certain relief indebtedness incurred during the 1930's and also settlement of the natural resources award to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Mr. BRACKEN: We are agreeable to this procedure on the understanding that we shall have a copy of the bill before we deal with it again.

Mr. ABBOTT: It should be available immediately.

Mr. BRACKEN: May I ask whether any financial arrangements have been made with any of the provinces other than that outlined in the bill which the minister is about to introduce?

Mr. ABBOTT: None whatever. As a matter of fact, the terms and conditions of the arrangements which this bill will confirm were announced by the provincial treasurer of Saskatchewan and by my colleague, the Minister of Justice, some months ago, and this is merely asking for legislative confirmation of settlements which have already been negotiated.

Mr. BRACKEN: Then there are no other major agreements on financial matters with any other provinces within the last year?

Mr. ABBOTT: None whatever.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Abbott thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 451, respecting the refunding and adjustment of indebtedness of the four western provinces to the government of Canada in respect of certain outstanding loans for relief and other

purposes and final settlement of the claims of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan in respect of natural resources.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The committee is considering item 551, national defence.

Mr. BROOKS: I was very much interested, having been connected with the reserve force for a good many years, in what the minister said with reference to reserve training of the army. There were a couple of questions I wished to ask in this connection, and I may say that I am pleased indeed to see that a much larger estimate than usual has been given for this training this year. No one knows the necessity for this better than an officer who has been with the reserve army for a number of years. The question I wish to ask the minister has reference to the training of tank regiments in rural areas, and I speak particularly of the tank regiment in my district. There are a number of squadrons. The regiment is not a city regiment but a rural regiment, and therefore these squadrons are scattered pretty well over two counties.

Some time ago I understood from the commanding officer that it was the intention of the department to send tanks for training purposes to the different squadrons. Perhaps the parliamentary assistant to the minister can tell me whether that is correct.

Mr. HUGUES LAPOINTE (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence): That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS: In criticism of that, it was felt that it was not feasible to send these large tanks, weighing from thirty to forty tons—I have not the exact weight, but that is about what they weigh—over country bridges, rivers and so on. That was not felt to be practicable unless the regiment is brought together in one central place. My suggestion with reference to this particular tank regiment would be that it should be brought to one centre, and if there is to be training with tanks, then it can be done in a more practical way. As a matter of fact, I do not believe tanks could be used in this area if it were attempted to carry out training by the different squadrons. This is a matter I should like to have the department look into.

I might say also, as the parliamentary assistant knows, that there has been a training centre at the town of Sussex for a good many years. This rural regiment has its headquarters at Hampton, a few miles from Sussex. I would think that the better plan for this regiment and probably for other tank regiments across the country would be to bring them together for a number of days during the year and give them training when they could all be brought together. I should also like to ask the parliamentary assistant if it is the intention to use the camp at Sussex as a training area. Some time ago I heard that training was not to be at Sussex but at Utopia, another camp in the southern part of the province. I might say that Sussex camp has been a training area now for, I think, over fifty years. That area was greatly extended during the war. The parliamentary assistant himself spent some time in Sussex and we were pleased to have him there. I think he knows it is a good training area. I hope consideration will be given to using it as a training area.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I wish to thank the hon. member for Royal for his constructive remarks. As regards his first point about tank regiments, I think the point he raised has been already appreciated by the department. It is realized that it is quite impossible in some areas where a tank regiment exists, to have training going on in that area. Tanks will be issued to those units in order to permit the men to be trained in the maintenance and operation of those tanks; but I dare say that training as a tank squadron would not take place in areas where it would cause any damage.

As regards Sussex, I regret that I have not the information here. I quite appreciate my hon. friend's point of view. I know of the facilities which exist in Sussex, and were it not for the fact that I should probably be contradicted by other members, I would say that one of the best brigades that ever went overseas was trained in Sussex. However I will look into this matter and give the hon. member the information he seeks.

Mr. FRASER: I have before me a letter from a man who says he joined up in the air force believing that he would be an instrument mechanic; he signed up with that agreement but, after he got in, he was told that there would not likely be a course in that subject and he would just have to take anything at all that was available. He wanted to have a trade of that kind, and there not being a course of that kind in there he said,

"Well, then, can I get out?" He was told that he could get out, but I understand that in order to do so he has to buy his way out. Is that right?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is quite right.

Mr. FRASER: Will the parliamentary assistant explain that? How does a man buy his way out?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have not the regulations before me; but roughly, the principle is that a man who has enlisted for a period of three years, five years, or whatever it may be, and who wishes, for reasons of his own, to withdraw from the service before the expiration of that period, must pay a bounty of so much a month. I believe in the case of the air force, although I would not say for certain, it is $2.50 a month for each month he still has to serve. That provision has always been in the king's regulations. It was there prior to the war and is still in force.

Mr. FRASER: In this case, I would judge that the air force was at fault to some extent, owing to the fact that they took him in believing that he would be an instrument mechanic. Now they are asking him to pay $100 in order to get out.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend quite realizes that I cannot tell him whether or not the particular air force officers concerned were at fault in this particular case. If he wishes to give me the particulars of the case, I shall be glad to look into it.

Mr. FRASER: I will do that. I will write to the man and then I will speak to the parliamentary assistant.

I have another case. I wish to get a little bit of information in regard to a course. A boy in Peterborough tried to join up at Royal Roads, but his age was just three months out and they would not take him in. But a Royal Canadian Air Force officer was in Peterborough interviewing the different boys, and he said that in 1948 there would be a course there for graduates of high schools with senior matriculation standing, and that they would be graded and given short-term commissions in the Royal Canadian Air Force. Is there to be some special set-up in 1948 for the Royal Canadian Air Force?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The only thing that comes to my mind that would explain this would be that this particular officer would be referring to university training, the equivalent of our Canadian Officers Training Corps in the army or U.N.T.D. in the navy—I do not know exactly what the name for it in the air force is—where a student, having senior matriculation, following the university course can follow the equivalent course in the air force and, after the period of service, be qualified to enter into the air force.

Mr. FRASER: There is another thing I should like to ask in regard to a course or joining up in the Royal Canadian Navy and the Royal Canadian Air Force and the conditions of entry at Royal Roads. Some of the boys in my district or, as I said before, one especially tried to join up and he was just three months over the age. As to age limits, a candidate must have attained the age of sixteen and a half years but not the age of nineteen and a half on July 1 of the year of entry; but in the case of candidates from French classical colleges the maximum age is extended to allow entry up to twenty and a half years on July 1 of the year of entry. These boys feel that they should have the same privilege to join.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The explanation that I could give the hon. member for that is—

Mr. FRASER: I know that has been the rule.

Mr. LAPOINTE: —that the matter has been looked into, and the authorities in all services looking into the setting up of qualifications necessary to enter these various schools have come to the conclusion that students coming out of these colleges to which my hon. friend was referring would be, generally speaking, one year older than students graduating from high school with senior matriculation. In other words, to have two men with equal qualifications coming from two different institutions of the sort, one would, generally speaking, be a year older. In order to permit of a fair representation amongst the students, the regulations were set in that way. This was thoroughly investigated before it was finally decided by the services themselves.

Mr. FRASER: These boys felt that the authorities were haggling over just a few months with respect to their age, and they did not like it. They thought they should have the same privilege.

I have not been able to be present in committee on the defence estimates, owing to meetings of the public accounts committee. Has the minister said anything with regard to bands which are being set up across the country? There is a Major Streeter who is in charge of bands in the army. He is setting up bands, or allowing units to set up military bands and bugle bands across the country. What is the set-up there?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Only bands authorized by headquarters are recognized and receive grants. I can give the hon. member the number of authorized bands and those organized up to date. The principle followed, if I may use that word, is that headquarters decides which units shall be entitled to bands. In the active force I believe two infantry units and one artillery regiment are authorized to have bands. In the reserve units the number is larger, based on the situation that existed before the war. Some units had bands before the war and still have the instruments, so it is only logical that they should be the first to be authorized to have bands now, but nothing final has been done.

Mr. FRASER: Does the department say whether they are to be bugle bands or brass bands?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I believe the request is made by the unit.

Mr. FRASER: Has the parliamentary assistant any statement on the matter?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sorry, but all I have here is the number that have been authorized and those already organized.

Mr. FRASER: I do not want to take up the time of the committee. If the parliamentary assistant would just place that information on *Hansard* I would be satisfied.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is very short. In the case of the navy, active, four bands are authorized and three have been organized to date. In the case of the navy, reserve, nineteen are authorized and eight have been organized. In the case of the active army eight are authorized and four organized. In the reserve army 317 are authorized, but I have not the figures as to those organized to date. In the air force, active, one is authorized and three are organized; this will have to be readjusted. Each auxiliary squadron is authorized to have a band, but I do not think any have yet been organized.

Mr. FRASER: Some few years ago I asked the then Minister of Munitions and Supply about helicopters. I understand that the United States navy has set up squadrons of these machines, and I wondered if our navy had anything of that sort in mind. They have been a great help in saving lives, in rescuing people who have crashed in planes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know the air force has a few helicopters at the present time, but I do not know of any plans to develop that further.

Mr. MERRITT: The other day I asked the minister several questions to which I hope the parliamentary assistant has the answers. I should like to call his attention to one in particular. I asked for a statement of the wastage in the forces, by which I mean a comparative statement of the number taken on strength and the number discharged, say in the most recent six months' period for which the parliamentary assistant may have figures. Then there are other questions I should like answered.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If the hon. member permits I shall deal first with one of the other questions he asked. I believe he asked if we could give the strength of various units so he might get an idea of the average strength of the reserve forces. I am sorry I did not give him the information yesterday; I had it a few minutes after he asked the question. I have here the strength of three infantry units, two artillery units and two engineer companies. The infantry units are located in Toronto, Windsor, and in British Columbia. In the case of the Toronto unit the strength is 34 officers and 270 other ranks. In British Columbia the regiment has 30 officers and 226 other ranks. The Windsor unit has 32 officers and 262 other ranks. As to artillery, the one field regiment in Ontario has 20 officers and 102 other ranks; the one in Montreal has 28 officers and 278 other ranks. In the case of the engineer companies, one in Quebec has 4 officers and 82 other ranks and one in Ottawa has 6 officers and 40 other ranks. These were given to me because they were the most readily accessible.

With regard to wastage I can give the hon. member the number of discharges over a period of a few months. In April, 1947, there were 746 enlistments and 53 discharges. In March, 1947, there were 568 enlistments and 37 discharges. In February, 1947, there were 700 enlistments and 25 discharges. During the period from October, 1946, to April, 1947, enlistments totalled 12,974 whereas the number of discharges during the same period was 135.

Mr. MERRITT: Is that the active force?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is the active force.

Mr. MERRITT: Would it be possible to get any figures on the reserve forces?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am afraid I have not those figures.

Mr. MERRITT: I should like to make one comment to the parliamentary assistant. The figures for the infantry battalions—and I think on the artillery regiments, though I cannot speak of that from personal knowledge as I am sure the hon. member for Calgary East will be able to do—seem to indicate that

these battalions have not sufficient strength for adequate training. I say that from my own experience. I feel that an infantry battalion with a strength of only 250 including officers is not in a position to train to best advantage. I know the parliamentary assistant will take note of that comment, but I hope he will apply it.

Mr. PROBE: Would the parliamentary assistant indicate whether or not there are approximate compulsory ages for retirement in all ranks of the permanent force? If there are, what are the ages when, except for special circumstances, it is considered that officers or other ranks should be retired from the permanent force?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I recall giving that information last year. There are ages for compulsory retirement of officers, depending upon rank.

Mr. PROBE: Would the parliamentary assistant put that on record?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would be glad to have that information placed on record, although I have not it at hand.

Mr. PROBE: While that is being looked up, I would bring to the attention of the committee the specific case of an officer who was retired on March 8 of this year. This case was brought to the attention of the hon. member for Yorkton. It refers to an officer who had attained the rank of captain and who was thirty-three years of age at the time of his retirement. This man had made application to be retained in the Canadian forces. He had had eleven years and 233 days of service in the permanent force and the active army, having served overseas, and prior to that had four years and 149 days of service in the non-permanent active militia, or a total service of about sixteen years.

At this early age of thirty-three years he was anxious to make the army his career. To the best of his knowledge, no adverse reports had been made about him, but he was retired by an officer selection committee under the provisions of K.R. Canada, section 267 (c). Not being compulsorily retired, he received a retiring allowance under part 5 of the Militia Pension Act, amounting to $677.91 per annum.

Mark you, this man had reached only the age of thirty-three years. The pension is to run until he is sixty-five years of age, at which time, if he is still living, he will receive a pension of $1,016.66 per annum. This man worked his way through the ranks of the permanent force and attained the rank of captain. The army has been put to a considerable expense in training him, and the country will now be put to a further expense in providing him with a pension for the rest of his life. In my view he has a considerable number of useful years of service left to him. The country will be placed to the further expense of training someone to take his place. It seems to me that, in respect of a man of only thirty-three years, the Department of National Defence must have strong reasons for retiring him. Otherwise the bases upon which retirements are compulsorily made are unnecessarily wasteful and poor business for Canada.

Yesterday the name of General Worthington was mentioned, a man who has served with considerable distinction in the Canadian permanent force and on the field of battle. General Worthington is not a young man. In the view of the departmental administrative officers, however, he is still able to give excellent service. I would presume that he is in his sixties or thereabouts. Surely a policy under which a man of thirty-three years with the rank of captain can be retired is not in the best interests of Canada. Would the parliamentary assistant comment on this case?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I believe I know the case to which the hon. member refers, because the hon. member for Yorkton brought it to my attention earlier. It is similar to those of many other service personnel who, having served in the permanent force prior to the war and having served in the active service during the war, naturally made progress. Some were commissioned and others received promotions. However, when the time came to establish a peace-time service a choice had to be made among many applicants, and it was found that some were not quite as suitable as others who were applying for appointments to the same rank.

With respect to the matter of pension, it will be recalled that last year we discussed the Militia Pension Act. Provision is made in that act whereby an officer who may have served over a period of years and who has given good service, but who, because of certain factors, suddenly is not found as useful as his subordinates, or others of equal rank, may be retired from the service, with a view to promoting efficiency and economy.

That is exactly what happened in the instance to which the hon. member refers. In view of the fact that this was a relatively young man and the fact that he had served eleven years, his case was looked into with even more attention than some others. In addition to the decision rendered by the selection board, assessment was made in his case by serving under officers, in a training

centre. It was on the report made following this period of service that the decision was taken to retire him.

Mr. PROBE: In other words, there is a standardized basis for the assessment of such cases?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Definitely.

Mr. PROBE: It is not a matter of personal opinion?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not at all.

Mr. PROBE: And there is something reasonable and scientific about it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Definitely.

Mr. PROBE: May I now pursue another matter. Last night, when there was discussion with respect to properties turned over to War Assets Corporation which had formerly belonged to the Department of National Defence the minister was asked if it had been found necessary to make rentals or purchases of other properties to replace those turned over to War Assets Corporation for disposal. The minister's answer was that no properties had been surrendered which had to be repurchased or replaced later.

In this connection I would refer to the break-down for defence services as it is found at page 275 of the details in the estimates. At that page, under the heading of "Defence Services", there is reference to the acquisition, construction, purchase, maintenance, repairs, rentals and operating expenses of properties, to an amount of $14,348,558. There is a further amount of $25,263,748 for personnel supplies and services; food supplies, medical and dental stores, clothing and personnel equipment, barrack, camp, hospital and miscellaneous equipment, laundry and dry cleaning. There is a further item for stores and equipment to the amount of $13,844,887, and under this heading are included such things as mechanical transport vehicles and spare parts, tractors, cranes and other engineering equipment. These items total more than $53 million.

When methods of disposal were under discussion before the public accounts committee there appeared before the committee a representative of the army ordnance corps who informed the committee that about a year and a half ago an ample supply of kit, barrack and other equipment was again being requisitioned. We realize, of course, that food supplies would have to be replaced from time to time. I should like some details as to the properties that are in the course of being acquired this year or are to be paid for this year, because I presume some may have been acquired last year but are to be paid for out of this year's estimates. I should like a list of the principal properties, those costing over $5,000 or $10,000. I do not want the petty items; I simply want the major items of property that are to be paid for this year. Then I should like the parliamentary assistant to indicate what properties have been held in the vicinity and what properties have been disposed of to War Assets Corporation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What particular vicinity does my hon. friend refer to?

Mr. PROBE: That is the point, I do not know. You have an item here of $14,348,000 for the acquisition, construction, purchase, maintenance and so on of national defence properties. I want to be satisfied that the Department of National Defence has not acquired properties in the vicinity of areas where properties have been disposed of to War Assets Corporation. Could the parliamentary assistant give a break-down of this item, giving expenditures in excess of $5,000 or $10,000?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In connection with the acquisition, construction and purchase of properties, the amounts for the services are as follows:

Navy	$1,436,940
Army	5,034,427
Air force	3,233,200

Most of that was for construction and additions to existing buildings. In the case of the army it would cover the construction of ranges or repairs to such things, and in the case of the navy—I know of one case—it covers the acquisition of property around a magazine in order to create a safety area. I can assure my hon. friend that no buildings are being purchased into which the services are being moved when there are already existing quarters or where facilities have been declared surplus and we now find ourselves under the obligation of purchasing others. During the war some branch of the service may have been in leased quarters, and in order to continue the operation of that station or that division we may find that we cannot lease the property and must acquire some temporary buildings in the meantime.

Mr. PROBE: Would this item cover the 1,000 dwellings which the minister mentioned yesterday were being acquired for the purposes of housing permanent force families?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This item covers one group of 556 family units and another one of 600 family units, which is more than the minister referred to yesterday.

Mr. PROBE: In those particular housing areas were any military properties declared surplus?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Those are married quarters and none were declared surplus.

Mr. PROBE: I am thinking of buildings which might have been suitable for conversion purposes and which have been declared surplus in those areas.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am informed that in those various areas the services retained all buildings which it was considered might be necessary for conversion into these temporary married quarters.

Mr. PROBE: What are the two areas to which the minister has referred?

Mr. LAPOINTE: When I referred to two groups I am afraid I gave the wrong impression. There are two separate construction schemes, but they cover many areas, such as Borden, Shilo, Chilliwack, Lachine, Centralia, Calgary, Greenwood, Sea Island, Vancouver, Saskatoon, Valcartier and Suffield.

Mr. PROBE: In none of those areas have buildings which might have been converted been disposed of to War Assets Corporation?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There might have been some, but none that were necessary for reconversion.

Mr. PROBE: Clothing and personnel equipment is part of the next item. The officer who reported to the war expenditures committee a year and a half ago indicated to us that the services had ample supplies of clothing and personnel kits to run over varying periods, as I recall it, from three to five years. Would the parliamentary assistant indicate how much it is estimated will be spent under this item this year and also justify to this committee the need for that particular item?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The break-down of clothing and personnel equipment is as follows:

Navy	$ 682,666
Army	2,065,878
Air force	1,600,647

Mr. PROBE: Those seem to be rather large expenditures in view of the large stores which the ordnance officers of the various branches told the war expenditures committee were in reserve. Would the parliamentary assistant elaborate on the need for those expenditures?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In the case of the active force, army, this item is broken down as follows:

Clothing and necessaries	$153,000
Officers' clothing	220,000
Individual equipment	35,000
Web equipment, trials	5,000

Mr. PROBE: What is meant by that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: For the testing of various web equipment under certain conditions.

Mr. PROBE: Is it the opinion of the departmental officials that the equipment turned over to War Assets was not suitable for the particular use to which this equipment is being put?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am informed that most of it is completely new equipment. My hon. friend understands that the ordnance service and various other branches of the army are continually making tests of personnel equipment and clothing and that changes are being made from time to time.

Mr. PROBE: There was so much equipment in store that considerable quantities were dumped into the lap of War Assets. Surely conditions have not changed to such an extent in the past year and a half that it is found necessary to buy new equipment. Even clothing, yardage goods, was turned over to War Assets by the hundreds of thousands of yards to the best of my recollection, and any that I have seen since look very similar to what was in use when I was in the service.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am informed that these sums are for equipment that was not possessed and was not returned to War Assets. I know that a huge quantity of uniforms was turned over to War Assets, but these items do not cover that type of equipment.

Mr. PROBE: One more question with regard to tractors, trains, and other engineering equipment and mechanical transport vehicles and spare parts. Huge quantities of these types were turned over to War Assets for disposal, and now apparently the Department of National Defence is in the market again for such equipment. Would the parliamentary assistant justify this item?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am told that this does not cover the purchase of wholly new equipment. But a considerable amount of equipment which we had on hand and which we retained did not have the spare parts which must necessarily be carried or kept in reserve for proper operation. This item covers spare parts and components in order that the equipment might be put into operation in the field.

Mr. PROBE: Would the parliamentary assistant give us some indication of what is being done in the maintenance of the northwest highway system and say why it is now a part of the function of the Department of National Defence to look after this piece of

road? What further highway construction is being undertaken by the department?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand that the only responsibility of the Department of National Defence for the Alaska highway is the maintenance of the highway. The operation of the highway comes under mines and resources. The army is concerned with the maintenance of the highway and keeping it in good order.

Mr. PROBE: Has the department a highway building programme?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not at all; it is purely maintenance.

Mr. STOKES: Last evening when there was considerable confusion in the house just before we adjourned, the minister said, in reply to a question that I had asked, that if I required further information he would give it. I was speaking of the installation for the second time of an asphalt floor in the armoury at Belleville city. It was first installed in 1945 at a cost of approximately $2,800. In the early months of 1947 that floor which had become useless and had failed to fill the bill was torn up and a new floor laid at a cost of nearly $4,500. Information that has come to me is to the effect that the work in the first instance in 1945 was not passed by the inspector. It was in charge of a government official. The return I have received shows that the contractor in that case was paid. It seems to me that something must be wrong with a job which the inspector did not O.K. and which afterwards fell down as he probably thought it would.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Following my hon. friend's remarks last night, I had the file concerning the Belleville armoury brought to me and, after studying it, I find that in 1945 a contract was given to replace the then existing wooden floor by an asphalt floor. At the time the unit that was called upon to use the armoury was an infantry unit, and an asphalt floor was the common thing for infantry units in drill halls. I find from the file that the floor when finished was accepted and certified by the officer, and the contractor was paid, as my hon. friend said. Following that, a changeover was made in the unit and the armoury was put at the disposal of an artillery regiment which used self-propelled equipment, such as tanks use. The use of self-propelled equipment over asphalt flooring had the same effect as it would have on our city streets when tanks are moved around. The floor did not prove adequate for this equipment, and consequently the officer in charge recommended that the floor be taken up and a concrete floor be put down, which I understand has been done. The matter is not yet finally decided as far as I can find out from the headquarters file, which I studied this morning.

Mr. STOKES: The officer in charge of the regiment there told me that even when an infantry unit was using the drill hall the dust was so bad that right from the start it affected the men's throats. So it was not much of a job.

Last night I asked the minister as to the possibilities of an armoury being erected in the town of Trenton, and his answer was no. Just on Monday last I was informed by a member of the municipal council of Trenton that certain properties on which they had hoped to erect housing which the municipality is badly in need of and for which plans had been prepared have been taken over by the government, and a government official said, "We are in ahead of you on this. We are going to build an armoury there". That does not agree with the statement made by the minister.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The minister was quite right when he said there would be no drill hall constructed at Trenton. There have been negotiations with the municipality and a piece of ground, I understand, has been made available on to which two army huts are being moved for the use of the reserve army as temporary quarters. I doubt whether my hon. friend would be willing to accept that as a drill hall. I am sure he will come back again next year.

Mr. HARKNESS: Would the parliamentary assistant answer two questions I asked the minister last night, first, as to the numbers of the reserve army by commands, and, secondly, as to what form the recruiting campaign will take which is to be put on in the fall for the reserve army? When will it start and just what is proposed to be done, so that we may form some idea of whether it is adequate or not?

Mr. LAPOINTE: As regards the first question, I have the figures on the reserve army strength by command as of May 31:

	Officers	Other ranks
Central command	1,676	8,509
Quebec command	1,094	8,284
Eastern command	581	2,625
Prairie command	596	4,644
Western command	769	4,926
	4,716	28,988

That gives a grand total of 33,704.

As regards the second question which bothered my hon. friend. I cannot give him a definite reply. The form which the recruiting

campaign will take is at present being studied by a committee and the minister is awaiting its recommendations. I understand that they will get into communication with the various defence associations, but there is no definite information I can give that would satisfy the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HARKNESS: How much is it estimated will be used for that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have an item of $134,000, but I am afraid I have no other particulars.

Mr. HARKNESS: The question of armouries came up last night, and I wanted to ask a question with regard to armoury accommodation at Calgary. Eight months ago there was a scheme on foot to take over what was at that time a deserted air force camp on the north hill in Calgary and to use it for armoury accommodation, which was very scarce owing to the large number of units that existed there. That scheme fell through by reason of difficulties with the provincial government on account of ownership of the land. What steps have been taken since to meet this acute need for armoury accommodation at Calgary? If nothing has been done so far, what is contemplated during the coming few months?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I believe the minister mentioned last night that for this year there are no prospects of the construction of new armouries.

Mr. HARKNESS: I was thinking more particularly of the utilization of the numerous huts and drill halls left over from the war.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is now under consideration. Wherever buildings are available which can be made accessible to the service we are anxious to get hold of them and we do so. The difficulty is more to convince the owners of such properties to let us use them.

Mr. HARKNESS: In that connection I should like to inform the parliamentary assistant that already in the neighbourhood of Calgary several very good drill halls which existed there and were used by the air force in their training scheme have been sold for the purposes of garages and other uses, and if the army simply continues to "consider" this matter, in a short time there will be no drill halls left because they will all have been disposed of otherwise. That was the situation, and that, I believe, is what finally happened in regard to these buildings on the north hill, which were eminently suitable. But that scheme, which would have solved the problem, was allowed to drop. What alternative, in the matter of utilizing these national defence buildings, is now contemplated in Calgary? A large number of buildings existed there, but unfortunately nothing was done. The matter was simply being considered, and in the meantime War Assets were taking over the buildings and selling them.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I said that this matter was being actively considered, and I might add that the minister has given instructions that a complete survey be made by all three services in order that all available accommodation may be made use of at an early day.

Mr. HARKNESS: I trust that some definite action will be taken before it is too late because, otherwise, I am sure it will be too late shortly.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I appreciate that.

Mr. BROOKS: I wish to ask a question in connection with drill sheds. I know there are a great many throughout the country. It was stated that some of these drill sheds would be taken and moved to different points to be used as armouries in smaller centres. Has that been tried in any centre, and what success have they had in moving these drill sheds from camps to other centres?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know that some of these drill sheds have been turned over to the reserve army, and as regards moving any of them, I know one which either has been moved or is now being moved. But that is part of the survey to which I was referring a moment ago.

Mr. BROOKS: I would doubt the feasibility of it.

Mr. MacNICOL: I wish to ask the parliamentary assistant a question regarding the control of equipment in camps. At Camp Borden last summer there was a great deal of equipment, and perhaps there is still. One of the men at the camp, without the consent of the commander, took out a motor car and went to Toronto. He was not familiar with the city or the stop signs or the motor by-laws, and yet he was driving along the streets very rapidly. He came to a stop street and ran into some people with whom I am acquainted and smashed up their car, injuring the man and his wife. The department owned that car, but it claimed that this soldier or camp follower had no business taking it out of the camp. He had not consent to take it out and yet he took it out. That would strike me as careless supervision of camp equipment, when any Tom, Dick or Harry could take out motor cars from a camp and

drive to Toronto. I brought the case to the attention of the government and they disclaimed responsibility. Surely citizens have some protection. These quiet people were motoring peaceably along the street when they were run into by this car, which should have stopped but did not. That was an infraction of the city by-laws and yet the department disclaimed responsibility. My question is, has the department responsibility for its equipment? Should not someone be responsible for taking cars or any other equipment—it might have been rifles—away from the camp?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I can only say that there are strict regulations governing the use of army equipment and particularly motor cars. I recall the case to which my hon. friend refers. As I remember, the culprit, if I may use that term, was himself an army driver and, as such, had a certain access to vehicles in this particular camp. Just as my hon. friend's chauffeur when sent out on duty might decide to make a trip on his own account, that is what happened here. The man was authorized to take out the car to do a certain job, and he kept the car instead of returning it, and proceeded to Toronto where he had an accident. He was not on duty. He had a car without orders, without authority. Consequently the department could not be held responsible any more than my hon. friend could be held responsible if his chauffeur had done the same thing; that is, from the purely legal angle. But I can assure my hon. friend that the greatest care is taken to look after service vehicles; and unless there has been a great relaxation, from my own experience during the time I served in the army it was practically impossible to move a vehicle out of anywhere.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is this man still in camp?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No. This particular man was, I believe, authorized to go out of the camp on duty, but he did not return to camp. He went to Toronto. That is the case to which my hon. friend referred.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is he still in the camp?

Mr. LAPOINTE: He was in the camp.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is he now?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No. Following that, the man was, I believe, authorized to go out of friend may know, and was furthermore brought up for discipline, court martialed and found guilty. I think he was eventually discharged from the army.

Mr. MacNICOL: Just a word further. I want to follow up for a moment the matter which was raised last evening by the hon. member for Wentworth, who made an excellent job of what he said about the sea cadets. I, too, am a bit exercised over just what is to be the future of the sea cadets. Is it going to improve? Are more sea cadets to be trained? Just what is the department going to do for them? As one of the presidents of the Navy League of Canada, Ontario division, for many years, I must compliment the department upon the great assistance it has given to the sea cadet movement all during the war. As a matter of fact, the predecessor of the present minister, now the premier of Nova Scotia, was a warm supporter of the sea cadet corps. Every time he came to Toronto he was given a great reception. During the war the sea cadets did great work. In 1945 I believe there were about 15,000 young men in the ninety-one sea cadet corps in Canada, of whom some 6,000 in thirty-eight corps were in Ontario. I have long taken an active interest in sea cadet corps work because, so far as I can ascertain, not one young man trained in the sea cadet corps was ever in the juvenile court or had anything to do with juvenile delinquency. That is a remarkable tribute to the training these young men get in sea cadet work. What the department does in that regard is highly commendable.

I want to say further that those associated with the work, the men and women who give their time voluntarily, and did so during the war, had a marked influence on the prosecution of the war as far as the navy was concerned, for some 10,000 of the sea cadets during the war served in the navy. I believe about 250 in the merchant marine and perhaps fifty in the air force. I should now like to ask what programme the government has in hand to maintain and assist the development of the whole sea cadet corps programme? At the present time I believe there are some fourteen camps in Canada, more or less.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MacNICOL: How many are there?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are eight now.

Mr. MacNICOL: The number has been reduced. There were fourteen, though.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There were at one time.

Mr. MacNICOL: They have now been reduced to eight. Summer camps were effective places for the purpose of getting these young lads off the street and training them. Are the eight camps sufficient to take care of all who are offering themselves for that splendid training?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The programme for this year is to have a strength of 10,000 sea cadets.

The highest strength we have had, as far as I can see, or the peak, was when we used to have an authorized strength of 15,000. At the present time the strength is below 10,000, but the intention is to bring it up to 10,000, which we believe will be easily achieved. The same facilities of training will continue for the sea cadets and they will continue to work under officers of the reserve navy as had been done in the past. With the ceiling at 15,000, there were fourteen sea cadet camps last year with a total attendance of over 5,000. This year there are eight camps for a period of fourteen days; the quota has been set for 4,000, and that is believed to be adequate to provide for about the same proportion. There is usually about the same proportion of the totality of cadets who go to camp. About one-third or slightly over go to camp. With the quota of 4,000 for the camp, it is believed that will serve the purpose we had in mind.

Mr. MacNICOL: I would like to make a suggestion looking to some recognition of the services of such men as David Gibson, who give, not only of their time, but a good deal of financial assistance. Mr. David Gibson of Toronto is dominion president of the Navy League of Canada, and Mr. Gordon C. Leitch of Toronto is president of the Ontario division of it. They and all the men who serve with them give of their time freely. I often wondered if the department had any picture, diploma or certificate which they could send to the headquarters of the navy league—they could hang it in their board rooms—to show the government's appreciation of the services rendered by these men and the officers serving under them during the war.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know of no such thing, although I quite appreciate my hon. friend's point of view. I realize that, especially during the war, everybody who took an active part in the navy league which sponsored these sea cadets did an extraordinary job. But I do not think the matter to which my hon. friend refers has ever been considered. I shall be glad to bring it to the minister's attention.

Mr. MERRITT: Recently I placed on the order paper a question with regard to the pay of the reserve army officers who are instructing at Canadian Officers Training Corps. The question was passed as an order for return, but the return has not yet been brought down although I asked for it on the orders of the day. If the parliamentary assistant has the information now, I will not read the question.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have part of the information. The only information which I do not have is the answer to question 3 (a), where the hon. member asked as to how many such days or hours of duty the reserve army personnel were paid for; that is, reserve army personnel who were working with the C.O.T.C. This information has not yet arrived from the various camps and areas.

Mr. MERRITT: Of course I wanted the information for these estimates, but perhaps I can put my question shortly. Were these reserve army officers paid at the rate at which they expected to be paid when the training season began? If not, what change was made in the rates of pay?

Mr. LAPOINTE: These army officers were paid the reserve rate of pay, and I understand that that was what they expected to receive.

Mr. MERRITT: My information is that they expected to receive pay for the number of days they actually performed their duties, which I understand would be around thirty days, but that subsequently, by reason of a departmental regulation, they received pay for only ten days, a smaller number of days than they actually put in at this important work. If that is the case I shall have some comments to make.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is the case. I understand that these reserve army officers were paid for the time they were on duty as contingent officers with the C.O.T.C. They were paid for ten days at reserve army rates.

Mr. MERRITT: And did they actually do more than ten days' work?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is what one might call the bone of contention. The staff of the army advised that this would be equitable pay for these officers. I believe some of them made representations, and the matter was discussed by the staff and also with university authorities. Following those negotiations, the service set the period of ten days as what they believed to be an equitable period for the service rendered with the C.O.T.C.

Mr. MERRITT: I understood that these officers were told before they undertook their work that they would be paid for the full number of days they were actually instructing, based upon the usual manner of calculating those days. Since the parliamentary assistant has not the final information, I shall not press the particular case at the moment further than to say that I feel any reserve army officer who is called upon to perform duties of that kind, or for that matter any duties, should be paid the full amount to which he is entitled, at the ordinary rates, for the period of time he puts in. There should be set no arbitrary period of ten days. If a man did twelve days or fifteen days he should be paid for that number of days, and there should be no attempt

to pay these men off at some set figure. I believe that is an important consideration.

According to some other information that has come to me, things like street car allowances in reserve army units have recently been cut off. I have here a letter from one officer who complains that many expenses which arise normally in the functioning of a reserve army unit are being thrown back where they were before the war, upon the officers of the battalion. He does not give me any details, but from my own service I know the kind of expenses that used to arise and to which an officer was put. With estimates of the size they are now, I trust there will not be any of what I can only call chiseling on the individuals who are actually performing this important service for Canada. I hope the case of the C.O.T.C. officers will be resolved equitably and generously in their favour. I would remind the parliamentary assistant that this C.O.T.C. programme, in which I believe they are carrying the greatest part of the load, is the keystone of the government's own policy for the production of officers for the active and reserve forces. If you are to use reserve army personnel to do the instructing, then they should be treated particularly generously, because they have a particularly heavy responsibility placed upon their shoulders by this government.

I leave that particular point now. I want to say a word about the estimates generally. There is only one part of the integration or consolidation of the armed forces that I do not like. I do not like to have all three services lumped together in the estimates of the department, because one cannot get any idea as to how this money is being spent. You see a large item of $25,000,000, and you do not know how much of that is for ships, how much for tanks, how much for aeroplanes or how much for shoelaces. It is quite impossible to get any picture from the estimates as they are now set up as to how the money is being spent. In future years I hope this particular integration will be done away with and that we shall have a picture of all three services presented in the estimates.

I want to call attention to two items, just to show what large sums of money are being spent without any particular indication of where they are going. There is an amount of $14,348,558 for the acquisition, construction, purchase, maintenance and so on of properties. That amount alone is greater than the entire amount spent on all three services, for all purposes, in 1932. And we have no accounting for that sum, other than the total stated. An even worse case is the last item, which reads:

Sundries, including printing and stationery, telephones, teletype, telegrams, postage, office machinery, special training equipment and films, fees for special courses, maintenance grants, miscellaneous services, and other items not included in above, $10,162,195.

I do not think that is a satisfactory way of bringing the estimates before the house. I would ask the parliamentary assistant to give us some break-down of this item covering sundries. I want to say that I have no objection whatever to the expenditure of considerable sums on our defence forces. I feel that this is money very well spent, that it is good insurance against catastrophe, and I am not particularly complaining about the total amount shown in the estimates. I think, however, that with the amount of money being voted this year, we should see more than the very small number of troops on the ground, ships at sea and aircraft in the air than actually is the case. In the way the estimates are set up I do not see any explanation as to why we need $214 million or $215 million for the armed services this year when, from the figures we are given with respect to the forces being maintained, we see that they are not very much greater in size than they were in 1939. Would the parliamentary assistant make some comment on this point?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. member asked as to what was contained in the sundries item. In it are found amounts for printing and stationery, office equipment, business machines, communications services and the like.

Mr. MERRITT: Those are set out in the estimates. I should like to have a break-down in respect of printing, teletypes and other items for the three services.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The break-down is as follows:

	Navy	Army	Air Force
Printing and stationery	$ 273,300	$ 576,505	$ 188,600
Communications services, telephones, teletypes, postage, etc.	310,738	1,093,000	680,000
Office machinery	45,038	nil	nil
Special training equipment and films	46,000	84,000	596,600
Fees for special courses	1,475,000	28,400	164,750
Maintenance grants	38,600	552,558	71,260
Miscellaneous	516,737	2,676,269	474,840
	$2,705,413	$5,010,732	$2,446,050

Mr. LENNARD: I should like to repeat what I said yesterday with respect to sea cadets. The restrictions in respect of training which have been imposed this year have never before been enforced. I know of one instance where a mine sweeper capable of accommodating 100 cadets and officers has been allowed to accommodate forty cadets and two officers. There were sixty-five cadets in the unit who wished to go to camp. Certainly this is a heavy restriction on training facilities. Yesterday I urged the minister to reconsider this matter and, if it is not possible to make any change this year, to arrange in another year so that more boys who have worked hard for the purpose may have the advantage of going to these training camps.

On occasions members supporting the government assert that those of us in the opposition do not offer any economic suggestions. Just about a year ago, as reported at page 5058 of *Hansard* for August, 19, 1946, I said

> Several weeks ago the minister said that he would welcome any suggestions that would curtail spending either by the government or by the Department of National Defence. I therefore draw his attention to the Canadian inspection board.
>
> On April 1 of this year the United Kingdom and Canada inspection board ceased to exist, and from then on it carried on as it does now under the name of the Canadian inspection board. From April 1 to July 1 that inspection board cost this country over $600,000. At that rate it will cost Canada this year over $2,500,000.

That establishment was not reduced until March 31 of this year. I readily understand that just because something is drawn to the attention of the government the excess service cannot be wiped out overnight. I say, however, that this represents a gross waste of the taxpayers' money. I know that many of the personnel in the export board did nothing for the six months prior to March 31, 1947. They were on extended leave. They would go to work in the morning, and would be sent home and told to report next day or next week. I know exactly what went on. If there are any other departments which have as little to do as the inspection board had last year, then the sooner they are disbanded or put on a greatly reduced basis, the better.

A return I received a few days ago shows that at present there are 348 civilian personnel on that board. How many of those have had overseas service? Are the three offices in Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa in existence, and are they operating on the same scale as they were prior to March 31 of this year? Are the same premises being used in those three cities?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The staff has been cut down to a point where it now numbers 329, which is a further decrease. I cannot now tell the hon. member the percentage of service personnel employed on the inspection board, but I can get that information and I shall let him have it. I know there has been a considerable cut in the office space used, but I cannot say to just what degree in each of the cities the hon. member has mentioned. However I know that the premises occupied by the inspection board in my own city have been cut down to a point where the inspection board building is now occupied by the Quebec division of the Royal Canadian Naval Reserve.

Mr. LENNARD: Is it necessary to have even this reduced amount of office space? I know we have to have an inspection board, but on a much smaller scale than we did during the war. Is it necessary to have these different offices scattered throughout the country? Would it not be better during peace time and with the present state of affairs to have this work centralized in Ottawa in one office and then, if necessary, the inspectors could go out from here?

Mr. LAPOINTE: A committee was set up a short time ago to report to the minister as to the further operations of what is left of the United Kingdom and Canada inspection board.

Mr. WRIGHT: One of the good features of the war was the fact that many young Canadians who joined the armed forces were able to visit many parts of the dominion and thus become acquainted with conditions there. I notice in the break-down on page 275 of the estimates that it is apparently the intention to permit the people in the various forces to do a lot of travelling. I notice the item for travel, transportation, freight and express is $84,102,145.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am afraid that is an error; the correct amount is $14,348,558.

Mr. WRIGHT: That does not appear to be so much out of line as the other item. Could the minister give a break-down of the various items and also as between the two railroads?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am afraid there is not much difference between travel and transportation; they mean the same thing. The break-down is as follows:

Travel and transportation:	
Navy	$1,519,400
Army	4,746,428
Air	2,239,080

Freight, express and cartage:	
Navy	481,750
Army	2,970,700
Air	2,391,200
Total:	
Navy	2,001,150
Army	7,717,128
Air	4,630,280

Mr. WRIGHT: Have you the break-down as between the two railroads? Could you also give some idea as to where the different units are trained? Are they trained in provinces different from the ones in which they are raised? Are they moved as units, or is this item to cover travelling expenses of individuals only?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It would be mostly transportation of troops, or of groups of men being transferred from one camp to another or from a basic training centre to an advanced training centre, groups of officers being sent on courses and so on. I doubt if over the year it would cover any great movement of troops.

Mr. WRIGHT: Would it include the transportation of reserve army men to camps?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It does. It covers departmental administration, active force, reserve force, R.C.A.F. auxiliary service, cadet services, demobilization, Northwest Territories and Yukon radio system, inspection board, dependents allowance board inspectors, Royal Canadian Naval College; it covers practically every operation of the three services.

Mr. WRIGHT: Have you the break-down for the two railroads?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The only figures I have are for the army last year. They are:

	C.N.R.	C.P.R.
Passengers	$4,070,325.83	$2,704,248.99
Meals	441,199.76	410,210.95
Freight	1,094,292.59	909,941.29
Express	73,710.90	42,141.17
Total	5,679,529.08	4,066,542.40
	or 58·27 per cent	or 41·73 per cent

Mr. GREEN: I think the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard was justified in questioning the way in which this item is brought down. The minister and his parliamentary assistant were really tempting Providence when they brought in an estimate of this kind. There is only about $200,000 shown in the ordinary estimates, and then we have an item of $239,741,165 under the demobilization and reconversion vote with no break-down as to the forces. As the parliamentary assistant knows, during the war we had a break-down, even with the war appropriation votes, as between the three services. Is there any reason why this new practice of lumping the whole thing together should be adopted? It is practically impossible to criticize expenditures or to make worth-while suggestions with regard to them. Why has this practice been adopted?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The explanation is that the three branches of national defence have been brought under the one minister, and it was desired to coordinate the services, wherever practicable, in order to avoid the duplication of administrative functions. I think that was the explanation given by the minister when he took over this department and the three services were brought under his jurisdiction. In carrying out the plan it was assumed that one service might possibly take over similar functions in the other services. With that in mind it was thought advisable, in view of the amalgamation, to bring in the estimates of all three services under the one item. Whether that practice will be continued next year I could not say. I appreciate my hon. friend's views and those expressed by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard, and I believe yesterday by the hon. member for Yale. Possibly another way will be found which will permit hon. members to have a clearer view of the expenditures which are contemplated by the department.

Mr. GREEN: The parliamentary assistant has been handling the estimates in such a pleasant way that it is difficult to go after him with a club, although that is the type of treatment he deserves with regard to this question. However we do give him fair warning that if he tries this again next year he will be in for trouble. We want a much better break-down of this estimate than we have at the present time.

Shortly after Japan struck in December, 1941, there rose up on the Pacific coast by voluntary effort almost spontaneously a group of auxiliaries who became known as the Pacific Coast Militia Rangers. They were men engaged in the logging industry, in fishing and in farming out in the more remote portions of the coast, and in some cases in the suburbs of the cities and the larger settlements. They did a grand job and they built up a wonderful esprit de corps. The defence department supplied them with certain clothing such as slickers for the rain and hats, also rifles and certain other equipment. The force made a great reputation for itself. After the war, many of the men in the Pacific Coast Militia Rangers wanted to carry on that work and they have been carrying on, I believe, as rifle associations. The present Minister of National Defence when he visited the coast at Easter of this year announced that there was to be a new ranger organiza-

tion formed under the Department of National Defence. I have a dispatch of April 9 in a Vancouver paper, which starts by saying:

Organization of a dominion-wide "people's" defence force made up of trappers, miners, woodsmen and farmers in remote parts of Canada as an addition to the reserve militia was announced here Tuesday by Defence Minister Brooke Claxton at the conclusion of his six-day inspection of west coast defences.

Last night I was amazed to read in the Vancouver *Sun,* dated July 4, 1947, which came in yesterday, this statement by the chief of staff, Lieutenant-General Charles Foulkes, then visiting in Vancouver. He said:

Formation of a rangers corps to succeed the Pacific Coast Militia Rangers here is being held up only by a technicality which makes it necessary to revise the Militia Act because the force is not a regular army unit.

That report may not be fully accurate. But what is the hitch? We understood from the minister's announcement at Easter that this rangers corps was to be organized under the Department of National Defence. Now apparently for some reason that is not being done. I would point out to the parliamentary assistant that delay in carrying out plans of this type is dangerous. It makes it just that much more difficult to hold the men together, and if the delay is to continue for another year until there can be an amendment to one of the dominion statutes, that is a most discouraging development. I would ask the parliamentary assistant to make a statement tonight in regard to this situation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know of the organization the minister had in mind when he made that statement on the coast, and that is being planned. The technicality referred to is one which has never before been brought to my attention, and I cannot say whether it exists or not. I have not heard of it before. I quite agree that we should try to go ahead with this organization as quickly as possible. The work which the Pacific Coast Militia Rangers did during the war is well known, and I believe they have affiliated themselves into an association which may be perpetuated through this rangers movement becoming part of the reserve militia. I will look into the point raised by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. GREEN: May I point out to the parliamentary assistant that some of the officials in the department may not be pleased to see this rangers corps established. There is a certain type of military mind that does not like these irregulars. I hope we have none of that kind on the staff at the present time, but they have been known to be at headquarters, and the minister may find that there is somebody delaying this organization. I would suggest that he personally go into it carefully and see that the rangers are given the proper status without any further delay.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Certainly.

Mr. GREEN: One final question. During the session we have had some discussion in the house concerning Canadian Arsenals Limited, a crown company which has been manufacturing certain weapons of war. It has been difficult to find out who is to be responsible for that crown company. At one time we were told that it was to be the Department of National Defence. I see the Minister of Reconstruction coming into the chamber. I am always a little suspicious that he may be mixed up with Canadian Arsenals Limited.

Mr. HOWE: If there is any question about Canadian Arsenals Limited, it is an important part of the Department of Reconstruction and quite out of order on this vote.

Mr. GREEN: I see the Minister of National Defence coming in. We should be able to get this settled right now. Can we find out whose baby this is? Who is responsible for Canadian Arsenals Limited, and who is to be responsible for it?

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence): Canadian Arsenals Limited with its five or six plants at the present time is under the Department of Reconstruction and Supply.

Mr. GREEN: The Minister of Reconstruction and Supply thinks he is going to keep it. Is that right?

Mr. CLAXTON: We do not know how long he is going to keep it, but he himself has announced that there will be a change. We have been considering whether or not the change should be in favour of the Department of Trade and Commerce and the associated government agencies there, or the Department of National Defence. There is no decision yet, but the present inclination is in favour of the Department of National Defence. We are envisaging a rather high level committee of representatives of the manufacturers who made munitions during the war and representatives of Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps Association, Canadian Arsenals Limited, Canadian Commercial Corporation, the Department of Trade and Commerce and the senior supply officers of the army, which would constitute a major government committee to advise the minister and the defence committee of the cabinet on matters of industrial organization. That is our inclination. We believe that in that way we shall be able to bring together all the forces

which worked so well during the war and which it is necessary to have working together in peace.

Mr. GREEN: On that committee will there be any representatives of industry?

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes; the majority would be representative of industry.

Mr. GREEN: How would they be chosen?

Mr. CLAXTON: Through the Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps Association council.

Mr. GREEN: That is civilians?

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: There are two points I wish to make. First, I would call the minister's attention to the peculiar situation that exists in connection with the organization grants for what are looked on as newly formed units in the reserve army. I believe the regulations lay down that this grant can be given to any unit which has been more or less just formed since the war as a result of the new reserve army set-up. However, what has happened in a large number of cases is that units which actually are new organizations have been given names belonging to some former unit which they are supposed to perpetuate. For example, in Calgary the 41st anti-tank regiment is claimed to perpetuate the 41st reserve regiment which existed there during the war and is an entirely war-time creation. Actually the only thing it inherited was the name. It did not get men, equipment or anything else. It simply got the name. Nevertheless, owing to the fact that it has the name, it is cut off from receipt of the organization grant. That has caused a certain amount of difficulty, and also misunderstanding on the part of the reserve army unit commanders. I should like to bring this to the minister's attention and ask him, if possible, to have the matter straightened out in a more equitable way than has been done so far, so that units which are in reality new will be able to draw the grant, notwithstanding the fact that they may have inherited a name and nothing else.

The second point I wish to bring up is in connection with the remarks, mentioned yesterday by the hon. member for York West, which were attributed in the Calgary *Herald* of Thursday, July 3, to General Foulkes when he was out there. He was speaking in connection with C.O.T.C., and he stated, according to the newspaper:

> Cadets are being trained as officer instructors capable of forming a nucleus around which a swiftly trained army could be formed in the event of an emergency.

[Mr. Claxton.]

I hope that is not the view of the Department of National Defence, because I do not think the fact that officers are turned out by C.O.T.C. corps now in existence will result in an army being formed much more quickly than we were able to form one on the outbreak of the war in 1939. In other words, we shall have only a certain number more of trained officers, and I certainly hope the Department of National Defence does not think that, owing to the institution of the C.O.T.C. training plan, we shall be able to form an army in a hurry in the event of an emergency. I do not think we shall be able to form it more rapidly than in 1939.

In addition to the fallacy, as I see it, in that statement, which I hope is incorrect, or is an incorrect report, I suggest that statements of that kind react disadvantageously as far as recruitment of the reserve army is concerned. If senior officers of the army, in travelling about the country, make statements of that kind, which are highly publicized, the average young man will say, "What is the use of my joining the reserve army? It is not much needed. These C.O.T.C. boys will have all the jobs as officers to begin with, and there will be no chance of my rising in the organization, because apparently that is all they need when war breaks out. They can get an army in a hurry and there is no use in my putting in training at the present time." It is particularly from that point of view that statements of that kind are harmful, and I hope this one was incorrect. Can the minister comment on those two matters?

Mr. CLAXTON: I am sure the hon. member would not disagree with the view, which has been so repeatedly expressed, that it is a good thing to have a very large number, as far as we can, of well trained officers.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am very much in favour of it.

Mr. CLAXTON: Everyone is agreed on that. On the other hand, in the event of war there will always be room for others; but in between we hope we shall be able to develop practices whereby promising men having qualities of leadership, education and physique will be given every possible chance of encouragement to qualify as officers. We hope our kind of force—and I mean by force the force of the three services—will be one which will give opportunity for a career for young and promising men either in the active or in the reserve forces.

With regard to the other question raised, the amount provided for grants to units is $375,308, and provision is made for the kind

of allowance to which the hon. gentleman has referred. I think that is amply taken care of.

Mr. HARKNESS: Do I understand the minister to say that he will look into the matter of organization grants and have that difficulty straightened out?

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: Thank you very much. There is one other matter I should like to touch upon in these estimates, and I shall have finished. On page 1321 of *Hansard,* there is a return which was brought down in answer to a question by the hon. member for Wentworth, which reads:

Mr. Lennard:

1. How many military vehicles or weapons were overhauled, repaired or reconditioned at Sorel, Quebec, during the year 1946?
2. What firm or firms did this work?
3. What was the cost?
4. What disposition was made or is to be made of these vehicles or weapons?

Mr. Lapointe:

1. Military vehicles—none; weapons—274 together with spares and ancillaries were modified and overhauled.
2. Sorel Industries Limited, Sorel, Quebec.
3. $514,719.87.
4. These weapons are being issued to active and reserve force units of the Canadian army.

That 274 weapons should have been repaired at a cost of approximately $514,000 means that the cost of repairing was a little less than $2,000 each, and I should like to know what kind of weapons they were and to whom they have been distributed, since the cost of $2,000 apiece for repairing weapons is, on the face of it, excessive, in fact very excessive.

Mr. CLAXTON: The weapons in question were 25-pounder guns which had been manufactured at Sorel Industries and the modifications of which were gradually applied and are still being applied in the armament depots of Canada. These modifications cost a good deal. It would have been much easier to have made the gun with the modifications than to have made the gun, and added the modifications later. It is an expensive proposition, but the modifications were proven to be necessary in consequence of war-time experience. They were necessary in order to bring the weapons up to date. They are the most up-to-date weapons and therefore we feel the expense was justified.

Mr. HARKNESS: The minister is aware, I believe, that I know a little about guns, and I should like him to tell us when these guns were completed, lacking in all these modifications. At the end of the war, our guns, many of which were made in 1942 and 1943, carried if I remember correctly, about twenty-seven modifications. Most of these modifications had been put on by our own men in our own unit workshops, and those that had not, had been done in the ordinary army ordnance workshops. When were these guns completed and delivered to the army, and what are the modifications that would run to $2,000 apiece? Unless you practically rebuild the gun I cannot see why it should require that amount of money.

Mr. CLAXTON: I believe the hon. member knows enough about guns and the cost of them to realize that $2,000 does not represent a very large proportion of the cost of a gun. In this case, production was begun, I believe, in 1941 or 1942, and modifications came in from time to time. Then they accumulated, and my colleague the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply was face to face with the problem of production. There is always the question whether you produce with modifications or without, and whether you take the time to produce the modifications or not. I think he was faced with that problem almost from the outset of the war until the end. Almost the greatest delays in the production of war materials, after you get the initial plans, I should think he would agree, were the modifications made in them. Frequently the modifications cost a good deal more than the original weapon. In the case of the 25-pounder gun, we began production in 1941 or 1942. Modifications began at once. Some of them were made in some weapons and some were not. They have gone up, I think, to something of the magnitude of twenty-five or thirty modifications. I have seen armament depots across Canada where there are still many modifications. They are always being made.

Mr. HARKNESS: But were those guns never delivered?

Mr. CLAXTON: That is right. Some of the guns were delivered and used in Europe, and brought back. Others were never delivered. We have both. As an illustration of this, I might mention the Mosquito aeroplanes. Throughout the length of the war I think there were some eighteen modifications which accumulated. To make the eighteen modifications with respect to each Mosquito would cost $15,000 today.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. HARKNESS: No. I am still not satisfied with regard to modifications in these guns. Instead of the government spending this

$500,000 odd, I think the army should have put them in their own ordnance workshops and had the modifications made there, particularly if the guns had been used in Europe, as most of the modifications would have been made. When I was there we modified these guns regularly. Another modification was made practically every two or three weeks. But most of those modifications were things which could be put on by your own unit fitters or your own light aid detachment.

Mr. CLAXTON: No.

Mr. HARKNESS: If they could not do it, then it could be done by the ordnance workshop. On the ones which came back from Europe, if they were in use, I would think very few modifications would have to be made. In any event, I think all the modifications should have been made by the army themselves in their ordnance workshops, as a matter of giving practice and experience to the men in them. This particular item of $500,000 odd which was spent in that way is, I think, an appropriate item to be investigated by the public accounts committee, and I hope it will be so investigated in the coming session.

Mr. CLAXTON: I shall be glad to have it investigated.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry? Carried.

Mr. ADAMSON: No, Mr. Chairman. I have a question concerning the permanent force units. Are the units being broken up? In other words, after the last war, the permanent force units were broken up very much to their detriment in training, morale and usefulness. The P.P.C.L.I., for instance, had one or two companies in Winnipeg and one company in Esquimalt. When the colonel wanted to travel between his headquarters in Winnipeg and his headquarters in Esquimalt, he had to pay his own way. I want to ask the minister specifically with regard to one instance, that of the Royal 22nd Regiment. Where is the headquarters of this unit? Are there two headquarters? Is the unit split up?

Mr. CLAXTON: With regard to the Royal 22nd, I can tell the hon. member for York West that the headquarters is in Quebec, and the regiment will be centred in Quebec; but one or two companies will be located in St. Johns, Quebec, during the winter months. The whole regiment will be brought together in Valcartier, Quebec, during the summer months for some training.

[Mr. Harkness.]

Mr. ADAMSON: Are there any units split up in such a way that it makes difficult their joining together as a complete battalion?

Mr. CLAXTON: I do not know of any other unit which is being treated in this way.

Mr. ADAMSON: The military establishment of the Royal 22nd Regiment consists of one company and the officers in St. Johns, Quebec?

Mr. CLAXTON: It is not quite fixed whether there will be one or two companies in St. Johns and the remainder in Quebec and what the proportion will be between the two. But it is decided for the time being that, in view of the lack of accommodation, part of the unit will be in Quebec; the regimental headquarters will be in the Citadel in Quebec, and the rest of the unit will be in St. Johns during the winter. The whole unit will be brought together in Valcartier for training in the summer.

Mr. ADAMSON: In modern training with a battalion, you need the whole unit together to do effective training. I would think the policy of splitting up a battalion militates seriously against effective work in the efficient training of the battalion. I should hope that steps would be taken to get all battalions together as units.

Mr. BROOKS: Can the minister say where companies of the Royal Canadian Regiment will be stationed? Will any be stationed in the maritimes?

Mr. CLAXTON: No, that is not contemplated.

Mr. BROOKS: Where are their headquarters, and where will they be stationed?

Mr. CLAXTON: At Brockville and Borden.

Mr. BROOKS: There will be none in Halifax?

Mr. CLAXTON: No.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—

552. Defence research and development, subject to allocation by the treasury board, and to authorize commitments against future years in the amount of $2,005,000, $13,031,834.

Mr. WRIGHT: This item deals with research. I think it is one of the most important items in the defence estimates, because quite often in the past we have blamed our defence on the basis of the last war we fought, instead of looking ahead to the one which might occur in the future. I do not think our own military men were any worse in this respect than the military authorities of any

other country. I believe, however, that we have learned a great deal from the last war with regard to the importance of research. The minister should give us some idea of how our research is being carried on. Is it being carried on in conjunction with the universities in Canada? Are they given certain problems to solve for the department? Is it being carried on through our national research council? What coordination is there between civilian and national defence research? In all research work, when men are seeking the solution of a certain problem, they quite often stumble on other things which are of value but which may not be of any value to them. To what extent are our research people making any information which they obtain and which may not be of interest to them, available to the industry and to the scientists of this country? The minister should give us some explanation.

Mr. CLAXTON: In response to the interest expressed by the hon. member for Melfort, I am indeed glad to make a brief statement on the subject of defence research. The Department of National Defence Act was amended on April 1 of this year to provide for the establishment of a defence research board as a permanent part of the department. The board consists of five *ex officio* and six appointed members serving under a full-time chairman, Doctor O. M. Solandt. The *ex officio* members are the chiefs of staff of the three armed forces, the president of the national research council and the deputy minister of national defence. The appointed members are Professor C. H. Best of the university of Toronto; Professor Paul Gagnon of Laval university; Colonel R. D. Harkness of the Northern Electric Company; Professor J. H. L. Johnstone of Dalhousie university; Professor Otto Maass of McGill university and Professor G. M. Shrum of the university of British Columbia. The country is most fortunate in obtaining the advice and guidance of such a distinguished group. Each one of them is not only an outstanding leader in his own field, but has also made an important contribution to the defence of Canada in the past war.

Under the guidance of this board, good progress has been made in setting up a permanent organization for defence research. This organization is already beginning to take its place as an essential part of the defence of Canada. It can be regarded as a fourth service, and there is every reason to believe that it will play an increasingly important part in military affairs in the future.

The organization under the defence research board will consist of a headquarters staff, advisory committees and a few research establishments. The ultimate aim of the whole organization will be to make available to the armed forces of Canada all the scientific resources of Canada and of other countries. The headquarters staff will be the main link with the armed forces, getting from them their research requirements and conveying to them the latest results of scientific research. The advisory committees will serve to make available to the armed forces the best scientific advice that is available in Canadian government, university and industrial research laboratories. They will also help to keep the whole scientific community of the country in touch with the problems of defence to facilitate rapid mobilization in time of need. In order to avoid any unnecessary duplication of research facilities, the research stations of the board will deal only with those problems of the armed forces which have little or no civilian interest. In other fields, such as electronics and aeronautics, it will make use of existing research laboratories, especially those of the national research council. In all its work, the board will give priority to problems in which Canada has some special interests for which our facilities are specially suited. Experience has already shown that well-directed defence research produces many results that are of considerable direct and indirect value to the civilian economy.

In planning this organization, the government has had clearly in mind the vital need for continuity in research. This new organization is no mere temporary addition to our armed forces. It is a fully integrated part of the defences of the country. It must be staffed and equipped to take a long term view of the scientific requirements of defence, and it must continue in being as long as there is a need for defence forces. Further, to ensure that research receives adequate consideration of the highest level, the director general of defence research has been given the status of a chief of staff, is a member of the chiefs of staff committee and defence council and attends meetings of the defence committee of the cabinet.

Coordination with civilian research and industry is effected through a number of committees. I can assure the hon. member that the important problem to which he has directed attention is being given the utmost consideration, and that the organization is already in being to deal with it in a way which I am sure he would approve.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am certainly pleased that the minister has made this statement, and particularly pleased that there is cooperation with industry and our educational institutions in this respect.

There is just one further question. During the war we were able to get much further in our research work through cooperation with the United States and with Great Britain. I am just wondering to what extent we are continuing that cooperation in this line today.

Mr. CLAXTON: I think the best thing I can tell the committee is that we are continuing to work together.

Mr. BROOKS: I notice an item of $25,263,748 for personnel supplies, food supplies, medical and dental stores, clothing and personnel equipment, barrack, camp, hospital equipment and so on. I should like to ask the minister if they are using the supplies left over from the last war. It would seem to me that, as far as clothing, dental stores and supplies for barracks, camps and so on are concerned, there should be sufficient supplies on hand to meet the needs of the armed forces. In that connection also, I should like to ask if uniforms for the soldiers are still being manufactured. I understand that is being done in certain parts of Canada, and it seems to me a ridiculous situation that, with the thousands of uniforms which must have been on hand at the end of the war, we should be still manufacturing uniforms.

Mr. CLAXTON: The situation is that at the end of the war we had very large supplies of various types of uniforms, but we did not have all the sizes to meet all the needs. Since then, we have just purchased what has been necessary. For example, quite a lot of cloth was to be declared surplus to War Assets Corporation by the Reconstruction and Supply pool, and we purchased from that corporation quite a considerable quantity of this cloth for the making of uniforms during the next three or four years. We have endeavoured to economize our resources in every possible way. As far as I know, we have not wasted any money. We have used what we had; but in order to supply a force as large as we now have, with some thirty-four or thirty-five thousand in the three armed services, it has been necessary to supply continuously such things as uniforms of different sizes, and that has been done only to the extent necessary. We have used up every possible piece of equipment we had on hand, and all the clothing we had on hand, and have obtained additional supplies only where necessary.

Mr. BROOKS: Do I understand that the change in size is due to the change in size of the personnel of the army after the war was over? We had sizes for all sizes and shapes of men during the war.

[Mr. Wright.]

Mr. CLAXTON: The hon. member will appreciate that when one is dealing with forces of the magnitude of 700,000 he does not require such refinements of sizing as are necessary when he gets down to 34,000 or 35,000.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Yesterday the minister agreed to inquire into a point of law which I raised. Can he give that information now?

Mr. CLAXTON: I am sorry I cannot give the answer yet. The question was raised for the first time. It has been referred to the judge advocate general and the law officers, and as soon as I get the answer I shall be glad to communicate with the hon. member.

Item agreed to.

190. Grants to military associations and institutes, as detailed in the estimates, $113,350.

Mr. PROBE: I believe the parliamentary assistant has some information for which I asked earlier.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. member asked about the age limits at which other ranks and officers must be compulsorily retired. The age group of other ranks in administrative and training staffs is forty-five, and for sergeants and above it is forty-five. In static units of headquarters establishments for the rank and file it is fifty, and for sergeants and up it is fifty-five. The discharge of certain specialists and tradesmen may be deferred for a period not exceeding five years beyond the age limit, but each of these cases has to be decided by army headquarters. All personnel is to be discharged on thirty-five years' active force service or at the age limit, whichever is the earlier. In respect of officers the age limit for brigadiers and above is fifty-five; for colonels, fifty-three; for lieutenant-colonels, fifty-one; for majors, forty-nine; for captains, forty-seven; and for lieutenants, forty-five.

Item agreed to.

Mr. CLAXTON: May I make two brief announcements, one of which has to do with civil service leave, and a matter which is of great concern for the reserves. I am happy to say that order in council P.C. 1/2728 covering leave for civil servants attending camp was adopted today, and I shall place it on the table, expressing the hope that the example set by the federal government in this field will be copied by provincial governments and industries throughout the length and breadth of Canada so as to permit members of the reserve forces to attend camp without monetary loss.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND RESOURCES

130. Departmental administration, $183,173.

Mr. CROLL: I should like to take only a few moments to bring to the attention of the committee what I consider is still an important problem, namely that of immigration. I shall not weary the committee tonight with the old arguments which have been used on many occasions before; nor am I going to reiterate the various arguments which are being used in the senate chamber, in the various forums in Canada and in the service clubs.

I am not going to discuss principles tonight, either, not because I believe the principle is not important, but I am convinced that not only are the principles of immigration understood in Canada, but they are accepted throughout the country. What I am concerned about is the matter of administration. I consider it important that the principles we accept should be translated into action. As things stand, we are not doing enough. It is true that over the period of months governments have evolved a policy which is commendable, but at the same time it is not bringing about results. Perhaps that is inevitable where we have a day-to-day policy, and particularly when we realize that the Department of Mines and Resources is a large one and has in it many important agencies.

The blue book indicates that in that department matters pertaining to the Northwest Territories are placed. Indian affairs form part of it, as does the dominion observatory. Indeed the department covers some thirty boards, branches and bureaux. I have nothing but praise for the department in the manner in which it has carried out its various diversified functions, but I think it is impossible under the present arrangement, to do justice to vital problems such as immigration. The first thing we must do is to let the immigration branch stand on its own feet. During the period of great immigration to this country, and in the days of our greatest prosperity the department of colonization and immigration dealt with some 2,835,000 people from 1901 to 1913. When the flow dwindled the department contracted, and was tucked away in the Department of Mines and Resources where it has remained ever since. It is an efficient department, but at the same time entirely circumscribed.

Today's papers indicate that the committee on Indian affairs has asked for the setting up of a separate Indian affairs department. I notice by the press that Senator Crerar, a former minister of mines and resources, is quoted to have said that Canada's natural resources have been neglected to a point that was almost tragic. I think the time has come to put the immigration department on a full-time basis, to reconstitute a separate department. If the government does not see fit to do that, then the least it can do is to appoint a deputy minister of immigration. The Department of National Revenue has two deputies; the Department of National Health and Welfare has two deputies, and the Department of National Defence has one deputy with three associate deputies.

The Northwest Territories in themselves have unlimited horizons, and that in itself provides an inspiring job. There is an empire there which needs developing, and that will take all the energies of a full-time deputy minister. The Indian affairs committee suggested that the department should be unscrambled by having a deputy devote his entire time to Indian affairs. I know it is a bold step, in these days when we hear so much of bureaucracy, to suggest a further enlargement. That sort of thing is looked upon with some disfavour, but I would recall to hon. members that, during the war and its aftermath, when important problems came to the front we did not hesitate to set up departments of government which were answerable to this house. For instance, there were the Department of Munitions and Supply and the Department of Reconstruction and Supply, both created to meet pressing needs. When the need had passed, one department was closed down and the minister has told us that some day the department of reconstruction and supply will go out of existence.

Immigration today and for the immediate future constitutes a problem of national significance. It offers a challenge which we must meet boldly. If we temporize; if we allow it to bog down administratively, we are likely not to reap great benefits. Another aspect of immigration is the regulations. Anyone who has made any study of the regulations will realize that to some extent they are not logical. If a nephew is twenty-one years of age, he is admissible under the regulations; if he is over twenty-one years of age, he is not admissible. I could never understand what difference it makes. If a man is in good health, is able to work and has someone here in Canada willing to assume responsibility, what earthly difference does it make whether he is twenty-one or twenty-two years of age, so long as he fits into our economy? I can see where in years to come we shall have a lot of people making affidavits before the old age pensions board to the effect that they are really a little older than they are supposed to be.

I do not like the category method of selection because it smacks too much of the United States system. Like the United States system, it is meant to keep people out, not to let them in. We should admit to Canada anyone who meets our requirements and can conform to our standards. We need hundreds of thousands of people. If the prospective immigrant has a relative here, no matter of what degree, so much the better. If he has not a relative but has a friend who is willing to undertake that he will not become a public charge, then that ought to be good enough.

We have been told that transportation is a difficulty, but recently the premier of Ontario showed us one way of cutting through red tape. The country was much impressed by the action he took in going over to England and arranging for plane transportation for a great number of people. Even today he has two ministers of his government in England arranging various details. I have here a clipping from the *Globe and Mail* of July 9, datelined London, which reads:

More than 600,000 Britons have made definite plans to migrate, according to the figures given in a man-power survey made by Political and Economic Planning, an independent research organization, and published here today.

We need that kind of people and we ought to make a serious bid for them. If the providing of passage is necessary to lure them to this country, then we ought to make sure that ships are available. I can recall when there was nothing we could do about transportation, but immediately after the premier of Ontario was able to make arrangements to fly people here, we were able to arrange for a ship. It seemed to come out of the thin air, but it will carry some 600 passengers a month. I think we now have transportation for almost 3,000 a month.

Some time ago we were happy to hear the minister announce that 5,000 persons from the displaced persons camps would be admitted to Canada at once. Newspaper reports indicate that the quota has been filled completely, although the people are not yet here. One question one must ask is: What now? From what we know as members, from the letters we get and from the people we see, we know that the surface has not even been scratched so far as people who have someone in Canada willing and able to stand good for them are concerned.

At the present time Britain is admitting 4,000 immigrants a week and has already admitted some 500,000 into that country. This is an urgent problem. We cannot afford to delay. We cannot afford to wait for the international refugee organization, because it may never function. From all indications the British are looking after their own zone; the French are looking after their zone, and the United States are looking after theirs. We in Canada must face the facts. We have pledged ourselves to provide a home for a fair share of Europe's refugee population who have roots in this country, not only of kinship, but of general national origin. This means that sooner or later we shall take a certain number. With our population, our resources and our absorptive capacity, my suggestion is that we do not wait too long. We ought to begin now to admit those who will eventually come here in any event, because delay is causing incalculable harm at the moment. To bring them over now would be, not only in their own best interests, but in our best interests, for other countries are making very much of the opportunities and are taking off the most skilled, the farmers, and the technicians in every calling, and if we delay we shall find ourselves with only the second best. I think it is time for us to make big plans and to make them at once.

One thing we have to be sure of is that no one shall come into this country without the approval of the government. I think we are all agreed that there is no room for private enterprise in that field.

In view of the statement made recently by the deputy minister that the quota of 5,000 has been used up, it is time that a new declaration should be made. The piecemeal attempt that we are making now is not finding complete favour with the Canadian people. The time has come when we must stop nibbling at this problem and take a good bite at it. Actually we can digest more than we think we can. On this particular question I feel that the people in the country generally are ahead of the government. They are not only willing but anxious that people should be brought in, and my suggestion is that the government make a bold declaration of policy. This constant business of allowing a certain number in today and another number tomorrow leaves us in an uncertain position, and for that reason, rather than the government making declarations from time to time, I suggest that they boldly declare now that we shall allow in a certain number, be it 20,000, 30,000 or 50,000 so that not only can we in Canada plan, but the people who are charged with this responsibility can also plan in order that we may get these people over here as quickly and as surely as possible, not only, as I said, in their own best interests, but in our own best interests too.

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Acting Minister of Mines and Resources): I should like to cor-

rect one or two statements that have been made by the hon. member. The first one I think it is important to correct because it was made not only by the hon. member but on the radio tonight and it has also been made in the press. It was that the committee on Indian affairs recommended that Indian affairs be a separate department of government. As a matter of fact that was not the recommendation. The recommendation was that all Indian affairs be in one department, and as I understand it, be in the present department. My hon. friend knows there was a separation of the department a year ago, and the committee recommends that Indian affairs be now reunited in one department.

I should also like to correct the hon. member's impression as to immigration. In his remarks he gave the impression that a quota of 5,000 immigrants had been established by the government. That is not the case. There are three types of immigration: first, immigration from the United Kingdom and from the United States—British and United States immigration; that is unlimited. Any man who is able to get to Canada from Britain or the United States and who has good health and sufficient funds to establish himself here is entitled to come, without limit.

Then there is the ordinary immigration from some non-enemy countries, which again is practically unlimited—immigration such as the Dutch settlers, some of whom arrived recently.

The 5,000 figure had to do wholly with men and women in displaced persons camps. Arrangements have been made with respect to these, and authority was given to bring in 5,000. These 5,000 have now been selected, and today the governor in council authorized a second 5,000. That is merely to coordinate the work of those engaged in selecting displaced persons and in placing them in Canada in order that one part of the organization may not get out of step with the other.

Mr. MacNICOL: Are they all coming from continental Europe?

Mr. HOWE: They are coming from displaced persons camps, which are all in Europe.

Mr. QUELCH: There are no limitations on those who may come from the United Kingdom?

Mr. HOWE: No limitations at all. There is nothing to stop any British subject resident in the United Kingdom from coming to Canada if he can get transportation and if he has good health and funds sufficient to establish himself. I simply make these few remarks now, which I shall extend at the next sitting, because I do not want the impression left that Canada is carrying on a limited immigration policy. We have an active immigration policy. The facilities for carrying on immigration are being improved each month, and we look for very satisfactory results by the year's end.

Mr. QUELCH: What provision is there that a person in the United Kingdom with a certain amount of money will be able to bring his money to establish himself in Canada? Is he allowed to bring a certain number of pounds?

Mr. HOWE: That is a matter wholly between the resident of the United Kingdom and his government. The United Kingdom has exchange control, as has Canada. The amount that the British treasury will permit a British immigrant to bring to Canada is a matter that depends on the circumstances and depends on the viewpoint of the treasury in the particular case.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, July 11, 1947

The house met at eleven o'clock.

HUDSON BAY MINING AND SMELTING

WORKS DECLARED FOR THE ADVANTAGE OF TWO OR MORE PROVINCES—CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 452, respecting the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the mine and metallurgical plants of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited are situated astride the Manitoba-Saskatchewan interprovincial boundary adjacent to the town of Flin Flon, Manitoba. The company is the second largest producer of copper and zinc, is one of the larger producers of gold and silver in Canada, and employs at present some 2,200 men. The mining shaft and railway operated by the company run across the interprovincial boundary. The mill, zinc plant and smelter buildings are also situated on both sides of the boundary. While the great majority of the employees are resident in Manitoba and are hired and paid in Manitoba, about one-half of them are working in Saskatchewan and the other half in Manitoba; and in the

course of their work they move back and forth daily across the interprovincial boundary.

Throughout the war years, the company's operations were subject in matters of labour relations to P.C. 1003 and to the wage control order. The return of jurisdiction over labour relations and wages and working conditions to the provinces has raised a problem of unique difficulty both to the provinces and to the company with respect to the application of provincial legislation governing labour relations and terms and conditions of employment —notably holidays with pay and hours of work legislation—to the company's operations. This is particularly so as the legislation of the two provinces on these matters is not uniform. In matters of collective bargaining, neither the company nor the union are in a position to bargain with certainty on matters relating to terms and conditions of employment in view of the doubt and difficulties as to application of provincial legislation.

The company has discussed the question with the governments of both Manitoba and Saskatchewan and with the Department of Labour in Ottawa, and also made a submission within the last week to the industrial relations committee of this house.

Manitoba and Saskatchewan, who are the only provinces interested in this matter, have requested that, with a view to meeting the admitted difficulties of the situation, the dominion should be asked to enact legislation to bring these mining operations of the company within the scope of dominion jurisdiction. Both governments have agreed on the procedure to be followed to effect this result, namely:

(a) That parliament should declare these mining operations of the company to be works for the advantage of two or more provinces.

(b) To provide that the rates of pay, hours of work and other terms and conditions of employment of employees of the company employed upon such undertaking shall be such as are established in collective agreements entered into from time to time between the company and the representatives of its employees but without affecting the application of provincial workmen's compensation legislation.

The unions representing employees of the company support the company's representations and the foregoing proposals.

This bill is being proceeded with at this session and as the difficulties relating to the company's operations are represented by the company and by the provincial governments as requiring an early solution, the government decided it best to introduce this bill which gives effect to the request of the two provinces mentioned and the representations made by the company to the industrial relations committee of this house. I believe that members of this house will be in agreement and be prepared to support the provisions of the bill.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the said bill be read a second time?

Mr. KNOWLES: Next sitting of the house.

Mr. MITCHELL: As this measure has been agreed to by the provinces, the companies and the representatives of the men, I would ask the house for unanimous consent to proceed with it now.

Mr. ADAMSON: As a member of the industrial relations committee, and knowing something about this bill, speaking for the Conservative party, I should be glad if unanimous consent were given to proceeding with further stages.

Mr. MacINNIS: I should like to know just how far the minister would want to go. Does he intend that the bill be given second reading only at this stage, and considered in committee later. If that is the proposal I shall be very glad to agree to it.

Mr. MITCHELL: I would agree with that; give it second reading now and we will proceed with the committee stage later.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

MILITIA PENSION ACT

PENSIONS FOR LESS THAN TWENTY YEARS' SERVICE UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a measure to amend the Militia Pension Act to provide that the governor in council may grant an annual pension to a member of the forces who has contributed to the consolidated revenue fund under part V of the Act and who has served in the forces for ten years or upwards but less than twenty years, and who is certified by a board composed of not less than three medical officers of the forces as being disabled or incapable of performing his duties as a member of the forces.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS

ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCE TO GOVERNMENT AND OPPOSITION LEADERS IN SENATE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved the third reading of Bill No. 443, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: On division.

Motion agreed to on division and bill read the third time and passed.

ROYAL STYLE AND TITLES ACT

OMISSION OF WORDS "INDIAE IMPERATOR" AND "EMPEROR OF INDIA"

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of Bill No. 449, to provide for the alteration of His Majesty's royal style and titles.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. POULIOT: I have just one observation to make, and that is with regard to bills which come from Westminster to the dominions. There is a particular way of drafting them, and when they are passed at Westminster in certain language they are supposed to be passed by the dominion in exactly the same language. I consider this plain red tape, and I will tell you why. The title does not affect the king as king of Canada; it affects him only as former emperor of India. Because the description of His Majesty the King of Great Britain as emperor of India is changed, I do not see why we should pass a bill like this, which does not concern us any more than a change in the name of the Dominion of Canada would affect the people of India. This is only to give us the illusion that we have something to do with that business. We have nothing to do with it. What is done concerning India does not concern Canada any more than what is done in Canada affects India, with the exception of trade relations.

This is not the first time this sort of thing has happened. I am a loyal subject of His Majesty the King. I have taken my oath of allegiance to him, and I have the greatest respect for the royal family. But I think this bill is just "blah blah", just to give Canada the illusion of having more importance than it has in interimperial relations. I protest against such legislation, which means nothing more than the consultation with Canada meant in regard to the engagement of Princess Elizabeth. If Canada had said no, she would have got married just the same. This bill is just an illusion, just a mirage, and I protest once more against such legislation which is just a waste of the time of the house.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

TRUST COMPANIES ACT

VARIOUS AMENDMENTS

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 417 to amend the Trust Companies Act.

He said: This bill contains a number of rather technical amendments to the Trust Companies Act. There has been no substantial amendment of that act since I think 1923 or 1924, and the trust companies who operate under dominion charter have discussed with the superintendent of insurance and with myself certain amendments which they felt it was desirable to make to the act in order to bring it up to date.

I can outline very briefly the principal amendments. First, they authorize an increase in the number of directors a company may have from twenty-one to thirty. The bill will permit the naming of an executive committe of the board of directors if desired. If these trust companies so desire they may have their capital divided into shares of $10 each instead of $100, which is consistent with the change made in the Bank Act at the last revision. There are provisions relating to the books of the company and transfers of stock, to bring them into line with the corresponding provisions of the Companies Act. There is an extension of the period for holding real estate other than office premises from seven to twelve years. The investment powers of trust companies are brought more nearly into conformity with those of Canadian life insurance companies under the insurance act. There are sundry minor amendments but those are the principal amendments to the act. The bill is now before the house.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I rise merely to make a suggestion to the minister with respect to this bill. As the minister has properly pointed out, the bill contains a number of technical amendments to the Trust Companies Act. Personally I think, and the

view is shared by a number of my colleagues who are interested in this particular measure, that we would save much of the time of the house, and the bill would receive much better consideration, if we were now to give it second reading without debate and send it to the banking and commerce committee.

I know it is late in the session, and that is perhaps an additional reason why it should be referred to that committee, because we might have a lengthy examination of the various provisions of the act if we took it up in committee of the whole here. To adopt my suggestion would save a great deal of time. Moreover some of the amendments proposed call for information from officials of the department. I want to make that suggestion as one which in my opinion is constructive and one which would facilitate the work of the session.

Mr. ABBOTT: Under ordinary circumstances I should be glad to comply with my hon. friend's suggestion, but I put forward this consideration for hon. members, that it should be unnecessary at this time to refer this bill to the banking and commerce committee. It was introduced in the Senate purposely that it might receive consideration both there and in the banking committee of the other place. The proposed amendments have been suggested after lengthy discussion and conferences between the association of trust companies and the superintendent of insurance. I do not think they are of a particularly controversial nature. They have been approved by the superintendent of insurance. I myself have been over them and I do not think they are objectionable. I really think they could be adequately considered in committee of the whole, and I am prepared to give such explanations as may be called for. The superintendent of insurance, of course, will be on the floor with me.

Mr. FLEMING: I would like to ask the Minister of Finance—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. May I point out to the house that we are on the second reading of the bill. The minister has spoken after the motion was put, the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) has spoken, and the minister has replied.

Mr. ABBOTT: If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I was merely replying to a question. I would not want it to be considered that I was closing the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest to hon. members that if they have any questions to ask the minister they wait until the house is in committee on the bill.

[Mr. Graydon.]

Mr. DONALD M. FLEMING (Eglinton): I should like to say a word in favour of the proposal put forward by the member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) on the question of referring this bill to the banking and commerce committee. We are all concerned about saving the time of the house at this stage. That is an important consideration and I think we could save a good deal of time on what is after all a lengthy bill. The amendments may not all be of leading importance; nevertheless there are many of them. I do think that we can save considerable time if the bill is referred to the banking and commerce committee, as it surely would in the ordinary course of events in an earlier stage of the session.

As one member of the banking and commerce committee, I for one value the privilege accorded in that committee of hearing explanations on such bills from the superintendent of insurance, Mr. Finlayson, who is also responsible for administering the provisions of the Trust Companies Act. I am quite sure we could save time in this chamber, where time is precious, and we could do a better job on this bill. There would be no delay, because the banking and commerce committee could be called together on a few hours' notice. I am sure the house would do a far more satisfactory job by following that course.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): I want to add a word to what has been said by the member for Peel. I think that this bill should go to the appropriate committee, not only because it would save time but because it is technical in character and we should thoroughly understand what we are passing. I rise merely to suggest that to the minister.

Mr. ABBOTT: If that is the wish of the house I am glad to comply. I am not pressing for the passage of the bill this year. It has been represented to the government as desirable in the interests of the efficient operation of trust companies, and if the banking and commerce committee can deal with it and get it back into the house, so that we can get it through, that is satisfactory so far as I am concerned. I wish to make it perfectly clear, however, that I am not pressing for the passage of this bill. I do not wish to speed it up or to rush it through, and if the house feels that the banking and commerce committee can deal with it more adequately and we can get it through this session, well and good. I move accordingly.

Mr. GRAYDON: With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, if I may say one more word, perhaps the minister would arrange, having regard to

the stage of the session we have reached, to have the banking and commerce committee convene at once so that the matter will not be delayed.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is up to the chairman of that committee. I am sure he will try to accommodate hon. members.

Motion agreed to; bill read the second time and referred to the standing committee on banking and commerce.

ARMY BENEVOLENT FUND

ESTABLISHMENT FROM ARMY CANTEEN AND OTHER SERVICE FUNDS—PROVISION FOR BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 410, to establish a benevolent fund from army canteen and other service funds.

Mr. BROOKS: Will the minister explain the amendments?

Mr. CLAXTON: The other place has made three amendments, the first in section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (a). Subsection 2 reads:

There shall be credited to the fund all amounts now credited to the following accounts in the consolidated revenue fund:

(a) The account known as the central trust fund of the army, navy and air force canteens and continued pursuant to an order of the governor in council dated the 18th day of September, 1946, P.C. 68/3910.

The amendment is to add the words "less equities of the Royal Canadian Navy and the Royal Canadian Air Force." That is to take account of the fact that there may be some claim on the part of these two services to the funds in question. The second amendment proposed is to section 5, where reference is made to a committee for the Mackenzie river district. It was found that the right name is the "Mackenzie district" and it is proposed to delete the word "river." The third change is made in section 9, subsection 2(b), which now reads:

The board shall be governed by the following principles:

(b) no grant is to be made by way of relief of want from the fund.

The words "of want" have been struck out as unnecessary. Those are the changes; they are purely a matter of drafting.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES ACT

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (for the Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 377, to amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act.

He said: These are purely technical alterations. They will be found on page 776 of *Votes and Proceedings*. They are as follows:

1. Page 1, line 30: delete "such" and substitute "the".

2. Page 1, line 30: after "order" insert "of the Attorney General".

3. Page 2, line 1: delete "such" and substitute "the".

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND RESOURCES

130. Departmental administration, $183,173.

(Translation):

Mr. PIERRE GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Mr. Chairman, while the hon. members admit quite readily that the acting Minister of Mines and Resources can meet fully the demands of his numerous duties, I am sure that we all deplore the absence of our very good friend the Hon. Mr. Glen, Minister of Mines and Resources. May I express the hope that Providence will vouchsafe him every possible solace as well as recovery from his present illness.

I have listened most attentively to the speech delivered last night by the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll). While agreeing with him on several points, I must say that I have clearly stated in the past my position with regard to immigration, and if I rise this morning it is not for the purpose of adding much to what I have already said, but rather to reaffirm the stand I took in former debates.

In order to please my hon. friends, I say at once that I shall not take more than a few minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): I have in my hand the speech delivered on May 1, 1947, by the prime minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) where I notice a sentence I fully endorse and which should ever remain in the minds of those who advocate immigration:

The government will seek by legislation, regulation, and vigorous administration, to ensure

the careful selection and permanent settlement of such numbers of immigrants as can advantageously be absorbed in our national economy.

Mr. MICHAUD: Hear, hear.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): To my mind, that stand is the most logical and worthy of the leader of a national economy like ours. I believe it is the soundest position that could be taken: "such numbers . . . as can advantageously be absorbed in our national economy".

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): I have already said, and I now repeat, that I am not in favour of mass immigration. I admit that a certain movement of people can take place between the various countries over a number of years, but I would not like the government to bring here too many immigrants some of whom will stay on the lands where they will apparently have settled down, while a greater number, perhaps, will take up residence in cities where they will merely increase the number of unemployed and lengthen what is commonly and quite appropriately called the bread-line, should this country have the misfortune of going through a period of unemployment.

I agree with the statement which the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) made not very long ago when he said, in answer to those who believe that we have an unlimited area of tillable soil, that the land awaiting cultivation may not be as extensive as it is claimed to be.

Mr. MICHAUD: That's right.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Having carefully considered this important matter of Canadian immigration, it is, to my mind, clearly shown that even though the area of Canada is greater than that of the United States whose population numbers 130,000,000 inhabitants, we cannot state that the tillable land in the country is as extensive as is claimed in certain quarters.

From 1871 to 1937, we admitted a very large number of immigrants. This morning, I added a few figures, and I find that 5,234,235 immigrants have come to Canada. Of that number, a certain percentage remained on the land. Incidentally, I must say that when the Immigration Branch gives instructions to its officials in European countries with reference to the choice of immigrants, it should stress that they select first candidates who intend to settle on the farm and apply regulations obliging them to remain on the land

Mr. MICHAUD: Five years.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Five years, as suggested by the hon. member for Restigouche-Madawaska, would not be too long and would allow us to determine whether those who left farms in Europe really intended to settle on the land and become bona fide farmers, or whether they planned to remain there only until they could leave to swell the city population.

Mr. MICHAUD: That's right.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): If we take the trouble of establishing the percentage relating to population in urban and rural centres, we will find that, generally speaking, especially in my province, the advantage seems to be in favour of the cities.

Mr. MICHAUD: Always.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): According to a survey, there are more people in the cities of the province of Quebec, than in the country. If we want our farmers to supply as much food as possible to the city workers, we must see that the proportion again favours our rural areas.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): That is why, during a debate last year—if I may be permitted to refer to it for a moment—I advocated a programme of reconstruction, comprising the setting up of recreational and educational centres in our rural communities, a programme that should be partly financed by the provinces and partly by the dominion government. Unfortunately, agreement with the provinces, especially Quebec and Ontario, is too slow to come about, so that our rural communities cannot benefit as much as they would wish to from those agreements, and specially from the financial assistance of which they could avail themselves to finance those rural and educational centres and render them far more interesting and attractive, in order to instil into our young people love for the land and for rural communities in general.

Coming back to the question of immigration, I have here a document, which was laid on the table of the house, showing, as I mentioned a while ago, that 5,234,235 people immigrated to Canada between 1871 and 1937. I agree that we should accept a certain number of immigrants. The Right Hon. the Prime Minister stated on May 1, 1947, that Canada had attempted to alleviate the sufferings of nations that had been sorely tried during the war, especially in Europe. Canada has largely contributed to the alleviation of the sufferings of people grouped in displaced persons camps, and continues to do so. It should

not be assumed, however, that Canada will do everything single-handed and without the help of the other nations of the world. I repeat that only a reasonable policy, such as was outlined by the Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King in this house on May 1, where he stated that we must first ascertain the number of immigrants that our economy can absorb—such a policy is the only one which will prevent us from reverting to the unfortunate condition that prevailed during the last depression, a recurrence of which is always possible, of seeing immigrants who had settled on farms or accepted employment in plants or industrial concerns, swell what we used to call the "bread-line". Therefore, we should not accept any more than our national economy can absorb.

I agree with those who are conversant with the problem of immigration that we could accept a certain number of immigrants, and that a certain natural movement can take place between the various countries of the world in the course of years. Some are complaining about the loss of talented young people and a certain number are evidently leaving Canada for the United States.

I notice that every time the subject of immigration is discussed and particularly when mention is made of the fact that we need a greater number of British immigrants, nobody ever stops to consider the great economic difficulties which are experienced by the United Kingdom at the present time. Under the title "Friday Forum—Europe offers good immigrants", here is what Mr. M. J. Heffernan wrote in the Montreal *Gazette* of July 11th, 1947:

(Text):

Europe Offers Good Immigrants

The fundamental fact is that Canada is losing several thousands of her most skilled farmers and tens of thousands of her trained youth. If the dominion is not to grow anaemic new blood must be had, and the source is immigration.

(Translation):

These people never seem to think that even without immigration—and I speak for my own province—we may place our hopes in the large families which are the pride of Canadian motherhood. Even without mass immigration, we may rest assure that the natural growth of population will give us the men to sow our land with wheat, so that the stems, rustling softy in the breeze, may sing of a people's hope to live in spite of everything.

Mr. MICHAUD: Hear, hear.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Mr. Heffernan continues—

(Text):

For the thousands who are leaving Canada there are millions in Europe eager to come, anxious to escape from the miseries of war, and willing to build up, where Canadians will give them the chance, the lives they have snatched from slave labour and internment camps.

(Translation):

Counter arguments are often put forward. When the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Dionne) dared to bring a few Polish girls to Canada to work at his plant, many unfortunate things were said in this house. Some went so far as to accuse the hon. member for Beauce of exploiting what is called "slave labour" in Europe. As I was saying before I started quoting this report, we are prone to forget the problems of British economy. It seems to me that we are rendering poor service to the United Kingdom when we persist in bringing to Canada, by hundreds of thousands—the quota has been set at 600,000—farmers and workers who are absolutely needed in Great Britain at this time for the reconstruction and the rehabilitation of the British Isles.

Mr. MICHAUD: Hear, hear.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): I have here the June 24 issue of the magazine *World Report*. I find in it a picture showing a poster held by English workers during a demonstration. This poster reads:

(Text):

We need 40,000 more miners in the United Kingdom. We need 75,000 more textile workers in the United Kingdom. We need 40,000 more farm workers.

They need these in the United Kingdom and we are asking them to send hundreds of thousands of immigrants to Canada. We are asking them to do that at a time when they need so much farm help, so many textile workers and so many coal miners?

(Translation):

I believe there is a much more reasonable and patriotic way of helping the United Kingdom than by asking it to pinch and scrape in order that our population be increased. Besides, I would request my hon. friends, supporters of mass immigration, to cast a sympathetic eye on the United Kingdom which, unfortunately, cannot rely on natural population increase, while we can count on that factor, especially in the province of Quebec and even in the other provinces.

Mr. MICHAUD: Hear, hear!

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): I claim that it is a great pity to request it to make an excessive effort and force it, as the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll) said last night, to import workers from other European countries in an effort to make up for the century-old inadequacy of the birth rate and the scarcity of workers which the very able socialist government is attempting to put to work in the British Isles. It seems to me that the fact of demanding that the present situation of Canada be taken into account, of asking who is now doing more than his share, who has done more than his share during the war, who has, in spite of the three, four or five great powers, joined the council of nations and of insisting that our country be not asked to do more than the others, is not acting as a bad Canadian.

When British immigrants are requested, I hope I shall not sound a flat note in asking that consideration be given to the sons of old France and intrepid Belgium who wish to come to Canada to live among those they consider almost as brothers.

Mr. MICHAUD: Hear, hear!

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I wished to restate very clearly my precise attitude on this most ticklish and complex matter of immigration.

I repeat that my words are not to be construed as meaning that I favour closing our frontiers to all immigration. Every time I speak on national problems in this house, I endeavour to express views that are as essentially Canadian as possible. I do not wish to close to those who have faith in the future of Canada a door which they would throw wide open, but I want those who advocate immigration to realize that our economy so badly shaken up by the war must not be jeopardized and that, in the near future, we may have to support people who will claim jobs from us, a larger number of whom, possibly, will be among those who have entered our country more or less recently rather than among those whose ancestors have lived here for years and even centuries.

(Text):

Mr. J. E. MATTHEWS (Brandon): I want to offer a few remarks in connection with these estimates, and I may as well do so now as under the item to which it more fittingly belongs, that for national parks and historic sites. I want to urge particularly that funds be made available from somewhere for the further development this year of our international peace garden at Manitoba and in North Dakota. I can easily understand that there is not at the moment a very live interest in this parliament concerning that project. It was one of those undertakings which were laid aside during the war; then when the war ended it was found that to a large extent a new generation of parliamentarians occupied seats in this chamber, and few of them knew anything about the aims and work of this organization, officially known as International Peace Garden Incorporated.

I am very sorry that the Minister of Mines and Resources is not in his place in the chamber in these days, and I am sure that one and all are hoping that the rest he is now enjoying may bring him back to a complete restoration of health. We are fortunate, however, that his duties are being undertaken by a gentleman who is also one of broad outlook and of undoubted capacity. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, and because the Canadian government is in honour bound committed to the furtherance of this undertaking, I desire as a matter of information to place on the record a brief, but I trust a clear, resume of the garden's background. I should emphasize that which is already suggested, that it is not a municipal, a provincial or even a national undertaking; it is international in every sense of the word. The seed was sown away back in 1929 when an international convention of the Gardeners Association of North America was held in Toronto, the first time that important association had ever met in Canada. At that convention the idea of a peace garden was submitted by the late Henry J. Moore of Islington, Ontario. Mr. Moore, as some hon. members are aware, was not an amateur gardener but a professional one of wide repute, a writer of recognized ability and a valued member of the Royal Horticultural Society of London, England. He was a man whose ability, vision, and experience were widely recognized. I am under the impression that he served for many years as horticultural expert for the Ontario government. In an inspiring address at the Toronto convention Mr. Moore won his way into the hearts of all his hearers as he suggested the laying out of a magnificent garden at some point on the international line as a beautiful and living memorial to everlasting peace, and an appealing symbol of good will between our two nations. Reading at this time, eighteen years after it was given, a summary of Mr. Moore's oration, for such I may call it, one cannot fail to be impressed by the similarity of thought, the expression of idealism and the cogency of appeal existing between that speech and the one delivered in this house a few weeks ago by President Truman.

Mr. Moore in the course of his Toronto speech made this announcement:

The United States ambassador to Canada, Hon. William Phillips, the highest representative of the American government, and the Governor General of Canada, Lord Willingdon, the direct representative of the King and of Great Britain, have in letters with the words of statesmen and of Christian gentlemen endorsed the project. The Prime Minister of Canada, the Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King kindly sent a representative to this meeting. The Hon. George S. Henry, a minister of the Ontario government, is present. The Hon. John S. Martin, Minister of Agriculture of Ontario, and the Hon. William Motherwell of the dominion government are in accord with the project. What better endorsation is possible?

Mr. Moore's proposal was carried unanimously and with wide acclaim, so wide that in a short time no less than fifty-six national, state and provincial organizations forwarded pledges of their support. These pledges, many of which came from the middle west and southern states, were sponsored by such organizations as the Canadian and American Red Cross societies, the Women's Federal Institute of Canada; the Imperial Order, Daughters of the Empire, both in Canada and in the United States; the Canadian business and professional women's club, the Manitoba and North Dakota chapter of the order of the Eastern Star and came from many western Canadian municipalities, boards of trade, school boards and even from many of the scholars themselves. You will therefore realize that a far-flung interest had arisen which, as I have said, waned temporarily owing to the demands of war.

Then followed the important task of translating the will of that Toronto convention into action. A strong international committee was appointed consisting of the following: Joseph E. Atkinson; E. W. Beatty; Mrs. George Black; C. E. Burden; Albert C. Burrage; Rev. S. Parkes Cadman, D.D.; Hon. Martin L. Davey; Hon. Athanase David; Henry W. Deforest; T. W. Duggan; Pierre S. DuPont; Lady Eaton; Mrs. Henry Ford; Right Rev. James E. Freeman, D.D.; Right Rev. William T. Gunn, D.D.; Mrs. W. J. Hanna; T. A. Havemeyer; Com. James Hay, O.B.E.; Hon. Arthur M. Hyde; Mrs. William A. Lockwood; Hon. Frank O. Lowden; E. B. Luke; Hon. John S. Martin; Most Rev. S. P. Matheson, D.D., L.L.D., D.C.L.; Miss Marion H. McClench; Rev. R. R. McKay, B.A.; Hon. D. G. McKenzie; Most Rev. Neil McNeil, D.D.; Hon. William R. Motherwell; Adolph Ochs; Hon. William Phillips; Miss Ethel T. Raymond; Right Rev. J. A. Richardson, D.D.; Prof. Robertson; Col. Hugh A. Rose; Mlle. Idola Saint Jean; Mrs John F. Sippel; C. F. Sise; Hon. Alfred E. Smith; L. S. Taber; Sir Henry W. Thornton, K.B.E.; W. V Udall; Senator Thomas J. Walsh; Mrs. J. A. Wilson; Most Rev. Clare L. Worrell, M.A., D.D., D.C.L.; Owen D. Young.

Read that list, Mr. Chairman, and you will find the names of some of the most prominent people on this continent, although a few of them have now passed on. There are such citizens as the late President Beatty, Sir Henry Thornton, Hon. Alfred E. Smith of New York, Lady Eaton, Mrs. Henry Ford and our own respected and beloved Mrs. George Black of the Yukon. These and a host of others are not the type of citizens to lend their names to any proposals which are unworthy and have no appeal.

This general committee having been chosen, no time was lost in appointing a committee to select a site, and no restriction was imposed upon that committee geographically or otherwise. If you want to grasp the idea of internationalism, listen to the names of those who composed that site committee: H. J. Moore of Toronto, Joseph Dunlop of South Euclid, Ohio, Robert P. Brydon of Cleveland, Ohio. Many sites were inspected along the boundary, but eventually one was unanimously chosen in the Turtle mountains, a range of hills situated astride the boundary between Manitoba and North Dakota. Those hills, at one time heavily timbered, rise to a height of 2,500 feet above sea level. They extend forty-five miles east and west and twenty miles north and south. They were named by the Indians centuries before the coming of the white man. At a later meeting of those interested, held not in Canada but at Asbury Park, New Jersey, on September 17, 1931, the Turtle mountain site received unanimous endorsation. The area of the garden consists of 2,340 acres, 1,452 acres in Canada, donated by the Manitoba government, and 888 acres on the United States side, donated partly by Washington and partly by the state of North Dakota. The selection of this site was greatly facilitated by the Hon. D. G. McKenzie, at that time Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in the Manitoba government, who on behalf of that government offered to donate the generous acreage I have just stated. Over much of this area there is a profusion of flowered foliage and an abundance of wild life, particularly bird life. Potentially it is one of those rare locations where the harmony and colour of the flowers symbolize that harmony of ideals which has enabled two great peoples to live side by side in friendship and understanding for almost one hundred and fifty years.

It is interesting to recall a paragraph of the speech from the throne at the opening of the Manitoba legislature on February 29, 1932, under the leadership of Hon. John Bracken, always an ardent supporter of the garden:

A memorable event of the past year is the provision made for the peace garden in the Turtle mountain region of Manitoba and North Dakota. This international project ought to have a prominent place in the peace chronicles of the present era when every thinking person in the world is compelled to realize that one of the most important questions facing our civilization is that of world peace, friendship, and cooperation.

I recall also an editorial of that time in the Winnipeg *Tribune*, from which I quote:

It is a worthy, a splendid project, and one that has the enthusiastic approval not only of the people of Manitoba and Western Canada, but of other millions in both countries... Some of the most magnificent monuments in the world have been erected to commemorate lost causes, vanished glories and ruined hopes. A peace garden, let us hope, will symbolize in its own living beauty, ever more cordial relations between the two countries.

I was privileged, Mr. Chairman, in having been one of almost 50,000 persons who were present at the official opening of that garden on July 24, 1932. People were assembled there from great distances in the central west, Americans and Canadians, many of whom not so long before had lost loved ones on the battlefields of Europe. But it mattered not whether American or Canadian, we were there as one people, our hearts and minds bent on one purpose. I have never forgotten the hush that prevailed over that great multitude during the unveiling of a huge cairn of native stone erected right astride the boundary line. Upon that cairn was a bronze plaque bearing this inscription: "To God in His Glory we two nations dedicate this garden and pledge ourselves that as long as men shall live we will not take up arms against one another."

Those seeds of international fidelity, sown years ago, came to early fruition when only seven years later our two nations found themselves fighting side by side in the most destructive war in all history. For us to have been fighting on opposite sides is simply unthinkable.

Even prior to this official opening elaborate plans of development had been prepared. These plans were approved—and I want you to note this—by the natural parks service of the United States and by the national parks bureau of Canada. The project was so designed that the total area controlled by International Peace Garden Incorporated will form one harmonious unit. These approved plans have already been developed to a considerable extent, including landscaping, permanent fencing, highway building and the opening of branch roads in the park area. However, during the war only maintenance work was carried on on the Canadian side by the Manitoba government. The time has now arrived when the work already done can be conserved only by hurrying more of those plans to completion. This further work is the responsibility of the federal government. Why do I make that statement? First, because the whole proposal is international in its aspect; also because the dominion government has already expended through the province of Manitoba approximately $52,000, and has supplemented this by substantial supplies of material to the United States side from Riding Mountain national park.

The United States section was developed very largely by the civilian conservation corps previous to Pearl Harbor, and a customs and immigration station is to be erected at a cost of $60,000, while the state of North Dakota has appropriated more than $30,000 for the development of the United States section. I have to confess that up to date there has been much more development on the United States side than on the Canadian. After a standstill during the war I understand the United States directors have recently made representations to the United States government for the early resumption of financial assistance, which will no doubt be granted.

May I make clear the fact that the international peace garden is incorporated under the laws of Manitoba and North Dakota, and has been recognized by both Canadian and United States governments. By that recognition Canada has given her approval, which, as I said, prior to the outbreak of the war was backed by repeated contributions. I am confident that our American friends will find Canada will not break faith in her continued support of this project. Henry J. Moore, that great Canadian, has passed to his reward. Strangely enough his death took place on September 21, 1946, the day of the last annual meeting of the association he had founded and always held so dear. He and many other enthusiastic sponsors of the plan have thrown the torch to younger hands, and I want to pay tribute to the manner in which the present directors have carried on from year to year without a dollar of remuneration, simply as a labour of love and out of allegiance to a great ideal; carried on with patience and understanding in the face of many difficulties. Seven of the present directors are Americans from various states, while eight are Canadians from different parts of western Canada. I know most of those fifteen directors,

and they are citizens of the highest type. Again I should like to place the names of those directors on *Hansard:*

Chairman of board—F. R. Longworth, Brandon, Manitoba
Honorary President—W. V. Udall, Boissevain, Manitoba
President—W. M. Smart, Minot, N.D.
First Vice-President—M. S. Colquhoun, Deloraine, Manitoba
Second Vice-President—W. P. Campbell, Dunseith, N.D.
Secretary—John Stormon, Rolla, N.D.
Assistant Secretary—E. J. Johnson, Boissevain, Manitoba
Treasurer—Judge A. G. Buckingham, Brandon, Manitoba
Directors—D. G. McKenzie, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Mrs. Mary Allen, Moose Jaw, Sask.; Russell Reid, Bismarck, N.D.; W. R. Leslie, Morden, Manitoba; Henry Sunderland, Dunseith, N.D.; Hon. Errick Willis, Winnipeg, Manitoba; John Barnett, Glen Head, N.Y.; D. J. Creighton, Convent, N.J.

Since this project, so far as the federal government is concerned, has been a forgotten responsibility since 1940, I want to go on record as having now placed before the dominion parliament a resume of this idealistic undertaking, and to make the request that in preparing the estimates for succeeding years reasonably substantial amounts be included definitely for that work. Other memorials that we may call peace memorials have been erected in past years at great expense between the nations of Canada and the United States, such as the peace bridge between Fort Erie and Buffalo, which was built at a cost of some $5,000,000, the Ambassador bridge between Windsor and Detroit, the bridge between Sarnia and Port Huron and the Ivy Lea bridge at the Thousand Islands. They are all large and ambitious undertakings, and in addition to serving commercial purposes they constitute a good example of the good neighbour policy. But let me point out that all these are in Ontario and relatively only a few miles apart. May I suggest further that there are provinces other than Ontario, and states other than New York, where the citizens desire to give some expression of the fact that they too live in equality and mutual respect. As far as I can recall this garden is the only peace memorial along the international boundary, from the bridges I have mentioned to the Pacific coast, a distance of over two thousand miles. Its further development on the part of Canada will express our practical reaction to the recent statement of President Truman in this chamber:

> We intend to cooperate actively and loyally with all who honestly seek, as we do, to build a better world in which mankind can live in peace and prosperity. We count Canada in the forefront of those who share these objectives and ideals. With such friends we face the future unafraid.

Someone will say this is simply another call for more expenditure. That may be, but there are some expenditures, even governmental, that prove to be good investments. That is Canada's experience in regard to the tourist industry. Our revenue from that source in 1946 amounted to the handsome sum of $227,000,000. I am confident that in the next few years a tremendous expansion is possible in that industry. Therefore I desire to point out that the international peace garden is located on perhaps the most important highway connecting central United States and central Canada. Someone has called it the main street of America, coming as it does directly from central America, Mexico and the central states and entering Canada via the peace garden, thence continuing northward almost in a direct line to Riding Mountain national park, on to The Pas, soon to Churchill and perhaps in time to the shores of Hudson Bay, at all events going through vast areas of wild and primitive scenery in our great northwest. Tourist development in Canada is simply astounding in its possibilities. I may mention Riding Mountain national park as an illustration. It was practically unknown a few years ago but led every national pairk in Canada with the exception of one in the number of visitors last year, and without exception led every park in the number of automobiles entering the park area in 1946. People went there in droves from every state in the union and every province in Canada. Most of us know something of the excellence and wide circulation of the *Christian Science Monitor,* which is published in the United States. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that there has been no collusion in this matter; but the reading room received this morning—and word was passed on to me—the latest issue of that publication, which contains almost a full page illustrative of Riding Mountain national park. I would advise every hon member of this house to read this article and look at the illustrations, so that, as far as the tourist industry is concerned, we may come to see ourselves as others see us.

More and more will United States tourists be drawn northward by the magnetic attraction of our natural parks. We all know how lasting are first impressions, whether favourable or unfavourable. Therefore when these tourists reach the front door of Canada we want them to be greeted, not by frowning fort nor silent sentry, but by a smiling garden symbolic of a peace so permanent that, like "the glory of the garden it shall never pass away".

May I emphasize in conclusion the intriguing fact that instead of being in the far east or in the distant west this garden is located actually within thirty miles of the exact centre of the North American continent. Surely that is a fitting place for a tall and commanding peace tower, proclaiming to the world the friendship between our two nations. I suggest further that the time may come, perhaps sooner than we think, when in that parklike garden in that unique centre of an expansive continent, there may be erected a joint statue of our two national war leaders, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister King who, having given superb leadership in the days of peace, yet rose to greatest heights in the hour of their country's greatest danger.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Just before the hon. member resumes his seat I should like to ask him a question. I wonder if it has been brought to his attention that the Waterton Lakes national park in southwestern Alberta was made an international peace park several years ago. That really should go on record in modification of what the hon. member has said.

Mr. RODNEY ADAMSON (York West): The debate we have had this morning on this department lends force to what I wish to say at this point. The Department of Mines and Resources has now become a receptacle for various tag ends of government business. It deals with Indian affairs, national parks, immigration, mines and resources and, apparently, national memorials. I want to make a plea to the minister, and since he is a practical man I feel he will agree, that this department should be what it says it is; that is, a department of mines and resources. This morning we have had a discussion on immigration, national parks and national memorials, and as I see it the debate on the minister's estimates will cover a large and varied number of unrelated subjects. Next to agriculture the development of the natural resources of this country should be the most productive endeavour of any government. I am prepared to say that within a very few years production from our natural resources, our mines and forests, will be of greater value to this country than agriculture owing to the growing importance of mineral production. I would ask the government to consider during the recess removing Indian affairs and immigration from the Department of Mines and Resources. As we have seen here today, immigration should be a matter for the Secretary of State or for some other department—I suggest the Secretary of State, who deals with naturalization. As we have seen this morning, it is a subject in which both races in Canada are interested. It is a subject which interests the whole of Canada. It may be suggested that it calls for a separate department. Certainly it is not an appropriate subject for the consideration of the Minister of Mines and Resources, who should be a practical man, preferably an engineer.

I come now to Indian affairs, and here again I suggest that the Secretary of State's department is the proper one to take over the Indian Affairs branch. By no stretch of the imagination can Indian affairs be considered as having anything to do with mines and resources. The Indian affairs committee has met this session, as it did last session, and if I am correct it has produced, apart from the veterans affairs committee, the most voluminous report that has ever been brought down in any parliament in Canada. The report covers many thousands of pages of evidence. For the Minister of Mines and Resources to have to concern himself with such voluminous reports is not in the best interests of the country.

This brings me to the complaint I have about the whole policy of this government and the other governments with regard to mines and resources. I am not going to go into fiscal policies or anything of the kind, but it has been shown that the money spent by the government on the development of our mines, on geological surveys, on laboratories, has been a mere fraction of one per cent of the total federal budget. If we are ever to have a balanced economy as between agriculture on the one hand and mining and forests on the other, as between imports and exports, we shall have to do far more than we have done in the direction of developing our mines.

The majority of the people do not realize what a serious situation confronts the mining industry today, particularly gold mining. Prices and costs have risen and are still rising steadily. The product has been artificially reduced in price by government action, and reduced to a very serious degree.

Last week the International Nickel Company agreed to a further increase of 13½ cents an hour to its workers. We have reached this state in Canada today, that if that increase is to be imposed on the gold mines also it will be the death knell of gold mining in this country. The industry at the present time is just getting by. There may be flurries in the market; expansive statements may be made by certain people in the industry and by promoters, but the basic thing is that the cost of producing an ounce of gold is steadily

rising whereas the price received for an ounce of gold has been artificially reduced. When these two meet, as they are nearly doing now, then mining ends. I shall have something to say about that on the estimates of the Minister of Finance, but since this is an administration item I take this occasion to say that it is imperative that the Department of Mines and Resources should be what it professes to be, a department dealing with the development of mines and the natural resources of the country. If it is not, if it is, as I have said, the national waste paper basket into which every unwanted and difficult problem is thrown, then we shall have a headless organization which will have no direction and which will be incapable of functioning efficiently. One has only to consider the fact I have mentioned, that a mere fraction of one per cent of the federal budget is spent on the development of natural resources.

I do not know whether he is the new minister, but the right hon. gentleman who is responsible for the department at the present time, an industrialist, a man who understands chains of command and who understands that to work efficiently a department must deal with one or two basic subjects, must realize that the main function of his department must not get sidetracked. I do hope that in the recess the reorganization of the Department of Mines and Resources will be undertaken. In this I am supported by the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, whose brief several years ago was one of the most cogent advocacies of the policy I now recommend to the minister.

Mr. ANTHONY HLYNKA (Vegreville): It is regrettable that owing to the government's inadequate immigration policy so many debates have been forced on the house on the subject of immigration. During the last two years I myself have spoken on this subject no fewer than six times and with the present inadequate immigration provisions my conscience would not be clear if I did not say something on this item today.

In the July 8 issue of the Toronto *Daily Star* I find a report to the effect that the Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources, Dr. H. L. Keenleyside, had stated:

> The Canadian seeking to have his displaced acquaintance brought to Canada need not be a relative but must accept responsibility for the immigrant.

And farther down:

> He said it was a matter of government policy whether further displaced persons would be accepted immediately.
>
> It was believed, however, that further displaced persons would be allowed entry prior to Canada's agreement with the intergovernmental committee on refugees to take a quota yet to be agreed upon.

Such statements appearing in the press have confused the people, and many of them have been writing to me asking whether an order in council has been passed providing for the admission to Canada of persons other than relatives. So far I have not seen an order in council to that effect, and I assume that the statement made some time ago by the Minister of Mines and Resources contained the complete provisions so far as immigration is concerned. I understand that only the following persons can be brought into Canada from displaced persons camps:

1. An agriculturist having sufficient means to farm in Canada.

2. An agriculturist entering Canada to farm, when destined to a father, father-in-law, son, son-in-law, brother, brother-in-law, uncle or nephew engaged in agriculture as his principal occupation, who is in a position to receive such immigrant and establish him on a farm.

3. A farm labourer entering Canada to engage in assured farm employment.

4. A person experienced in mining, lumbering or logging, entering Canada to engage in assured employment in any one of such industries.

5. The husband or wife, the son, the daughter, the brother or sister together with husband or wife and unmarried children, if any; the father or mother, the orphan nephew or niece under 21 years of age of any person legally resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and care for such relatives. The term "orphan" used in this clause means a child bereaved of both parents.

6. A person entering Canada for the purpose of marriage to a legal resident thereof, provided that the prospective husband is able to maintain his intended wife.

When the minister speaks I should like him to state whether the government has passed any order in council extending the provisions which I have placed on the record. I should like to know also the present immigration provisions so far as displaced persons and refugees are concerned. We should have a clarification of the government's immigration policy, because I hope we shall all be going home soon and our constituents will be asking for information. I should be grateful if the minister would give us the required information.

Before proceeding with the few remarks I wanted to make I should like to pay a tribute to the senate committee on immigra-

tion and labour for the splendid work it has done in connection with immigration during the past two sessions. That committee has done more for immigration than any other body in the way of arousing public opinion and prodding the government to adopt the measures which it has adopted so far. I am somewhat disturbed when I read that the United States of America is considering admitting 400,000 displaced persons and refugees; that the United Kingdom has taken a large number and is taking many more; that Argentina is picking the cream of the material available; that Brazil has accepted quite a number and is continuing to take more, and that Australia has also taken quite a number and is still taking more—what about Canada?

The arguments used by the immigration authorities are that there are no transportation facilities available. All who have had cases referred to them by their constituents and people in other parts of Canada know that very few immigrants can qualify under the present regulations. It seems to me the time has come when we should change the controls and permit a number of intellectuals to come in.

The government seems to be afraid of people with brains; all they are interested in is people with muscle. If muscle is all we want, we can bring in a bunch of horses, but of course horses would not pay taxes and they could not vote and that would be a disadvantage. If we are interested only in physical strength and not in individuals as such, then the government should bring in horses. I know a gentleman in Sudbury who is well off financially. He has two or three cousins in displaced persons camps in Europe and he wants to bring them to Canada. He has bought two or three quarters of land and has given up the bakery business in which he was engaged. He is willing to provide any guarantee the government wants in order to permit him to bring these people in. What is the answer? "We are sorry, but your cousins are, first, a newspaper man and not a farmer and therefore he does not qualify and, second, a lawyer."

Mr. WARREN: May I ask a question?

Mr. HLYNKA: The hon. gentleman can ask his question when I get through.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Vegreville has the floor and he cannot be interrupted without his permission.

Mr. HLYNKA: We are in committee, and if the hon. gentleman wishes to ask me any questions later I shall be only too glad to answer them. I have in the neighbourhood of 2,000 applications from people all over Canada for assistance to bring in relatives. These people cannot qualify because one happens to be a newspaper man, another happens to be a lawyer, a third happens to be an engineer and so on. Most of these intellectuals are willing to work on farms; that is what they want to do when they arrive here. They do not want to pursue their professions which they followed before the war because many of them at least have not a sufficiently good command of the English language. Surely, Mr. Chairman, if these men want to come in, and they are with us in every sense and are the best material we can get, we should let them come in.

I have always pleaded for displaced persons and refugees regardless of their racial origin, but I wish to place on the record a special plea for sympathetic consideration for persons of Ukrainian origin. On checking over a table which was presented by Mr. Jolliffe, the director of immigration, on Wednesday, April 30, 1947, I find that among those admitted to Canada—these are European, not British immigrants—there were 216 Czechoslovakians, 844 Germans, 627 Poles, 28 Roumanians, 23 Russians, and so on down the list, but only one Ukrainian. I should like the minister to tell me why this discrimination existed. Is it because they feel the people of Ukrainian origin have not stood by them well enough in the past? I must say that they did. People of Ukrainian origin have supported the party in power today more than any other party in Canada, and yet this is the consideration they get—only one Ukrainian admitted in the twelve months of 1946.

Mr. MITCHELL: Would not most of the Poles be Ukrainians?

Mr. HLYNKA: A few of them were, but the minister could probably count on the fingers of his two hands all the Ukrainians who came to this country in 1946. I know practically every one of them. The urgency of the situation is this. I have in my hand a table issued by G-5 division, of the military government in the United States zone of Germany, and I would appreciate it if the committee would be kind enough to allow me to have this inserted on *Hansard*.

The CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. member unanimous consent?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. HLYNKA: The table is as follows:

DISPLACED PERSONS
U.S. ZONE, GERMANY
AS OF 15 December, 1946

G-5 DIVISION

DISPLACED PERSONS BRANCH

26 December, 1946

NOTE.—The information indicated below was received from UNRRA and Military Sources.

I. UNITED NATION DISPLACED PERSONS

Nationality	On Hand			Repatriated		Resettled		Total	Per cent Repatriated	Per cent Resettled
	In Camp	Out of Camp	Total	From 1 Dec. to 15 Dec.	Total to Date	From 1 Dec. to 15 Dec.	Total to Date			
Belgian and Luxembourger	53	1,802	1,855	1	149,505	.....	17	151,377	98·8	·011
Czech	648	6,662	7,310	162	38,574	.....	34	45,918	84·0	·074
Estonian	14,945	3,282	18,227	.....	465	.....	59	18,751	2·5	·315
French	68	3,179	3,247	.....	592,641	.....	31	595,919	99·4	·005
Latvian	44,787	6,548	51,335	.....	1,357	.....	75	52,767	2·6	·142
Lithuanian	30,547	5,531	36,078	.....	238	.....	73	36,389	·7	·201
Norwegian	17	259	276	.....	2,925	.....	2	3,203	91·3	·062
Polish	116,144*	39,889	156,033	5,623	322,479	.....	1,004	479,516	67·3	·209
Russian	8,518	11,752	20,270	.....	1,042,976	.....	.....	1,063,246	98·1	.....
Yugoslav	4,833	12,151	16,984	.....	67,242	.....	71	84,297	79·8	·084
Stateless	11,736	13,159	24,895	.....	.....	.....	220	25,115	.....	·876
Others and unclassified	22,461	166,068	38,529	1	255,236	.....	1,543	295,308	86·4	·526
Jews	126,980	27,755	154,735	.....	.....	99	6,708	161,443	.....	4·16
Total	381,737	148,037	529,774	5,787	2,473,638	99	9,837	3,013,249	82·1	·326

*Included in this figure is 51,640 Polish Ukrainians.

At present there are 32,500 persons in civilian guard units and labour service companies not reported in the above figures for the U.S. Zone, Germany. There are, in addition, 3,000 such persons in similar units under Western Base Section.

II. AUSTRIANS AND ITALIANS

Austrians	95	17,490	17,585	715	14,762†	.....	55	32,402	45·6	·17
Italians	203	5,247	5,450	.....	343,893	.....	2	349,345	98·4	·0006
Total	298	22,737	23,035	715	358,655	.....	57	381,747	94·0	·0015

† Total is from July 1, 1946. Previous figures not available.

III. EX-ENEMY DISPLACED PERSONS

Bulgarian	28	1,341	1,369	.....	520	.....	1	1,890	27·5	·053
Hungarian	112	21,032	21,144	2,447	136,785	.....	13	157,942	86·6	·008
Roumanian	257	5,795	6,052	.....	9,401	.....	3	15,456	60·8	·019
Total	397	28,168	28,565	2,447	146,706	.....	17	175,288	83·7	·01
GRAND TOTAL	382,432	198,942	581,374	8,949	2,978,999	99	9,911	3,570,284	83·4	·278

Mr. MITCHELL: That is only in the United States zone, not the British.

Mr. HLYNKA: That is true, but travelling in Europe I found the situation was similar in all the zones, British and French, except the Soviet zone, about which we know less.

I should like to draw the attention of the committee to a few figures in the table. Of those repatriated from the end of the war to December 15, 1946, only 2·5 per cent of Estonians were repatriated back to their homeland, which is now controlled by the Soviets; Latvians, 2·6 per cent; Lithuanians, ·7 per cent—not even one out of a hundred was repatriated. Now I come to Poles. Hon. members will find a footnote in the table which says that of the 116,144 Poles in camp, 51,640 are Polish Ukrainians, which simply means Ukrainians, but the Poles held that territory after the first great war and prior to the second great war. What are the figures there? Remember that the majority of these people called Polish are Ukrainians; 67·3 per cent of them were repatriated by various means, including force. Now I come to Russians, which largely means Ukrainians who were under the Soviet union prior to September 1, 1939. There were 98·1 per cent of them repatriated.

I come to Yugoslavs, of whom 79·8 per cent were repatriated; stateless, none; others and unclaimed, 86·4 per cent; Jews, no per cent. I claim that on the basis of these figures those against whom such tremendous force was applied to repatriate them, the Ukrainians, should be given the preference in admittance to Canada. The reason is that under the Yalta agreement between Britain, the United States and the Soviet union it was agreed that persons who resided in territories held by Soviets prior to September 1, 1939, should be repatriated to the Soviet union without regard to their personal wishes and by force if necessary. That applies chiefly to Ukrainians. Take, for instance, a Ukrainian who is a Ukrainian and not a Russian, and who has never been a communist, but resided in the part of the Ukraine that prior to the war was held by the Soviet union. Perhaps he expressed himself against communism and was imprisoned, or he may just have returned from a prison camp in Siberia and now finds himself in a displaced persons camp. What happens? The British and United States authorities say: We must repatriate you—you must go back to your country. That means death or the concentration camp—nothing else.

I appreciate the efforts of this government, particularly of the Minister of National Health and Welfare for his stand on this question before the united nations. This world is supposed to be civilized, and when people say that they want to remain Christians and democrats, that they want to cling to the western world, we should not say to them: Your crime is that you are against communism and therefore you must go back under the Soviets.

I have no time to review the conditions under which these people have been and still are being repatriated. I am sorry to have to say this but there is one man in the United States, a former mayor of New York, Mr. LaGuardia, for whom not one tear will be shed by the displaced persons when he passes away because he favoured men retaining positions in displaced persons camps who were definitely pro-communist. Many who showed any consideration for displaced persons were put out. In this day and age, when we claim to have such high ideals about humanity and use all the high sounding words, we should review our own conscience and see whether we can improve on what we have been doing. Time does not allow me to put on the record before the noon recess everything that I have to say but I pointed out at the outset that the government offers as an excuse that there are no transportation facilities available. That is fine; I recognize the problem to a certain extent, but let me point out this to the committee. In the *Daily Tribune* of Toronto of June 24, 1947, a communist publication, I read this announcement on page 7:

> One hundred and ten Canadians going to youth fete in Prague.
>
> Over thirty members of the national federation of labor youth will attend the world youth festival at Prague, Czechoslovakia, next month, it was announced here to-day by federation officials.
>
> Thirty members will come from all parts of Canada and will represent trade unions, cultural organizations from many language groups, and progressive youth community clubs.
>
> The N.F.L.Y. delegation will be part of a 110-strong Canadian delegation from a large number of organizations being sent under the auspices of the Canadian committee of the world federation of democratic youth. It will be the largest single delegation ever to leave Canada for the international gathering in Europe.
>
> Following their participation in the festival, the N.F.L.Y. delegation will proceed to Yugoslavia where they will work for two weeks on the Samac-Sarajevo youth railway as their contribution to the rebuilding of war-torn Europe and the promotion of friendship between the youth of Yugoslavia and Canada.
>
> Over 80,000 youth have volunteered to work on the railway this summer. They will be

working without pay to complete the thirty-mile project with the help of youth volunteer workers from all over the world.

Highlight of their stay in Yugoslavia will be the presentation of a pledge of friendship, signed by over 10,000 Canadians who have contributed well over $1,000 to buy sports equipment for the youth who are working on the railway. The pledges and the equipment will be presented in August.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, has the immigration branch or the Department of External Affairs considered the problem of transportation? If not all, the majority of these one hundred and ten Canadians are communists going across the sea to get a little more training in their propaganda activities. Why did not the government say to these young people: You must understand that human lives are involved in this matter of transportation and you must be satisfied with ten delegates?

I understand that the Canadian government cannot refuse to grant permission to these people to go because we are a democratic country, and we should be fair and all that; but when the communists themselves in their newspaper state that this is the largest delegation that has ever left Canada to attend an international conference or festival, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that there is no excuse. It simply means that the government did not give consideration to the fact that other people who today find themselves in Europe need to be saved because of tuberculosis and other illnesses, because of lack of food and so on. There is no excuse for having allowed these people to go over.

Two or three minutes remain before one o'clock, and I should like to read one or two other statements in this regard to complete the record. In the *Daily Tribune* of Toronto of June 28, 1947, on page 16 I find the following:

Forty Montreal Youths Leave for Prague

Montreal, June 27.—The largest Quebec youth delegation ever to leave Canada for an international gathering will board the S.S. *Waterman* here to-morrow bound for the world youth festival in Prague.

Forty young people from this province—French, English, Jewish, Ukrainian, Chinese and others—will join the 110-strong national delegation to "demonstrate their desire for international friendship and peace."

The Montreal youth coordinating committee which is sponsoring the festival locally said that delegates will take part in cultural and sports events as well as "informal discussions on youth problems." They will also join youth reconstruction brigades.

It is estimated that approximately 50,000 young people from sixty-five countries will take part in the festival.

This statement appeared in the same issue of the *Daily Tribune* of Toronto on June 28, 1947, at page 2:

Young Canucks Off to Prague

From yesterday's late edition

Thirty representatives of the National Federation of Labor youth left Toronto last night on the first lap of a journey to Prague.

The representatives are part of a delegation of one hundred and ten Canadians to the world youth festival to be held in Prague from July 20 to August 17.

At the conclusion of the festival the thirty delegates journey to Yugoslavia. They will spend one month there working on the construction of a one hundred and fifty mile stretch of railway.

I should like to make one or two suggestions after the lunch hour and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to call it one o'clock.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at two o'clock.

TAX AGREEMENTS

COMPENSATION TO PROVINCES IN LIEU OF INCOME AND OTHER TAXES

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance) moved the third reading of Bill No. 411, to authorize the government to enter into agreements with the governments of the provinces pursuant to which, in return for compensation, the provinces agree to refrain from levying certain taxes for a limited period.

He said: If I may be allowed to do so, I should like to answer now a question asked by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black), which I omitted to do earlier. The hon. member asked me a question as to the position of the Yukon under this legislation. I intended to answer him when we were at the committee stage, but I overlooked doing so. He asked whether an agreement could be made with the Yukon Territory along similar lines to those made with the provinces.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I do not wish to delay passage of the bill by insisting on an answer to my question.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is fine. I will give the hon. member the answer privately.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. HAMEL: On division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

WESTERN PROVINCES

ADJUSTMENT OF INDEBTEDNESS—NATURAL RESOURCES CLAIMS

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 451, respecting the refunding and adjustment of indebtedness of the four western provinces to the government of Canada in respect of certain outstanding loans for relief and other purposes and final settlement of the claims of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan in respect of natural resources.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill before the house is designed to authorize a definitive settlement of certain claims and counterclaims existing between the government of Canada on the one hand and the governments of western provinces on the other hand.

It will be recalled that the impact of the depression of the thirties was most devastating in the case of western Canada. Unemployment and low prices were the common lot of all Canada, but to the west, an economy built on a highly specialized grain growing industry, there came the additional scourge of a succession of drought years, aggravating enormously the economic losses and multiplying the problems and the financial burdens of government.

While the expenditures of the provincial governments increased many times, their revenues dropped precipitately, creating deficits of a very large order. Taxes were increased and new levies were imposed, but such action did not go far to bridge the deficits. Even for governments in the soundest financial position, it is usually not easy to borrow at reasonable rates, but so great had been the economic disaster to western Canada that the credit of provincial governments resting upon that agricultural economy was seriously impaired or in danger of being lost altogether. In the late thirties, the improvement in economic conditions and in the investment market was more than offset by the huge debts which the western provinces had already accumulated. Throughout the thirties it continued to be impossible for the western provinces to finance their deficits. In this connection I wish to quote some pages from the Sirois report. On pages 163 and 164 of volume 1, the commission had this to say:

The problem of financing sharply rising outlays for relief would have been difficult enough had the costs fallen evenly upon the various sections of the country. The extreme differences which occurred, however, greatly aggravated the situation. The wide disparities and the regional incidence of the depression had, as a consequence, large variations in the incidence of the burden of relief and other welfare costs upon the several provinces.

The costs of relief varied inversely with the ability to meet them. In western Canada, where incomes fell most rapidly, relief costs were relatively the highest. The weight of the burden in Saskatchewan, the province most severely affected, was about five times as great as that in the maritimes and Ontario, the provinces least affected. Total relief expenditures during the eight-year period amounted to nearly two-thirds of the total municipal-provincial revenues in Saskatchewan compared with about one-fifth in the maritimes and Ontario. A burden with such extreme variations in its incidence could not be entirely carried with local resources.

Speaking of the unprecedented problem in the province of Saskatchewan, the commission had this to say at page 170:

The costs of direct and agricultural relief completely overwhelmed the finances of the province and its municipalities. These costs during 1930-37 never fell to less than 27 per cent (1933) of the total municipal-provincial revenues, and in 1937 they rose to 163 per cent of such revenues. For the whole period the relief expenditures amounted to 60 per cent (compared with 21 per cent for the rest of the country) of the total ordinary receipts of the province and its municipalities combined. Although new taxes were imposed and rates increased, revenues could not be maintained at levels required to provide adequate ordinary government services, much less to pay for any part of relief costs. It was manifestly impossible to meet any significant portion of the outlay on relief by means of local taxation when total expenditures for this purpose for the eight-year period exceeded the total net farm cash income of the whole province . . . The provincial government undertook, either directly or indirectly, virtually the whole of the liability in excess of the dominion share. Between 1930 and 1937 the total debt of the provincial government was more than doubled. Three-quarters of this increase was due to relief. In 1929 the per capita deadweight debt of the province of Saskatchewan was the lowest in Canada with the exception of Quebec; in 1937 it was the highest.

Finally, speaking of the western provinces as a whole, the commission said on page 173 of its report:

The western provinces either temporarily or permanently lost their financial independence and could only continue to function with dominion loans and in some cases with partial default of debt charges. In 1937, one-fifth of the total municipal-provincial revenues were absorbed by the interest on non-self-supporting debts.

Of the loans made by the dominion to the four western provinces during this period, an amount aggregating over $165 million is still outstanding, of which Saskatchewan owes $80 million, not counting indebtedness arising out of 1938 seed grain loan guarantees which was

refunded in 1945 and is now outstanding in the amount of $10,051,707.96; Manitoba nearly $25 million; Alberta $26 million, and British Columbia $34 million.

This indebtedness is secured by treasury bills held by the dominion. The bills all bear three per cent interest, although rates on the earliest loans by the dominion were as high as five per cent. In the case of Saskatchewan, interest has not been paid in recent years on a very substantial proportion of its total indebtedness. The indebtedness is represented by treasury bills which are payable either on demand or at the end of one year. The practice has been to renew the one year treasury bills repeatedly as they came due; and while from time to time small amounts have been paid off by provincial governments, it has been impossible to get any substantial amounts paid off or to put into effect any systematic plan for the retirement of the indebtedness.

As the house will recall, a couple of years ago there was a dispute between the dominion and the province of Saskatchewan in regard to the payment by the province of a demand treasury bill arising out of the guarantee of 1938 seed grain loans in the province. The dominion had endeavoured to use the principle of "offsetting" part of the dominion's payments to the province under the wartime tax agreement against the seed grain loan debt owed by the government of Saskatchewan to the dominion. An arbitration tribunal was set up under the wartime tax agreement to adjudicate upon this dispute but did not reach a unanimous decision. Shortly thereafter a settlement was arranged between the two governments by which the debt was refunded and arrangements made for its repayment over a reasonable period of years.

This controversy served to emphasize the unsatisfactory situation arising out of the indebtedness of these provinces to the dominion and during the negotiations leading to the dominion-provincial agreements it was recognized that as long as there was a possibility of the dominion using the power of "offsetting", no judicial determination of the question having been achieved—

Mr. GREEN: The minister is going too fast. We cannot hear him properly.

Mr. ABBOTT: —it might be dangerous for a province with a large demand indebtedness due to the dominion to rent to the dominion certain of its tax rights in exchange for annual payments from the dominion. Consequently, during the course of the negotiations of the dominion-provincial agreements last fall, my predecessor and the representatives of the government of Saskatchewan discussed in detail ways and means of arranging a settlement of the debt owed by the province to the dominion as well as of certain claims which the province had against the dominion. Fortunately a mutually satisfactory agreement was reached. Once agreement had been reached with Saskatchewan, which was most heavily indebted to the dominion, it was possible to apply the same principles, so far as they were applicable, to the financial relationships existing between the dominion and the other three western provinces. The bill now before the house seeks authority to enter into the agreements which were reached with all four provinces.

Perhaps it will simplify the explanation of the provisions of the bill if I deal first with the counter-claims which the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta had against the dominion. As the house will recall, the control and administration of the natural resources in the prairie provinces were not handed over to the three provincial governments until 1930. The Manitoba transfer agreement was preceded by a royal commission which reported upon the financial readjustments involved. This royal commission recommended that the dominion pay the provincial government $4,584,000 plus interest. This award was acceptable to both and was accordingly implemented. In the case of Saskatchewan and Alberta, however, while the transfer of the resources was affected in 1930, the question of the financial readjustments was left for future settlement. The formal transfer agreements provided for the establishment of a royal commission for each province to inquire and report on what consideration, if any, should be paid to the two provinces in order to place them in a position of equality with the other provinces of Canada with respect to the administration and control of their natural resources from September 1, 1905 (the date of the establishment of the two provinces) until the date of their transfer to the provinces.

The Saskatchewan commission was appointed in December, 1933, and that for Alberta in July, 1934. Mr. Justice Dysart, of the Court of King's Bench, Manitoba, was chairman of both commissions, and Mr. George C. McDonald chartered accountant of Montreal, was a member of both. The third member of the Saskatchewan commission was Mr. Justice H. V. Bigelow, of the Court of King's Bench, Saskatchewan, and the third member of the Alberta commission was Mr. Justice T. M. Tweedie, of the Supreme Court

of Alberta. The two reports were submitted simultaneously in 1935.

The recommendation of the two reports was identical. I quote it as taken from the Alberta report:

> We recommend that the dominion pay to the province of Alberta a sum of money which, when added to all the purely provincial benefits that Alberta has received or is yet to receive from the dominion in respect of its resources will, in our judgment, balance the amount of net revenue which the province would probably have obtained from those portions of its resources alienated or otherwise disposed of by the dominion during the course of its twenty-five year administration. The sum which we so recommend is $5 million. We also recommend that this sum bear interest at the rate of five per cent per annum from October 1, 1930, to March 31, 1935, and thereafter to such date and at such rate as the two governments may agree upon.

In the case of the Saskatchewan commission, however, a minority report was presented by Mr. Justice Bigelow in which he recommended an award to Saskatchewan of $58,242,691.

Immediately after the submission of the reports, Alberta indicated informally that the award was acceptable. Saskatchewan, however, made it known that it was dissatisfied with the majority award. In February, 1936, a formal request was addressed to the two provinces asking whether the award was acceptable. Saskatchewan replied that they did not consider the majority award to be fair and equitable and stated that they were not prepared to agree to a settlement on that basis. I quote a sentence from their reply:

> The minority report of the royal commission signed by the provincial representative on the commission advances so many weighty and impressive reasons for his arriving at his decision and so many factors which appear to have been disregarded by the other members of the commission that we do not feel the majority award to be fair and equitable in so far as this province is concerned.

Alberta answered in effect that they were prepared to accept the award but on condition that if Saskatchewan were paid an additional consideration in the future, then Alberta should receive a similar additional amount. The dominion advised the government of Alberta in 1936 and again in 1937 that it would agree to paying the award only if the award were accepted by the province as a final settlement and if the money would be applied as an offset against the provincial debt due to the dominion. In the case of both provinces, therefore, the matter has remained unsettled since the reports were presented.

The province of Saskatchewan made representations to the Sirois royal commission requesting that favourable consideration be given to the more favourable minority award. The commission felt that it was not called upon to review the work of the Dysart commission and in its report stated:

> We strongly recommend that this claim should be settled before, or as part of, any general readjustment of the financial relations between the province and the dominion . . . We think it equally desirable that the outstanding claim of Alberta for compensation should be settled at the time when a general readjustment of dominion-provincial relations is made.

It is with a good deal of satisfaction, therefore, that I am now able to report and ask for approval of the settlement of this outstanding question which was reached during the negotiations carried on last summer by my predecessor. As a part of the agreement which was then reached in regard to outstanding claims and counterclaims between the respective governments, the dominion undertook to pay to Alberta the sum of $5 million plus interest as recommended by the royal commission, and to pay to Saskatchewan the sum of $5 million plus interest as recommended in the majority report of the royal commission. These payments will be made in full and final settlement of all claims against the government of Canada in respect of the administration and control of natural resources during the period mentioned and the province will withdraw all or any claims for further compensation in this connection. Interest is to be calculated at five per cent from October 1, 1930, to March 31, 1935, as recommended by the royal commissions and thereafter at the same rates as applied from time to time on the treasury bills owing by the provinces concerned to the dominion. So calculated to June 30, 1947, accrued interest brings the total payment for principal and interest to the aggregate amount of $8,031,250 in the case of each province, and as I shall indicate later this amount is to be applied against the treasury bill indebtedness of each province to the dominion.

I come now to the settlement which was reached in respect of this treasury bill indebtedness, which settlement is applicable, as I have indicated, not only in the case of Saskatchewan and Alberta but also in the case of Manitoba and British Columbia as well. The matter is somewhat complicated but

I shall endeavour to explain it as simply as possible and, with the consent of the house, I shall place on *Hansard* a table which I believe will summarize the results of the settlement very effectively. The table is as follows:

TABLE SHOWING RESULTS OF PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF PROVINCIAL TREASURY BILL INDEBTEDNESS TO DOMINION

—	Manitoba	Saskatchewan	Alberta	British Columbia	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
A. Total Treasury Bill Debt.....	24,734,451 82	*80,361,852 44	26,212,000 00	34,031,219 04	165,339,523 30
B. Treasury Bills for capital and ordinary governmental purposes.....	13,855,100 66	13,414,440 93	15,617,000 00	17,346,837 65	60,233,379 24
C. Treasury Bills for direct and agricultural relief.....	10,879,351 16	61,221,227 44	10,595,000 00	16,684,381 39	99,379,959 99
D. Amount to be cancelled— (1) Half of C.....	5,439,675 58	30,610,613 72	5,297,500 00	8,342,190 69	55,416,164 06
(2) Capitalized relief interest	.....	5,726,184 07			
E. To be repaid in cash out of proceeds of Natural Resources Settlement (calculated as of June 30, 1947).....	.....	8,031,250 00	8,031,250 00	.....	16,062,500 00
F. Amount to be refunded without interest.....	5,439,675 58	30,610,613 72	5,297,500 00	8,342,190 70	49,689,980 00
G. Amount to be refunded with interest.....	13,855,100 66	5,383,190 93	7,585,750 00	17,346,837 65	44,170,879 24

* Excluding Treasury Bills covering 1938 seed grain loans refunded in 1945. Original amount $16,468,852.49, amount presently outstanding $10,051,707.96.

For the purposes of the settlement, the outstanding treasury bills were first divided into two classes, those that represented borrowing for capital or ordinary government purposes, and those that represented borrowing for direct and agricultural relief. It was felt by the dominion that any adjustment granted could relate only to the second category, namely, relief loans.

Loans for other than relief purposes, it was felt, should be paid off in full over a reasonable period of years on a systematic amortization basis. It was agreed that the total indebtedness of each province for capital and ordinary government purposes should be refunded by means of a new issue of securities which would be retired over a period of thirty years by equal annual payments representing amortization of principal and interest at 2⅝ per cent, which is approximately the cost of borrowing by the dominion for a comparable period. In order to encourage more rapid repayment if the finance position of a province should make it possible, it is provided that in case a province should pay any amount of principal in advance of the date fixed for payment thereof, interest shall be deemed to have been payable on the amount so paid at a lesser rate appropriate to the term for which this amount of principal was outstanding. A table will be inserted in each treasury bill showing the interest rates to be used in connection with such prepayments and these rates will correspond approximately to the cost of dominion borrowing for the varying periods in question.

When the legislation has been passed and the arrangement implemented, the new issue of treasury bills which will replace the treasury bills now outstanding issued for capital and ordinary government purposes, will amount in round figures to $13·9 million in the case of Manitoba; $5·4 million in the case of Saskatchewan (after applying the natural resources award payment); $7·6 million in the case of Alberta (after applying the natural resources award payment) and $17·3 million in the case of British Columbia, a total of just over $44 million.

In the case of the treasury bills which represent provincial borrowing for direct or agricultural relief, the arrangement is that

half of the bills now outstanding will be cancelled and the other half replaced with a new issue of treasury bills payable, without interest, in equal annual amounts on the first day of July in each of the next thirty years. The total amount of indebtedness which will thus be cancelled is $55,416,164.06, divided as follows: Manitoba, $5,439,675.58; Saskatchewan, $36,336,797.79; Alberta, $5,297,500; and British Columbia, $8,342,190.69.

In the case of Saskatchewan this amount includes $5,726,184.07 of interest on relief treasury bills which was capitalized during the thirities. Prior to 1940-41, Saskatchewan only paid its interest in cash in respect of certain treasury bills issued for capital or ordinary government purposes, and interest on the balance of its treasury bills was paid by the issue of further provincial treasury bills, which, of course, increased the provinces debt to the dominion. No treasury bills in respect of capitalized interest were received after March, 1940, but it should be remembered that under the wartime tax agreements Saskatchewan accepted the net debt service option and consequently had the province been paying interest to the dominion on its relief treasury bills, it would have been entitled to receive during the life of the agreement a corresponding increase in the annual amount payable by the dominion under that agreement. This did not seem sensible at the time and no such arrangement was made. I believe the house will agree that the sensible and sound course today, in view of the general settlement which has been reached, is not to continue to carry this capitalized interest down through the years but to cancel it as has been arranged.

The amount of the relief indebtedness which will be refunded by a new issue of treasury bills but without interest aggregates $49,689,980, divided as follows: Manitoba, $5,439,675.58; Saskatchewan, $30,610,613.72; Alberta, $5,297,500.00; and British Columbia, $8,342.190.70.

This completes the description of the essential features of the arrangement. Perhaps I may summarize the position as follows: Today the four western provinces, as a result of their experience in the thirties, owe the dominion some $165 million (excluding the Saskatchewan seed grain loan indebtedness previously referred to). On nearly $74 million of this debt, no interest is currently being paid. Part of the debt is payable on demand and the rest theoretically is payable at the end of one year but in fact it has under present circumstances to be constantly renewed. The debt is carried on the books from year to year with little change and there is no systematic plan for its retirement. When the new agreement is implemented, slightly over $16 million of the total debt will be paid off in cash and another $55 million will be cancelled. There will then be outstanding almost $94 million of treasury bills, of which slightly over $44 million will bear interest at 2½ per cent and the remainder, no interest. Systematic provision, however, will have been made for retiring the whole of this amount in equal annual amounts over a period of thirty years. The annual payments required to be made by each province in order to pay interest and retire the debt should be comfortably within the capacity of the province to pay.

I believe, therefore, that hon. members will agree that this arrangement is one which is in the best interest of the dominion and the provincial governments concerned and will contribute to sounder dominion-provincial financial relationships.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I am not rising to go into the detail of this measure at this time, but I may say at the outset that it will receive our support. The minister has given us a long statement of the history of these financial relations. There is so much in it, and he has gone over it so rapidly, that I fear no one in the house can remember every detail he has given. It is for that reason that I wish to ask two or three questions and he may answer now or wait until we get into committee.

This bill I understand has to do with the refunding and adjustment of relief and unemployment debts of the four western provinces, contracted between 1930 and 1937, and it provides also for the final settlement of certain natural resources problems with two of those provinces, namely, Alberta and Saskatchewan. The minister has given us a great many figures, and has intimated that these provinces owe the dominion $165 million. What the house would like to know in simple language is this: How much has that debt been written down, and how much does each of the provinces save as a result of this so-called refunding or adjustment, which I take it is largely a matter of writing down, and the assumption by the dominion of the amounts written off? What is the saving to each of these provinces? Assuming that their obligations have been proper obligations up to now, and deducting from that the amount the government says they still owe, what is the saving? What is the cost of this operation to the dominion treasury?

Those are very simple questions, the answers to which will give the final or net result of the operation. I should like to ask one other question. These debts were created from ten

to seventeen years ago. I was on the other end of these obligations for many years. In my opinion the government has been too long in coming to an adjustment of them. However, I should like the minister to say now when these adjustments were made. I take it that within the last year the government has come to an understanding with the provinces, and this is enabling legislation to enable them to carry out the settlement which they have nominally agreed upon.

I should like also to ask the minister this question, and I imagine what his answer will be. I would ask him whether this settlement had anything to do with the discussions on the dominion-provincial relations matter which have been going on at the same time. I expect he will say there was no connection. I should like him to say whether the discussions were carried on at the same time as those that took place on dominion-provincial relations.

As for the details of this measure, my associates and others will no doubt want to raise some questions either now or later on, but these main points I should be glad if the minister would answer clearly and concisely as soon as it is convenient for him to do so.

Mr. ABBOTT: Some of them have already been answered in the statement I made.

Mr. BRACKEN: We are not in committee now and perhaps there are others who would like to speak. I have no objection to having them answered now but the minister can deal with them in committee.

Mr. ABBOTT: I will deal with them in committee, though, as I say, I have already answered some of them.

Mr. F. S. ZAPLITNY (Dauphin): This bill seems to be a post mortem on the hungry thirties, and there is not very much we can do about it except to let it pass through the house. I hope, however, that the minister will at some stage of the proceedings let the house know what the federal policy is, what is contemplated by the government in this matter in the case of a situation arising such as necessitated this bill. In other words, if another depression happens to strike Canada it will again effect western Canada very rapidly, and I should like to know what the government proposes to do in the matter of direct relief and other matters allied to that problem.

I would like to make a suggestion to the government—that we do not wait until we are faced with a situation under which large sums of money will have to be spent on direct relief. After all, money expended in that way is not an investment; it is practically wasted, although it is necessary at the time. It would appear to me to be the better part of wisdom if the government would adopt the policy of making available to the western provinces, particularly the three prairie provinces, large sums of money, interest free, probably to the extent of $10,000,000 per year, in order that they may stabilize their economies and open up new fields of industry, such as processing, which industry would fit in so well with the economy of western Canada. That would be making an investment in the western provinces rather than just spending money as a stop-gap in the trying times of a depression.

I want to emphasize the fact that this money should be made available interest free, because in reality it will be assisting the people of Canada through the federal government. If we learned a lesson from the last depression it was that if the different governments wait until a depression is upon them and there are thousands of unemployed in need of some direct relief or other form of assistance to keep body and soul together, large sums of money—in the last depression it ran to over a billion dollars—will be spent with practically no return. I hope the government will announce some new policy, perhaps revolutionary for them, of making available to the provinces large sums of money interest free in order that they may prevent the next depression rather than having to spend money when it does come.

Motion agreed to; bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. BRACKEN: Would the minister make a short statement on this section?

Mr. ABBOTT: The leader of the opposition asked what the cost to the dominion treasury would be. I think I mentioned that in my statement. The total treasury bill indebtedness is shown in the table which I placed on *Hansard* as $165,339,523.30. The treasury bills for capital and ordinary governmental purposes total $60,233,379.24. Treasury bills for direct and agricultural relief total $99,379,-959.99. The amount to be cancelled, which is half of the amount I have just mentioned, is $55,416,164.06. That figure represents the amount the dominion government is writing off.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Does that include interest, or is interest being forgone also?

Mr. ABBOTT: Interest has been forgone on that part of the indebtedness which we are cancelling, that is half of the direct and agricultural relief indebtedness.

Mr. BRACKEN: I do not think that is what the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario was referring to. Does the figure of $165 million include accumulated interest?

Mr. ABBOTT: In the case of Saskatchewan that includes an item of accumulated interest to which I referred in my statement of some $5,700,000. The figure of $165 million, in round figures, which I mentioned, includes approximately $5,700,000 of accumulated interest owed by Saskatchewan. As I mentioned, Saskatchewan, having since 1940 accepted the debt service option under the wartime tax agreements, this would have been paid by the dominion as an increased amount, so it was offset.

The next question was as to when this was done. The committee may recall that late last summer by predecessor, the present Minister of Justice, and the provincial treasurer of Saskatchewan, Mr. Fines, made an announcement that this settlement had been negotiated. A public announcement was made of a settlement in the terms of the bill which is before us. As the committee will see, the bill is to be effective as of July 1 of this year.

Then the next question was if this had any relation to the dominion-provincial discussions. It had to do with them in this way: Saskatchewan, and possibly other provinces, was not willing to enter into any financial arrangement with the dominion government when it had this tremendous overhanging load of debt and the threat that the dominion might exercise its right of offset against any payments which might be agreed upon in lieu of tax fields which it was surrendering. Of course it has no connection with the arrangement whereby annual payments are made to the provinces in consideration of their refraining from exercising the imposition of these taxes during the period of the agreement.

Obviously all the western provinces, and particularly Saskatchewan which had this enormous depression incurred debt, could not be expected to enter into agreements unless and until some arrangements were made for settlement. To that extent, yes, it had a connection with the dominion-provincial discussions, but to that extent only.

Mr. BRACKEN: The minister did not state how the $55 million which is to be cancelled is divided between the four provinces.

Mr. ABBOTT: I gave it in my statement, and it also appears in the table, but I shall give the division again in round figures: Manitoba, $5.4 million; Saskatchewan, $30.6 million; Alberta, $5.3 million and British Columbia, $8.3 million. In addition there is $5.7 million to Saskatchewan to capitalize relief interest payments.

Mr. BRACKEN: Could the minister take a moment to tell the committee why the Saskatchewan obligations are so much greater than the others?

Mr. ABBOTT: I think I covered that in my statement. It is because the drought conditions in Saskatchewan were so much worse than they were in the other provinces of western Canada.

Mr. GREEN: Have all the provinces agreed to these terms?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Is there any reason why the agreements should not be made a schedule to the bill?

Mr. ABBOTT: There are no formal written agreements. This is just an adjustment of outstanding indebtedness. You do not really need any agreement. The figures are complicated but the arrangement is very simple. Province A owes so much money: the dominion makes an arrangement for settlement. I do not think there will be any agreement. There may be some written evidence, but the arrangement is of the simplest type. My hon. friend will appreciate that that is so once the principle is accepted.

Mr. GREEN: The bill contains provisions for the liquidation of any claims with respect to the transfer of the natural resources of Alberta and Saskatchewan?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Will there not be a formal release of claims?

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend is quite right. There will have to be that, of course.

Mr. MacNICOL: In my opinion the western provinces, particularly Saskatchewan, would not have been in the box they were in had this country done what it should have done years ago, give the western provinces a chance to go ahead. The minister mentioned the drought. It is not much wonder they had no crops when they had no rain, for we had made no provision for them to have water, which we easily could have done. I hope when this is all over, this country will commence a long-term programme whereby the western provinces will be given a chance to live. This may be a stop-gap for the present

but we have to go further than that and provide for the water that is there being made available to the western provinces. We need only look at what they have done in the western United States where they had the same trouble, but they combatted it and provided against a recurrence of the troubles they had had there by providing water for their dry states. We are voting some millions through now, but we should have done it long ago.

I rose merely to say that Saskatchewan was not to blame for this debt, nor perhaps Alberta or Manitoba. The western provinces, and Saskatchewan in particular, were not to blame.

Mr. WRIGHT: This agreement, as the hon. member for Dauphin has stated, does not provide for any emergency which may arise in the future. Personally I do not think the agreement is a satisfactory one so far as Saskatchewan is concerned. During the drought years, particularly in Saskatchewan, we were faced with a national emergency. The people of Canada came to the assistance of the western provinces in their extremity at that time, and now by this bill the people of Canada are writing off a portion, but only a portion, of the relief that was then supplied. In my opinion the amount which is being written off in the case of Saskatchewan, which was the province most affected by the drought conditions which existed in the thirties, is not sufficient. The people of Canada, realizing at the time that it was a national emergency, came to the assistance of the provinces, and now because the emergency is over the dominion government is being just a little tough in this agreement and settlement. It is better than nothing at all; the provinces have accepted it, but they have accepted it on that basis.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Since this matter has been referred to by the member for Dauphin, the member for Davenport, and the member for Melfort, I think it would be a good thing to spend two or three minutes more on the general question. The dominion government ought to adopt a long-range policy looking towards the strengthening of the economy of the four western provinces. Not only should irrigation be supplied, but steps should be taken to encourage the development of industry, which would assist very greatly. Considerable attention is being paid to freight rates and tariff incidence, which have injured the western provinces a great deal. I do not propose to go into detail, but much validity is to be found in the words of the three hon. gentlemen who have just spoken.

I happen to come from Alberta. I remember that when we took a strong stand in 1935 and elected a government to do something about the situation we received very little appreciation from people down in this part of the country who should have had ten times better sense than they showed at that time. We heard nonsense about losing our credit, spoken by a lot of men who did not take the trouble to understand the real facts of the situation, as the minister evinced that he had done in his excellent statement. I commend him for that statement. It does indicate that finally the government is able to see clearly what did happen and is prepared to go some distance to help these provinces to adjust themselves in the national economy. Many more steps must be taken before the problem is solved in a long-range manner.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I would like to ask a question and say one word about the arrangement which has been made. I am not discussing its details. I think it is generous, but notwithstanding that, as one whose lawful occasions took him to Saskatchewan nearly every year in the thirties, I feel that they went through a terrible time and that they are entitled to great consideration. I used to wonder how people could endure what they went through during those years.

My question is this. Subsection 3 of section 2 says:

> The Minister of Finance may charge to the reserve provided for in the public accounts of Canada entitled "Reserve for possible losses on ultimate realization of active assets"—

What is the nature of that reserve? Is it a reserve in the sense of a business reserve built up out of earnings?

Mr. ABBOTT: If my hon. friend will cast his mind back, I spent considerable time in my budget speech in explaining the nature of that reserve. I explained that out of this year's revenues we had placed $25,000,000 to the credit of this reserve, which now stands at $155,000,000. I went into it in some detail, and perhaps my hon. friend will refresh his memory by looking up my speech. This will be charged to that reserve.

Mr. JACKMAN: I understood that that reserve applied almost entirely against our loans abroad.

Mr. ABBOTT: We started to create that reserve long before we had made any substantial loans.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): How much will this transaction need in the way of a reserve?

Mr. ABBOTT: About $55,000,000, in round figures.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): And at what figure does the reserve stand now?

Mr. ABBOTT: At $155,000,000.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3—Natural resources settlement.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Subsection 3 says, in line 42:

—releases and discharges the government of Canada from all or any liabilities in respect of the matters mentioned in subsection one of this section, other than in respect of the payments provided for in paragraphs twenty and twenty-one, and twenty-one and twenty-two, of the agreements mentioned in subsection two of this section, respectively.

That is the natural resources agreement, I take it?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is correct.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Would the minister explain what that exception means?

Mr. ABBOTT: The natural resources transfer agreement and the statute authorizing it provide that there shall be annual payments and the sum of $562,500 a year is fixed as a minimum, to be increased to $750,000 when the population increases to 800,000 and increased to $1,125,000 when the population reaches 1,200,000. These were subsidy payments fixed under this agreement, and the effect of this clause is that the settlement of these claims, to which I referred in my preliminary statement, is final and conclusive with the exception of the annual subsidy payments to which I have just referred, and which are provided for in paragraphs 20, 21 and 22 of the agreements referred to.

Section agreed to.

Sections 4 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND RESOURCES

130. Departmental administration, $183,173.

Mr. HLYNKA: When the house took recess at one o'clock I had just concluded putting on the record the three reports which appeared in the *Daily Tribune* stating that one hundred and ten young Canadians were granted permission to attend the youth festival in Prague, Czechoslovakia. I said that the government should have limited this delegation to ten members and reserved the remaining one hundred spaces on ships for British immigrants or displaced persons and refugees to come to Canada. I maintain that an error has been made in granting permission to such a large number of these people to attend the conference, thereby reducing the shipping space, because these people will have to come back to Canada eventually.

One other point in connection with this particular matter has to do with the money which these young people will spend while in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. The government should have given consideration to that. I do not think we have too much foreign currency to spend as freely as these people no doubt will. I endeavoured to plead the cause of displaced persons and refugees on many occasions, and today I laid emphasis on the advisability of permitting a certain number of displaced persons and refugees who may have education to come in but who are willing to accept farm employment and employment in other lines of endeavour where there is a shortage of labour. The government would do well if it extended its regulations to permit some of these other people to come in. I appeal to the minister to give his earnest consideration to that matter.

There are one or two other things that I wish to mention in regard to Ukrainians. It so happens that Roumania was an enemy country during the war and is still looked upon as an enemy country. The Ukrainians who happened to inhabit one province of the Ukrainian historic land, the province of Bucovina, were incorporated into Roumania from the time of the first great war until the second great war, and as residents of Roumania, as they call it, they are considered enemy aliens. They are not I do not think a single Ukrainian who came from Bucovina fought against the British or the allies. The Roumanians held this land, and the Canadian government should be well enough versed in these matters to know that these people were held by force and had nothing to do with the Roumanian army, and for that reason they are not enemy people and should be admitted to Canada. These people should not take the blame for the Roumanian government, because they are neither Roumanians, nor did they ever agree with the occupation of their historic land.

The procedure which the government follows seems to exclude immigrants rather than allow

them to come in. That is the way it appears to me. I did mention that a number of countries, United States, Britain, Brazil, Argentina and a few others, are taking in these people as fast as they can. Until recently it was an urgent question, and of course the government of Canada turned a deaf ear to the pleadings of those who spoke on behalf of displaced persons and refugees. The government rendered lip service, issued statements and passed regulations, but in effect did very little to allow these people to come in. It is now a matter of being fortunate if we get a number of these people, because when the United States, Britain and other countries that are taking these people get through there will be nothing left for us. Surely we should realize that in the future we shall not be able to get any European people to come to Canada, at least from countries that are today held or dominated by the Soviet union. Therefore why not take them now; why not take the best possible element? I would urge the government to give earnest consideration to that recommendation.

In this connection I should like to mention that I have in my hand a number of letters, and I shall read one or two sentences from one of them. They are from displaced persons who were fortunate enough to be accepted by Belgium. Here is one:

I am very sorry that you did not come with us to work at the Belgian mines.

He is writing to one of his friends.

The people are working hard here, but they are earning money and are able to buy everything they like. You can buy everything in Belgium if you have francs except the bird's milk. The shops are full of wares. After my life in Germany I cannot believe that it is really so. It seems that I am dreaming, that I am in America. It is really America in Europe. All information we read in newspapers were true. I am glad that I left Germany and the UNRRA's care. Although I have no money in my pocket, I feel that I am in a proper place here. The food is very good. We now get 4,000 calories per day.

The Belgians are showing a good attitude towards us. I advise you to come to Belgium as soon as possible. If you can't do it, tell other people to go to Belgium.

I regret that we do not receive such letters from newcomers to Canada telling their friends that Canada, recognizing the contribution of those who have come to this country as immigrants, is giving present-day immigrants an opportunity to make a living and opening up to them the possibility of a future. I could read many more of these letters, but I do not think I should at this time.

I wish to refer to only one other matter which I do not think I have mentioned before. It is in connection with families who were separated throughout the war and are separated even today. I have here a list of names of people in the various zones, British, American and French, in Germany, Austria and Italy, where the husband is in one country and the wife with a child in another, and so far they have been unable to get together. I also have several replies from camp and zone directors stating, "We are sorry, but you cannot join your husband", or "You cannot join your wife and kiddies". Although this may not be directly connected with the department of immigration, I would ask that this government recommend to the governments which have a say in these matters that these people be allowed to get together. I realize that this country does not play a large part in international affairs. Though our country is large in area, our population is so small that we are not in the category of a large nation—though the hon. member for Temiscouata usually feels that Canada is being slighted if anyone refers to this country as a secondary or smaller nation; he does not like that. But in reality, in international affairs, we must admit that she is. I do not expect this government to right all these injustices in the international field. I realize that Canada cannot do that. But Canada can make recommendations, and Canada can help these people by allowing a certain number of them to come in. Once again I ask that this be done. I may be quite critical at times, but if better results than we have had thus far are not forthcoming, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that not only myself but all others who are interested in this subject, from the point of view of Canada and from the humanitarian point of view, will really have to get at the government and create public opinion to make the government move in the direction in which they should.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I suggest to hon. members that we shall make better progress if we deal with the items in an orderly way. On departmental administration it is quite in order for an hon. member to deal with any phase in connection with a department. But we have here certain items, for instance, 131 to 140, which deal with the mines and geology branch; then lands, parks and forests is another branch. If the minister is to answer questions in regard to these different phases of his department, he will perhaps require different officials. Therefore if hon. members could deal with the items as they are called, I believe it would be better for all concerned.

Mr. MacINNIS: I just wish to ask a question, Mr. Chairman. I do not intend to speak on this. We are now on item 130?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MacINNIS: I think the suggestion made by the chairman is a good one, that we deal with the appropriate items in their proper place.

Mr. HOWE: I feel that the hon. member for Vegreville has made some strong statements, many of which are quite erroneous. I think his statements should not be allowed to stand without the correct facts being put on *Hansard*. With your indulgence, sir, I should like to reply to the remarks he has just made.

The hon. member has repeated the cry that the government has no immigration policy. Apparently he has not followed the statements made in this house by the minister of the department and the statements that have been made in recent debate, even as late as last evening. The fact is that the government has a specific, well-rounded and coordinated policy of immigration. It is being applied actively and energetically by an expanded and competent branch of the department. The policy may be described briefly as follows:

1. There is practically free entry for all citizens of the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Ireland.

2. There is equally free entry for all citizens of the United States.

3. Citizens of non-enemy European countries may enter Canada if destined to relatives here who are in a position to assist them to get started, or if they are coming to work in agriculture, mining, lumbering or other basic industries.

4. Other persons from such countries who have adequate means are also admitted freely.

5. Individuals in the displaced persons camps are admitted to Canada when applied for by close relatives in this country. This is outside the special quota of 10,000 which was authorized as to 5,000 on June 6, 1947, and as to a further 5,000 on July 9 last.

6. A person applying for admission to Canada for the purpose of marrying a legal resident of this country is admitted if the prospective husband is in a position to maintain his intended wife.

7. In order to carry this policy into effective operation, we have established offices which can handle immigration cases, not only in the United Kingdom and the United States, but also in Paris, The Hague, Brussels, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Portugal, Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Ireland, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, China, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Cuba, Mexico, Switzerland and India. In addition, we have special teams operating in Germany in cooperation with the preparatory committee of the international refugee organization, to handle the movement of persons from the displaced persons camps.

8. From time to time movements such as that of the 4,500 members of the Polish armed forces who were recently admitted are approved and their admission to this country facilitated.

9. Except for the wives and minor families of Canadian citizens of Chinese origin and similar relatives of Canadian citizens or residents of East Indian origin, there is at present no provision for oriental immigration to Canada.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I should like to be clear in my own mind as to what the minister said. I thought he said any relative of a Canadian citizen resident in a non-enemy country of Europe could come to Canada. Would this mean that the cousin of a Canadian, resident with his wife in Poland, would be entitled to come to Canada?

Mr. HOWE: No; a cousin is not within the published list of relatives. They include a son, daughter, wife or orphan nephew or niece, et cetera, but not cousins.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I ask that question because outside this house a certain misinterpretation is placed upon the word "relative"; that is why I am glad to have the matter clarified.

Mr. HOWE: I might also point out to my hon. friend that the word "cousin" is an almost all-inclusive term if we go back far enough. On May 1, 1947, order in council P.C. 1734, further amended by P.C. 695, made provision for the admission of the husband or wife, son, daughter, brother or sister, together with husband or wife and unmarried children, if any, and orphan nephew or niece under twenty-one years of age of any person legally resident in Canada in a position to receive and care for such relatives. The new order also provided for the admission of a person entering Canada for the purpose of marriage to a legal resident thereof, provided the prospective husband is able to maintain his intended wife.

The situation with respect to the admission of persons from the displaced persons camps has been explained repeatedly in this house and outside. On June 9 I said in the house, at page 3916 of *Hansard:*

> The 5,000 individuals to be covered by this order will include those displaced persons who have already been admitted. They need not be residents of Canada.

In spite of these facts the hon. member for Vegreville apparently is still unacquainted with the situation. In his speech this morning he gave it as his understanding that only certain persons could be brought into Canada from displaced persons camps, and went on to read the list of persons who are admissible generally from any non-enemy European country. We have been admitting relatives within the defined categories from the displaced persons camps for many months. On June 6 it was announced in this house that we would admit 5,000 persons from these camps without waiting for an international agreement on the subject. Last evening I stated that the government had agreed to admit a further 5,000. This total of 10,000 persons does not include relatives but is additional to them. For the most part the movement consists of large groups coming to industrial or other employment in Canada. In addition to that, however, we are admitting individuals and families who are not applied for by relatives in Canada but who are applied for by other persons in this country who agree to assist in their settlement.

At one point in his statement the hon. member suggested that the Canadian immigration authorities were discriminating against Ukrainians. Of course there is not the slightest element of truth in this suggestion. The immigration regulations are not weighted against the Ukrainians, and in the administration of those regulations people of all national groups are treated precisely the same. If I understood him aright the hon. member for Vegreville seemed to suggest that this government was in some way responsible for the repatriation of a large number of Ukrainians from the displaced persons camps in the British and American zones. He indicated that a large number of these people were repatriated against their will. The regulations in regard to repatriation, as my hon. friend must know, were agreed to by all the occupying forces; and included in them was a provision that no one should be repatriated against his will unless he had been a collaborator with the enemy during the war. For my part I am satisfied that this regulation has been carried out in good faith by the British and American authorities in Germany.

There is another point in the hon. member's statement which I am not prepared to allow to pass unanswered. I refer to his wholly unjustified reference to Mr. Fiorello LaGuardia, at one time mayor of New York city and later director general of UNRRA. Mr. LaGuardia is a great friend of Canada and a personal friend of mine, and as chairman of the United States section of the permanent joint board on defence, and in many other ways, he has shown his friendship and respect for this country. He is, moreover, one of those who has worked most ardently on behalf of the displaced persons of Europe. I am sure the Minister of National Health and Welfare, to whom the hon. member for Vegreville referred in eulogistic terms and who knows the situation of European refugees as well as anyone in this country, would fully substantiate my statement. To suggest that Mayor LaGuardia is a communist or a friend of communists is palpably absurd.

Then my hon. friend made the statement two or three times that the United States is taking displaced persons "as fast as it can." I should like to ask him when those persons were taken into the United States, and on what authority. To the best of my knowledge and belief not a single displaced person has been accepted in the United States to date, outside the quota.

Mr. HLYNKA: I should like to correct one or two statements made by the minister, which I feel were quite unfair. I do not blame him for the government's immigration policy, for he is only pinch-hitting for another minister who happens to be ill at the present time. I feel that results speak loudest. I have in my office several hundred cases of Canadians applying for the admission to Canada of both close and distant relatives, and that permission has not been obtained from the immigration branch. If the minister wishes to assure me that no obstacle will be placed in the way of granting permission in these cases I will be the first to give him and the government credit for that step. I have no reason at all to endeavour to discredit the government or reflect upon its policy. All I want to do is see that this thing gets moving, because so far the results have not been very substantial. The minister said I seemed to suggest that the Canadian government was responsible in some way for the repatriation of many of these displaced persons, and he went on to say he had full confidence that the British and American governments would adhere to their word once they promised not to repatriate any of these people by force. One must study the situation closely to learn the truth. I must tell the minister that it depends largely on the type of man who is in charge of a camp as to whether or not the people are repatriated. Let me say at once that at least fifty per cent of the camp directors working under UNRRA and the military governments have been exceptionally good to these people. Some of them really went out of their way to help; they were humanitarians. About twenty-five per cent

were more or less indifferent; they carried out their instructions and that is about all. But I would say that the remaining twenty-five per cent of the heads of UNRRA camps had no business in any humanitarian organization. I was there; I met them; I discussed these problems with them, and their attitude was almost that of persons serving a country in whose interest it was to destroy these people or at least make them as miserable as possible. I have received hundreds of letters and I have seen these conditions myself. If the minister states that I am unfair in the assertion that these people are being repatriated, I wish to put on record an UNRRA order, UNRRA U.S. zone headquarters, Heidelberg, November 11, 1946. It is as follows:

Soviet proclamations, literature, films and newspapers will be distributed.

That is, in the camps.

Some such material is now available for distribution and additional material has been promised by Soviet officials. Cultural activities will be utilized and turned toward the theme of repatriation . . . Every advantage must be taken to utilize the sentiments of persons who accept repatriation. This will call for alertness on the part of repatriation officers and area directors. As the programme gains momentum the experience of mass appeal already gained in the Polish repatriation drive can be brought to fruition with these nationalities. The propitious time for the use of emotional devices will be left to the judgment of the district officers and area teams. Special status with UNRRA will be accorded repatriates in all camp affairs and priorities for basic needs will be arranged on existing stocks of clothing and amenity supplies. Lists of Soviet citizens who lived in the USSR prior to the 1st September, 1939, and determined to be Soviet citizens by the military authorities—

That is the screening or army review board.

—and receiving UNRRA care will be forwarded to UNRRA district headquarters by the 1st of December, 1946, where they will be consolidated and then transmitted to U.S. zone headquarters who in turn can transmit them to G.5 third U.S. army for ultimate transmission to the Soviet liaison mission.

That is plain enough. Many of these people in camps have been kidnapped. It so happens that an unscrupulous head of a camp will leave the camp for the evening and that evening the Soviet liaison officers will come in and call out certain names and ask these people to appear, and when they appear that is the last time they are seen or heard of.

I am not blaming the Canadian government at all for this but I am pointing to the urgency of the situation as applied to people who lived within the territory held by the Soviet union on September 1, 1939. That is the only reason I brought the matter up. The minister also said that I was unfair in my suggestion that the government discriminated against Ukrainians, but we have the figures tabled by the director of immigration, Mr. Jolliffe, in the immigration and labour committee, given in the report I quoted. All the minister has to do is look up the figures and he will see that one person of Ukrainian origin was admitted in twelve months.

I wish to be fair. As the Minister of Labour pointed out, there were a few others, just a few, who came in as Poles and perhaps under other nationalities, the reason being that some of these people are compelled to change their nationality, to say they are Poles or something else, because otherwise they would be repatriated.

An hon. MEMBER: To Russia.

Mr. HLYNKA: Yes, to Russia, under force; and we in Canada are engaged in this house many hours a day discussing human rights and fundamental freedoms and all the rest of it. Surely if we are sincere in that regard this is one place where we could make our representations. I know the Canadian government has made representations.

As regards my remarks with reference to the former Mayor LaGuardia, the minister says that he is one of Canada's friends, but it does not mean that he is a friend of displaced persons simply because he is Canada's friend. He may be a good friend of Canada and not be a friend of displaced persons. I am sorry I did not bring down from my office the names of persons who were removed from camps, as heads of camps and areas, by Mayor LaGuardia when he held a high office—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the item.

Mr. HLYNKA: I am replying to the minister. I will be brief, but I must justify my remarks with reference to the former Mayor LaGuardia.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What the hon. member thinks of Mr. LaGuardia has nothing to do with the item before us.

Mr. HLYNKA: I was pointing out the urgency of allowing some of these people to be brought to Canada because the conditions under which they find themselves are miserable, and Mayor LaGuardia was one of those who contributed to that misery. That is why I made the reference. The minister undertook to refute my argument and I am trying to substantiate my position. When we reach the specific item on immigration I will place on the record certain authentic information

which appeared in the *New Leader*, published in the United States, regarding the treatment of displaced persons and those whom the former Mayor LaGuardia dismissed from service.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member would be in order in dealing with the immigration policy of Canada, but I do not think it is wise at this stage to take up the time of the committee criticizing Mayor LaGuardia.

Mr. MacNICOL: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, whether we are going to have a discussion all over again on immigration in connection with an immigration item? Under this item we are discussing everything. Are we going to discuss immigration again?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may discuss immigration policy, but I hope he will confine his remarks to the policy of the Canadian government.

Mr. HLYNKA: I have concluded for the time being, but if the minister allows what he has said in connection with my reference to the former Mayor LaGuardia to remain on *Hansard* I am willing to place on the record material to substantiate my remarks. That is all.

Mr. BROOKS: The matter which I wish to discuss now is one which I felt should be brought up under this general item. I do not know that it could come up under any of the other items. It has reference to the question I asked the minister yesterday in connection with subsidies paid to the Dominion Coal Company in Nova Scotia.

Mr. HOWE: Under what item of mines and resources does the question of coal subsidies come?

Mr. BROOKS: If it does not come under mines and resources I do not know under what department one would discuss coal.

Mr. HOWE: Under reconstruction and supply.

Mr. BROOKS: I also wish to discuss the royal commission on coal, and by no stretch of the imagination can coal, one of the great natural resources of the country, be said not to come under mines and resources. If that is so, I contend that the hon. member who spoke this morning was right when he said that it was time the Department of Mines and Resources dealt with mines and resources.

In replying to my question yesterday the minister—

Mr. HOWE: I ask for a ruling. Coal mining happens to be under reconstruction and supply. We must draw the line somewhere or members will be talking about the Nova Scotia election under this item.

Mr. BROOKS: We are not talking about the Nova Scotia election. I am referring to mining, and if that does not come under mines and resources—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The payment of subsidies is not under mines and resources.

Mr. HOWE: It is item 577.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is reconstruction and supply.

Mr. JACKMAN: What does it deal with?

Mr. HOWE: You would not understand. I will have to make it clear later.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think it would be in order to discuss coal mining.

Mr. BROOKS: Thank you for your ruling.

Mr. HOWE: Coal subventions are not under this department.

Mr. BROOKS: I am dealing with the mining of coal in the maritime provinces. If this item has nothing to do with mines, I will sit down. If the Department of Mines and Resources can be said to have nothing to do with the mining of coal, then I am quite willing to take my seat.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What are the items the minister is referring to?

Mr. HOWE: Item 577 reads:

To provide for production and transportation subsidies for Canadian steel producers under such terms and conditions as may be approved by the governor in council.

Item 921 reads:

To provide for production and transportation subsidies on steel, iron and coal under such terms and conditions as may be approved by the governor in council and also as provided in item No. 577 of the main estimates.

Both items are under reconstruction and supply.

Mr. BROOKS: I understand the ruling is that I can speak under this item. I would have been finished with this matter long ago if I had been allowed to speak. I do not intend to take up very much time. I was disappointed with the statement made yesterday by the minister that subsidies were being paid only to the Dominion Coal Company. At that time the minister said that he got his authority from the report of the royal commission on coal. I have gone through that report very carefully and I find that that commission recommended subventions and

tariffs as a means of assisting coal mining in the maritime provinces. On page 584 of the report is a supplementary note which looks to me more like an after thought than anything else. It is signed by W. F. Carroll, the chairman of the committee and it reads:

I think that it may be necessary to afford the Cape Breton mines interim support immediately following the suspension of production subsidies arising out of price control.

That apparently is the basis for the payment of subsidies to the Dominion Coal Company in Nova Scotia. The Dominion Coal Company is the largest producer in the maritimes, and if it needs assistance, surely the smaller producers—I speak particularly for those in New Brunswick—need similar assistance. The Dominion Coal Company has received more assistance than any of the smaller companies. Not only do we not have a subsidy in New Brunswick; we are faced with the fact that the Dominion Coal Company has received more assistance than any of the smaller companies. Not only do we not have a subsidy in New Brunswick; we are faced with the fact that the Dominion Coal Company is paid a subvention to ship coal into New Brunswick to compete with the small mines there.

I do not wish to give offence to the minister, but I do contend that if this policy is continued it will drive this small industry in New Brunswick out of business. I do not want to be insistent, but I must emphasize that this industry means much to the people down there. To a great extent our whole economy depends upon our coal mines. Our hydro electric power is developed from our coal which is sold almost exclusively in our own province. If the government is going to continue to pay subventions to the coal industry in Nova Scotia to ship coal into New Brunswick to compete against the smaller mines there, it will drive those people out of business.

I had a letter just a day or so ago protesting against this and calling attention to the report that the president of the Dominion Coal Company had said that they were negotiating for subsidies. I feel keenly about this matter and that is why I have brought it to the attention of the minister again. I have great confidence in the minister and I submit that this is a matter which should receive his personal attention.

I think the cost of the royal commission on coal was out of all proportion to the benefits the coal industry has derived from its investigations. I was just looking up the cost of producing this large book and carrying on the investigations and I find it was $282,374. As far as I can find out the only recommendations that have been carried out have been to appoint a dominion coal board, which could have been set up without any investigation of this kind, and carrying out the recomendation in a footnote by one of the members of the commission, Mr. Justice Carroll, a footnote which is not signed by the other members. That recommendation is simply to help the Dominion Coal Company. I make no apology for bringing up this matter at this time, and I sincerely hope the minister will give it the consideration it deserves.

Mr. BROWN: It seems to me that the question of immigration falls roughly under three headings. First, there is the desire of the Canadian people to assist and relieve suffering in foreign countries. Second, there is the uniting of families. Third, there is the building up of our own country in a strong and efficient way. There has been a certain fictional romanticism about the efforts of the premier of Ontario to bring a certain number of immigrants to this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BROWN: I am glad to hear applause from certain quarters and I hope the hon. members approve of it. In order to expedite matters I wonder if the Acting Minister of Mines and Resources would state whether any arrangements have been made by the British government for the settlement of immigrants in Canada.

Mr. HOWE: I know of no arrangements made by the British government. British immigrants are received freely here and the services of the department of immigration and the Department of Labour are devoted to placing them properly in employment. That is the only arrangement that I know of.

Mr. BROWN: Certain publicity has been given to the statement by the premier of Ontario that the British government have made certain arrangements for the settlement of immigrants in Canada. The minister says that there is nothing of that sort?

Mr. HOWE: Do you mean the Ontario government?

Mr. BROWN: The Ontario government has had a certain amount of publicity by stating that the British government have made plans for the settling of people in different commonwealth countries.

Mr. HOWE: I have the literature published under the seal of the agent general of Ontario,

issued from Ontario House, 13 Charles II street, London, and the plan as given in this literature says:

The Ontario government has contracted by charter with the Transocean Airlines Company of California, to supply daily two Skymasters each carrying 40 passengers to fly from Britain during August, September and October. The immigrants pay the full passage fare and are transported at Toronto, Ontario. The proposition is merely one of offering increased facilities to permit emigrants to move. There is no other intention or obligation on the part of the Ontario government.

Upon arrival the immigrant is interviewed and offered certain employment opportunities based on his capabilities; also living accommodation suggested. He is under no compulsion to accept what is offered. If he has some prearranged employment, he need not use the facilities of the placement officer, and he is at liberty to seek his own job.

No guarantees are given by the Ontario government of employment or living accommodation, but the immigrant may be assured that many opportunities exist and that every reasonable assistance will be given if he wishes to avail himself of the service.

Another paragraph reads:

Only the following need apply.

Ages: Male—16 to 17½—with parents' consent.

Ex-military service up to 21—with parents' consent. 21 to 40 inclusive.

Female—21 to 45 inclusive.

The Ontario government has asked for the cooperation of the federal government, and the full cooperation of the immigration department has been offered. The great difficulty of the plan is that the Ontario government has made what purports to be a contract with a United States air carrier with a business based on California. But Canada has a reciprocal agreement with the United Kingdom which provides that only Canadian or British equipment may fly the United Kingdom-Canada Atlantic route, and which provides further for a division of the traffic on that route between the United Kingdom and Canada. Canada is also a signatory of the international air transport agreement, which provides that certain rates will apply for certain periods on the Atlantic. This Ontario plan cuts across both these agreements. There is no possible way in which a United States carrier could carry traffic between the United Kingdom and Canada under existing international arrangements. Canada must take the view that it must keep its agreement with the United Kingdom and therefore it cannot permit a United States plane operating between the United Kingdom and Canada to land in Canada.

I believe that the proposal now is to land in the United States and transport the passengers thence to Canada by buses. That will protect Canada so far as our agreement goes. It does not protect the United Kingdom, and it leaves the United States in rather a peculiar position. However, Canada is satisfied to protect our own good faith in carrying out our agreement, and we shall be happy if the movement can proceed without involving any violation on our part. It seems reasonable to expect that, if a province wishes to engage in a charter air operation, it should apply to either a British or Canadian aviation company for the necessary equipment. Charter equipment is freely available in England and in Canada. This seems to be a perfect example of a man playing with machinery that he did not understand and getting his fingers cut. However, no movement by air has taken place as yet under the Ontario plan.

Mr. BROWN: Who pays the cost of these immigrants flying to this country?

Mr. HOWE: As I understand it, the Ontario government has guaranteed full loads, and in consideration of that guarantee the fare is reduced by about $50 or $60 below the normal Atlantic crossing rate. The Ontario government has in effect relieved the carrier of all the cost of booking passengers, and of all the loss that occurs through passengers not appearing at the time of the departure of the plane. From the point of view of the aircraft operator the charter is attractive, but from the point of view of competition with other carriers it places the United States company in a preferred position. Although it purports to be a charter, it is my understanding that tickets for this service are being sold through a travel agency in London.

Mr. BROWN: What percentage of the immigrants coming to Canada in 1946 and in 1947 to date were from the British isles, and what percentage from continental European countries?

Mr. HOWE: For the fiscal year ended March 31, 1946, the totals of English, Irish, Scottish and Welsh were 20,162; from the United States, 7,454; northern European races, 1,148; all other races, 2,317, or a grand total of 31,081, of which more than 20,000 came from the British isles.

Mr. BROWN: Has the minister the figures up to March 31, 1947?

Mr. HOWE: For the fiscal year ended March 31, 1947, 47,976 were from the United Kingdom, 11,410 from the United States, 5,605 from northern European races, and

1,999 from other races, so that over 47,000 out of a total of almost 67,000 were from the United Kingdom.

Mr. FULTON: Are the wives and children of service men included in those figures?

Mr. HOWE: I understand that these figures are for all immigrants, and show that more than two-thirds of our immigration came from the United Kingdom.

Mr. BROWN: Then when the premier of Ontario says that most of the immigrants coming to Canada are foreigners—

Mr. MacNICOL: He would not say anything like that. You are playing politics.

Mr. BROWN: He said foreigners and other European nationals. I take it from the figures given by the minister that the statement of the premier of Ontario is not correct.

Mr. HOWE: It is not correct. I can read the statement in the Ontario literature:

Many continentals and foreigners are now being permitted to enter Canada. We feel it essential that we maintain our present percentages of British stock.

Mr. HAZEN: The 4,000 Poles who were brought in cannot be included in the last figures the minister gave. The number amounted to 4,000. When did they come in?

Mr. HOWE: That movement occurred after March 31, 1947.

Mr. HAZEN: Some more of these are being brought in.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HOWE: I am told some were brought in before and some after. Those who came in before March 31 would be included in the figure I gave; those who came after would not.

Mr. WRIGHT: I wish to bring up a matter with regard to British immigrants. I was waiting until we came to the item dealing with immigration. Since we are discussing this matter perhaps we might as well discuss the point I have in mind. One of the difficulties the British immigrants are facing is that of transferring their assets from Great Britain to Canada. When they desire to emigrate they naturally dispose of what assets they have over there and obtain pounds for them. I have a letter from a British immigrant which states:

Before the Canadian authorities will accept me as desirable, I must present a statement from the Bank of England as to my financial position. I, therefore, through my local bank, got in touch with the Bank of England, and find that owing to the regulations, an immigrant is to take out of this country only one-fourth of his total assets each year for four years, up to a maximum of £5,000 and although on the form it states that the banks may, in certain circumstances, grant more than one-fourth the first year, it still takes four years to move his total assets.

Now the average immigrant is not burdened with too many assets, and in my opinion could very well use the little he has when arriving in Canada to settle, either on the land or in industry, to buy his farm or his home—if in the city—and to settle in, and he would have a more reasonable chance of becoming a useful citizen—both to his advantage and to Canada in general, if he could convert all his assets into dollars for use when arriving and settling down—of course up to a fair amount. Would it not be to Canada's advantage to set aside a sum of money to be used for the conversion of the immigrants' sterling into dollars, so that those who are passed as desirable could draw on these funds to get a good start rather than in pieces?

I know that this matter involves more than the Department of Immigration; it involves the Department of Finance and it also involves some arrangement being arrived at between Great Britain and Canada with regard to sterling exchange. But it does seem to me that we should do something in this country to make it easier for British immigrants coming here to realize on their assets immediately, especially when the amounts are small. It would involve some arrangement whereby the Canadian government would make dollars available for the pounds, and keep these reserves of pounds in England; either that or to use these pounds to sell to people who want to take excursions to the old country. The Department of Immigration would be well advised to take this matter up with the Department of Finance, and through them with the British government, to make some arrangement whereby these immigrants can realize on their assets and become established in Canada as quickly as possible.

Mr. HOWE: The management of pounds sterling is, of course, a matter for the Bank of England and for the Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain. The practice has been that immigrants with small means are allowed a greater proportion of their means in the first year than people better off. I think that any man desiring to emigrate to Canada is given sufficient money to satisfy Canadian regulations that he shall have funds sufficient to take care of him until he becomes established, which is a very small amount. I might point out that it would be difficult for Canada to get excited about this situation, because Canadians who wished to emigrate to another country have not been allowed to take all their funds; they have been allowed to take only a limited amount.

Mr. McLURE: In going over the definite policies of the government a few moments ago the minister said something that I did not quite understand. There are two people from Lebanon in Syria who applied to come to Canada, a mother and a son eighteen years of age. I want to know whether I understood the minister aright, that these people could not come here now. There are also two Polish residents, a man and his wife. They have relatives in Canada who are anxious to bring these two people here. There is also a family from Holland, quite a wealthy man, who wants to go into business in this country. Did I understand correctly that these five people whom I have mentioned could, under the new regulations, come to Canada? Their relatives are here.

Mr. HOWE: I made it very clear in my statement that except for certain classes, which I have mentioned, there is no provision in the Canadian Immigration Act for Asiatics. Lebanon is in Asia. That situation is being studied and there may be a change in the regulations; but at the present time the people of Lebanon are not admissible under the Canadian regulations. What is the occupation of these Polish people? Where are they?

Mr. McLURE: The man and his wife want to come out here to farm. Their people are already in Canada. They have two brothers living in Montreal and two brothers living in Charlottetown. They are splendid people, good citizens. They are in a position to establish themselves. Their people here are willing to put up bonds that they will not become a burden on the state.

Mr. HOWE: They are admissible if they are in good health.

Mr. WRIGHT: The minister said, as I understood him—perhaps I misunderstood him —that the Canadian government could not get excited about this since the same condition applied to Canadians leaving Canada, that they were not allowed to take all their assets. Did I understand the minister to say that?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT: How was it that the group of Slavs who left Canada recently were allowed to take their assets with them? They were Canadian citizens. They took their assets. Surely we should have some arrangement whereby British emigrants coming to this country could bring their assets in.

Mr. HOWE: The people to whom my hon. friend referred were allowed to take certain assets out. Of some of them who had a considerable fortune in Canada, they were not allowed to take all their fortunes.

Mr. JACKMAN: It depends on exchange.

Mr. HOWE: No, it does not depend on exchange.

Mr. JACKMAN: There is lots of sterling.

Mr. HOWE: There may be lots of sterling, but my hon. friend may get all the sterling he wants to spend in England.

Mr. JACKMAN: May I ask the minister a question with regard to the point raised by the hon. member for Melfort. Have there been any discussions between the Department of Finance and the Department of Mines and Resources, immigration branch, in regard to putting Canadian dollars at the disposal of the United Kingdom authorities to assist immigrants from Great Britain who have some capital there which they wish to transplant into this country, so that there will be a source of Canadian funds which can be drawn upon in exchange for sterling balances? I ask this question apart from the general financial considerations which exist between Great Britain and Canada in regard to Canadian dollars. What I want to know is, has the Department of Immigration had any conversations with the United Kingdom to obviate the difficulty which the hon. member mentioned?

Mr. HOWE: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. JACKMAN: May I also ask the minister a question in regard to the transportation by air which was arranged by the premier of Ontario. The minister said that the T.C.A. or some transport service in Canada operated by T.C.A. had equipment which could do this particular job; also that the contract was a very desirable one. On that premise may I ask the minister whether or not T.C.A. ever approached the premier of Ontario with the suggestion that their services would be at the disposal of the province of Ontario to assist in the transportation of British immigrants?

Mr. HOWE: Trans-Canada Air Lines have indeed approached the Ontario government.

Mr. JACKMAN: Did they approach the Ontario government before the contract was made with the United States company?

Mr. HOWE: Unfortunately Trans-Canada Air Lines did not happen to be in England at the proper time. The contract was, I understand, made in England.

Mr. TIMMINS: Did I understand the minister to say that Premier Drew was out of line when he arranged for the flying of immigrants here from the old country?

Mr. HOWE: No, I do not say that at all. I said he was out of line when he arranged for an American plane to fly between Canada and the United Kingdom.

Mr. TIMMINS: Did not the hon. member for Beauce, when he brought over the immigrants from Poland, land at Bangor, Maine? Is that not in the same category?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: That is a different matter. That is by order in council.

Mr. TIMMINS: Is it the suggestion that Premier Drew is wrong in his approach?

Mr. HOWE: Not at all. That is quite all right as far as Canadian regulations are concerned. An American plane flying from Germany to the United States is not subject to Canadian regulations. That is quite a proper operation. We can offer no objection if other contracting parties are willing to allow an American plane to fly between the United Kingdom and Buffalo at less than approved tariff rates.

Mr. WRIGHT: To follow up again the question I asked before, in a letter from the foreign exchange control board with regard to this matter, it is stated:

Since the loans would be made against sterling assets not yet eligible for transfer to Canada, the foreign exchange control board does not have authority to use its assets for such purposes—

And this is the part I wish to bring to the minister's attention.

—and the question becomes one of general government policy.

In my humble opinion the government should have a policy with regard to this, to assist in the matter of British immigrants transferring their assets over here. I just wanted to state our position in that matter, because I think it is important that these people, especially those having assets of two or three thousand pounds or under, should have such assets made available to them on their arrival in Canada so that they can become established. Otherwise they simply cannot purchase a home at all and become established. Their assets are dissipated over a period of three or four years and very often to little purpose.

Mr. HERRIDGE: I just wish to refer to a few of the remarks made by the hon. member for Vegreville who, I think, was most unfair in charging the government with discrimination as far as his people are concerned. I say that because I think the hon. member seems to permit himself to be misinformed. To support my contention, I want to read from a Canadian press dispatch of April 2, 1946, as follows:

On March 25, Anthony Hlynka, Social Credit member of the Canadian House of Commons for Vegreville, Alta., said he had been informed in a letter from reliable British and Canadian sources overseas that a group of drunken Canadian occupation troops were led by a Russian officer into Wesserflug displaced persons camp at Delmenhorst, Germany, February 1 and February 2. There, according to the letter, they seized ninety Ukrainians and took them into the Russian zone.

The reply to that, in the Canadian press dispatch from London, of the officials concerned, reads as follows:

Canadian troops in northwest Germany have been participating in a search of displaced person camps for Russian citizens who must be repatriated to the Russian zone under military government regulations, Canadian military headquarters here said yesterday.

Opposition to deportation has been encountered from some displaced persons, officials said, particularly those Russian citizens who have "guilty consciences" because of cooperation with the Germans during the war. In some instances force has been required to send the "D.P's" to the Russian zone.

Persons suspected of being Russians are removed from displaced persons camps and appear before special board which determines their nationality. Any Russians are then sent to the Russian zone under military government policy.

In addition to that, these reports were brought to the attention of the Minister of National Defence, who asked for a report from the commander overseas at that time. I am quite sure that if the report on this matter of the commander of the Canadian forces in Germany at that time was read to this committee, hon. members would fully appreciate the kind of people they were dealing with in this instance.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Since we are on the general item under immigration, I might as well say at this time what I had intended to say later on. I do not desire to take much time so far as my views on immigration are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: The discussion so far has been general. It occurred to me that we might now, by considering items 185, 186 and 187, deal with immigration and complete the discussion on that subject, then revert to the mines and geology branch, if that met with the approval of the committee.

Mr. MacNICOL: That will be all right, if you stay on it item after item, instead of wandering all over the lot, the way we have been doing.

The CHAIRMAN: All right. We shall complete discussion on immigration and then take up the other subjects.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I wonder if it might not be in order to let the first item stand until the end, and allow hon. members to discuss the items they wish to discuss. If the first item stands, it protects the privileges of

all members to discuss anything they may want to discuss after we have finished the general discussion.

Mr. MacNICOL: That is fine.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I take it that we are to go on with the discussion of immigration at this time?

The CHAIRMAN: Well, it is my opinion that we should carry the first item, No. 130, and then discuss the other items under the headings.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I believe you would accomplish your objective more satisfactory. Mr. Chairman, if you allowed item 130 to stand, because then all hon. members would know that when that item came up again they could discuss anything they wished to. In the meantime, most of the underbrush would be cleared away.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no general agreement, we shall have to take the items as they are set forth in the estimates.

Mr. MacNICOL: What item are you going to start with, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Does item 130 carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I am not just clear on this. Is it understood that if the first item carries, we are on item 185 next?

The CHAIRMAN: I was suggesting that we could carry item 130 and move on.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. BLACKMORE: We would be better off, Mr. Chairman, if we allowed item 130 to stand.

Mr. HOWE: Let item 130 stand.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That has been done many times in the past.

Mr. GRAYDON: We would be better off if we made up our minds what we are going to do.

The CHAIRMAN: I am in the hands of the committee.

Mr. MacNICOL: Let item 130 stand.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 130 stands.

Item stands.

Immigration branch—

185. Administration of the Immigration Act and the Chinese Immigration Act, $277,423.

186. Field and inspectional service, Canada, $2,221,532.

187. Field and inspectional service, abroad, $351,595.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Under item 185 I wish to take a little time to refer to the question of immigration. On the general policy of immigration I believe it is not necessary to say much more. We have discussed it in this house before. I have been trying to find some disinterested authority which might give some clue as to what effect a policy of greater immigration may have upon our country, and this may be of general interest to the committee. I have come across the reprint of an article written by R. H. Coats, the retired dominion statistician, which appeared in *Saturday Night*. Quoting from his article, they have this to say, which I think gives us some lead as to what we may expect:

> Statistical records show that periods of high immigration are also periods of rising wage levels, says the retired dominion statistician, who is one of the world's chief authorities on the subject and is now a special lecturer at the university of Toronto.

Then a direct quotation from Mr. Coats:

> The trend of wages, like that of prices and the cost of living, is contingent primarily upon the condition of the economy as a whole, and will not suffer from immigration if the latter is economically sound.

I think that sets out in brief terms the proper approach to the question of general immigration; that is to say, that if our economy is properly planned in such a way that we may expand the economy together with an expanding population, there is then no danger of unemployment or a dropping of wage scales.

I will leave that part of it at that point and go on with the other question which has been discussed today and which I believe the committee is more interested in at this time. That is the question of the displaced persons, the refugees, to which reference has been made by several hon. members today. On other occasions I have been critical of the government in connection with this matter, but today I want to quote from a document which gives the government a certain amount of credit, because I believe we should give credit where it is due. This is a memorandum submitted to the government by the Ukrainian Canadian committee in March of this year, and the paragraph I wish to quote I believe is very fair. It reads:

> With regard to the second problem, namely the settlement of refugees, we wish to express our sincere thanks to the Canadian government

for its action and the humanitarian stand taken by its delegation at the recent conference of the united nations. We have also noted with deep gratitude the fact that our country, Canada, was the first of all nations to sign the charter of the international refugee organization, which was created at the united nations conference. We believe that the Canadian government will continue its present course towards the final solution of the refugee problem. It is our belief that the government of Canada will serve as an example to governments of other countries in the resettlement of refugees and displaced persons by opening its doors more generously.

That is a bouquet thrown to the government, which I hope will not have the effect of making them rest on their laurels. I hope they will continue to take vigorous action in this matter in order that these people, whom we have referred to so often in this house and who are suffering in the displaced persons camps of Europe, may be relieved of their misery as quickly as may be humanly possible.

In that connection I want to add that when we last discussed this question in this house I offered a recommendation to the government. To what extent it has been carried out, I am not in a position to say. I recommended then that the most careful consideration should be given to allowing to come to Canada from the displaced persons camps persons who have relatives in Canada in a position to look after them and give them a start in life. I know there are thousands of applications in the immigration office. I know many members of this house have in their own files hundreds of letters regarding these applications for permission to bring relatives to Canada. Unfortunately the rate at which these applications have been handled and the rate at which permission is being granted is disappointing. We do not oppose the entry of other people to Canada. I believe the action of the government in passing only yesterday, an order in council under which an additional five thousand will be permitted to enter Canada will meet with approval across the country. But there is general disappointment at the speed with which these applications are being handled. There is a special urgency, because many of these people applied months ago. Some of these applications have been before the officials for two years now. If action is to be taken this year it can easily be seen that it must be done immediately. We are now in the month of July, and it is not long until the harvest season. If people are to become established here it is much better to let them come in now, when they can be of some assistance to their relatives in Canada and at the same time have a few months of the summer season left in which to become established. That would be far better than having them come in the late fall or winter months. Therefore I hope some special effort will be made to expedite the handling of these applications, so that people waiting for permission to enter the country may have something to which they can look forward.

I also mentioned to the government the advisability of giving those who are now in displaced persons camps, and on whose behalf applications have been made, some statement to this effect in documentary form. Many of those people do not regularly receive information from Canada; in fact most of them do not. In some cases newspapers are not available, and for most of those people it is difficult to correspond with their relatives in Canada. They do not even know whether application has been made on their behalf. It places them in an uncertain position, and that uncertainty and suspense in their own minds is very bad for their morale. I would suggest—and I do not think it would involve very much extra expense or work—that when an application is received by the department from a person in Canada on behalf of a relative in a displaced persons camp, the person on whose behalf that application has been made be notified of that fact immediately and be given some document to indicate that fact. Then he will know that as soon as he becomes eligible, as soon as transportation is available, if he meets the qualifications of the immigration department he will be able to proceed to Canada. He will have a document to show the officials of the camp and any other authorities concerned, and will have the satisfaction of knowing that some action is being taken on his behalf. It would also have the effect of giving those people something to look forward to in the future. As we all know, the relief that has been given so generously to those people by UNRRA is now being terminated. Many of them will have to leave the displaced persons camps, perhaps not of their own choice, but through the necessity of earning a living. It is not going to be easy for them to decide whether to establish a home somewhere in the country in which they happen to be or still to plan on coming to Canada, unless they have something in their possession to show that someone in Canada is working on their behalf to bring them here.

I wish also to ask the minister to comment on the position of people who are now classified as enemy aliens; that is, people who, during the war, happened to be in countries which were fighting against the allies. Many of those people are not really nationals of those countries. They happened to be there by reason of geography, or because of changes

in geography over which they had no control. The example of Roumania was brought up today, and there are other cases of people of a different nationality who happened to be in those countries when war was declared and who are now regarded as enemy aliens until the peace treaties are ratified. I would ask the minister to comment on what position they will be in once the peace treaties are ratified, whether they will be treated like all other people in European countries; also what possibility there is of such people being able to prove that they are not truly nationals of the country under whose jurisdiction they came without consent and often against their own will. Many of those people were strongly opposed to the nazi regimes of those countries; some were actively opposed in the way of resistance movements, while others were perhaps just passively opposed. We could hardly expect women and children to be actively opposed to those governments. However, they are now in the position that, owing to an accident of geography, they are classified as enemy aliens. They may have very close relatives in Canada; we have cases where a father in Canada wants to bring his son or daughter from a European country, but because that son or daughter happened to be in a country like Roumania or another country in a similar position, they are classified as enemy aliens and at the present time are not eligible for entry. I hope the minister will make some statement on that position.

The other question I should like to ask is in connection with Poland. Some time ago I inquired of the department as to whether any information was available concerning the position being taken by Poland with regard to people who wished to leave that country and come to Canada. On March 7 of this year I received from the director of the immigration branch a reply in which he said in part:

> We are not yet in a position to state whether or not the Polish government permits emigration from that country. The position at the moment is that we have no facilities for the examination of immigrants in the country named. However, there will be Canadian representation in Poland very shortly and we then hope to be able to arrange for immigration inspectional facilities if immigrants can leave that country.

I am wondering whether any change has taken place since March of this year, whether any representations have been made since that time, and what attitude, if any, has been taken by the Polish government on this question.

There is only one more question I wish to raise, and that is along the lines of a question raised by an hon. member to my right today. In connection with people who are known in Canada as Armenians, I have received documents and letters from certain persons interested in this matter who have asked me to raise this question in the house in order to get some clarification as to where Armenians stand under the immigration regulations. According to the regulations at the present time, Asiatic races are excluded, and apparently under order in council P.C. 2115 Armenians are regarded as Asiatics. I have the following information from a gentleman interested in the matter. He tells me that Mr. C. E. S. Smith, an official of the department wrote to him on May 10, 1947, a letter in which he stated:

> With respect to your comment regarding Armenian nationals I would inform you that order in council P.C. 2115 covering such matters is based on geographic and not ethnological grounds. In view of the location of Armenia nationals of that country come within the scope of the order in council mentioned.

In other words, the interpretation of the regulations is such that people coming from what is known as Armenia are considered to be Asiatics. I have documentary evidence signed by two professors of the university of Montreal, both professors of history in that institution, who apparently have made an exhaustive study of the question. They inform me that the Armenians are of Indo-European culture, race, language and civilization. They are of Aryan origin. Geographically speaking, they state, Armenia is situated in Trans-Caucausia, which is generally included in Europe. They say, further, that many Armenians were born in Constantinople, a European city which is situated on the European continent.

I have no reason to question the information given me by these gentlemen, who, as I say, have made a study of the question. I merely raise the matter, so that the officials of the department may make a closer study of the situation and clarify the regulations in order to be able to prove in their own minds whether the Armenians are actually an Asiatic race. From information given me, and from the studies I have made on the subject, it appears to me that they may more properly be classified as European than as an Asiatic race. These are simply a few points I wish to bring to the attention of the minister and I would ask him to comment upon them.

Mr. MacNICOL: I wish to set my position right in connection with immigration. I was looking around the chamber to see where our members come from. The hon. member for Vegreville is, I believe, from the Ukraine,

and we are all proud to have such people here. He is a credit to the country. So is the hon. member for Dauphin.

An hon. MEMBER: He was born in Canada.

Mr. MacNICOL: The hon. member for Acadia was born in British Guiana. The hon. member for Lethbridge was born in the United States. The hon. member for Bow River was born in the United States. The hon. member for Camrose was born in Ulster. The hon. member for Battle River was born in Ulster. The hon. member for Wetaskiwin was born in England and the hon. member for Cariboo was born in the Orkneys, Scotland. The member for Macleod was born in England. The hon. member for Spadina was born in Poland—

Mr. CROLL: Russia.

Mr. MacNICOL: I stand corrected. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre, although you would not know it from his speech, was born in Scotland. You can hardly understand him sometimes. The hon. member for Selkirk was born in Scotland.

Mr. BRYCE: A good Canadian.

Mr. MacNICOL: But you were born in Scotland. The hon. member for Port Arthur was born in the United States. The hon. member for Kootenay West was born in England and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was born in the United States. That is all I wish to say.

Mr. KNOWLES: Of Canadian parents.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes. We welcome here people from every country. If folks come here and do what these hon. gentlemen in the House of Commons have done or what, as we know, men in business, in the professions, in music and in art have done in Canada, we may well welcome them and keep them all as Canadians.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): When we keep juggling these items around one is apt to get a little off the track. There are one or two things I wish to say, and I am not too sure that they apply particularly to mines and resources. Earlier in the estimates I approached the Minister of Agriculture with a question regarding the Thames river, and he said that had nothing to do with agriculture, that it was part of public works. Then, when the public works items were up the minister of that department said he would not promise anything as far as the Thames valley was concerned but he would not say no.

An hon. MEMBER: That has nothing to do with immigration.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

The CHAIRMAN: In order that the committee may be clear as to procedure, may I say that there was no general agreement to discuss immigration. The committee will therefore have to proceed in the usual way, taking the items as they are shown in the estimates. We are now on the first item, which is 130, departmental administration. The hon. member for Middlesex East is in order.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): While the Minister of Public Works would not say yes, he also said he would not say no to assistance in connection with any projects on the Thames river. I may say to the government that they find ways of channeling taxes they take from the residents of Ontario to do works in other parts of the dominion. As I look over the departments of government, I am wondering whether one of them will fit into the Ontario picture to assist the Thames valley if and when that project is in need of assistance.

I would ask the minister to break down these immigration figures, because there is no doubt that many of the wives and children of members of the Canadian armed forces are included in these figures as immigrants from the British isles and are not really immigrants at all but are being repatriated.

Mr. HOWE: I can assure my hon. friend that no repatriation figures were included.

Mr. FULTON: The minister said, wives and children, and they are being repatriated.

Mr. HOWE: If a Canadian went to England and married an English girl and brought her to Canada she is a Canadian; nevertheless she would be included in the immigration figures. If his wife went from this side and simply returned she would be considered a repatriate and would not be included in the immigration figures.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): We realize that many of the persons who were given in these figures are really the wives and children of Canadians returning to Canada.

Another item I wish to bring to the attention of the minister is that of Pelee island in lake Erie. Apparently, looking over the estimates for public works, there was no place for it there. Extremely high lake levels have imperilled a large acreage on that island. We are carrying out irrigation projects in the west, but not a great deal is being done about the washing away of lake shores by the changing currents of the lakes. The eastern shore of this island is quite low. The land has been drained and is now below the level of lake Erie. There are only 523 inhabitants on the island, but their production in soy beans and corn is quite high. They are concerned about

their situation should a severe storm similar to the one last week on lake Ontario occur. It is almost out of their reach to provide the funds necessary to construct a breakwater adequate to protect this shore.

When the hon. member for Essex West was questioning the minister with regard to the actions of the premier of Ontario in regard to immigration I was wondering if it would not have been better if he had warned the minister about the condition that prevails on Pelee island which is in Essex county. I hope the minister will take care of this matter because it is quite urgent. The lake level is extremely high. This is a separate township, and they are part of the county of Essex only for election purposes. They do not get any county funds and they are in a desperate position.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I should like to say a word or two about immigration and give one illustration. A man in Toronto has a brother in Poland who is eligible to come to Canada. The man in Poland has a son who is eligible to come to Canada. But his daughter-in-law is not eligible. When the father comes to this country he can apply immediately to the immigration branch to have his son come here, but the daughter-in-law will not be allowed to come. It seems to me that that kind of thing ought to be straightened out. We should not be dividing families. I do not see any reason why a family should be broken up, especially when they are fine people. I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for Spadina. There are many good people in Europe who would like to come to Canada and who would be an asset to this country. We need population; we need the right kind of people. If we do not hurry up and get the best of these people somebody else is going to get them.

The immigration branch is doing a big work right at the present time. It has a great deal to look after, and I suggest that there should be a deputy minister of immigration to take care of the situation which will arise in the future. I should like the minister to take into account what I have just mentioned and see if it is not possible to bring in a family like that rather than break them up, especially when we need this type of good citizen.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): May I just interject one sentence with regard to another feature of immigration work which to my mind is important? While I am speaking now, there is landing at Malton airport in Toronto a man by the name of Tonge. He is married and his wife will be coming out in due course. He has a position here to go to. He is part and parcel of a big organization in London which is world-wide. He is part of an organization which purpose in due course to move their headquarters from London, England to Ontario and bring into this country a great deal of British money, provided that they can get it changed into Canadian money.

In the meantime they are bringing personnel here to study the Canadian situation. Two of that personnel are at present in western Canada, one in Athabaska and another somewhere near Calgary. A third member, an export manager of some twenty years standing, a gentleman by the name of William Gerrard, a director of a large organization, is buying a home with the intention of establishing himself in Canada. This man is backed up with an abundance of funds. He is ready to go ahead and develop in Canada an industry of the kind about which they have more know-how than any other industry in the world. I speak with authority; I know whereof I speak.

I wish to make some observations in two or three sentences. I suggest that the immigration branch should encourage this movement from Europe. I see an hon. member from Quebec City in his seat. He knows that in his native city there are some European developments which will bring about a new industry in Quebec City. I mention that in passing. I come back to the theme that is worrying me and ask that the immigration branch facilitate the movement of these executives of industry into this country. They should take a broader view of the labour legislation which prohibits such industrialists and scientists coming to Canada until such time as the national employment service of the Department of Labour has made a review and canvass of the entire population of Canada to find out whether or not there is someone in Canada with the same know-how who would have to be put in a certain position when these know-how people, I will call them, are available and ready to go ahead and do business in Canada.

I have in mind a man by the name of H. W. Orwell who recently arrived in Canada. This man is full of know-how from British scientific manufacturing institutions. He is here on only a year's permit. He is a $10,000 a year man, highly schooled and technically trained, to a degree which no one else in Canada has attained. He finds himself here, but his daughter was left behind. He should not be in the position of having to wait for the approval of the Department of Labour.

My plea in a few sentences is this. Take a broad view of those who want to come to

live among us, those who are trained, those who are executives, those who will expand industry, those who will be a great credit to this country, those who are enthusiastic over the idea that Canada has a future, that perhaps in days to come Canada will be the centre of gravity as far as the empire is concerned. They are great citizens; they are good people to have here. Do not let the picayune regulations of the Department of Labour and the national employment service keep them out. They are necessary for the proper development of Canada. We should let in these people, not only from the United Kingdom, but from Europe. Let us in Canada see if we cannot at this time capture these world markets which, before the war, were served by Europe, Germany and Belgium in particular, and, to a lesser degree, by Italy and perhaps Holland. With all these people anxious to come to our shores to help us develop our natural resources, let us see if we are not big enough in this assembly to take full advantage of the situation by admitting these people to our shores instead of holding them back by picayune regulations. Let us admit these people of good will who want to come here and who can give Canada the know how that has been accumulated over the generations in Britain and in Europe.

Mr. HOWE: I say once again, as I have said three or four times this afternoon and once last evening, that any resident of British race in Great Britain who is of good character and in good health and has a small sum of money sufficient to maintain him until he can establish himself here is entitled to come to Canada, and not the slightest obstacle will be put in his way.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Under a permit for one year.

Mr. HOWE: No, a permit is unnecessary.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Thank you.

Mr. HOWE: He can come at any time. The contract labour laws that were in vogue in the bad days before governments were paying serious attention to immigration have been suspended.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): There are scores and scores who have come here within the last two or three months and are still here under a permit for one year.

Mr. HOWE: From where?

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): From the United Kingdom. I will give the minister the names and assignment numbers and everything.

Mr. HOWE: I wish the hon. member would give me the nature of the permit. I have been Minister of Immigration for several weeks and have never heard of that kind of permit. The deputy says he has not heard of it. I cannot imagine why there would be a permit for one year. So far as bringing out capital is concerned, my hon. friend will agree that any country in the world is entitled to pass laws to prevent the flight of its capital. This country has such laws, and has been enforcing them over the years and is still enforcing them, and naturally it is not going to interfere with the laws of another country designed for that purpose. There is nothing we can do about that. But so far as a person resident in the United Kingdom is concerned, if he is of good character and is in good health, and has sufficient funds to maintain himself until he becomes established, he is free to come here at any time. He can arrive with the necessary documents and be admitted the next day.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Anybody from Europe?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I understood the minister to say that. The present regulations are bad because they separate families.

Mr. HOWE: I do not know how many times I have to repeat the degrees of relationship. We admit the husband or wife, the son, daughter, brother or sister, together with the husband or wife and unmarried children, if any; orphan nephew and niece under twenty-one years of age of any person legally resident in Canada in a position to receive and care for such relatives. Surely that is clear enough.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): It is clear enough, but it breaks up the family. A man can bring in his son, but he cannot bring in his daughter-in-law. I have one such case that I have been trying to do something about. But when a man comes here and becomes a resident of Canada he can immediately apply to have his son and daughter brought in. It seems an anomalous thing.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend will have to go to work on the regulations. We cannot extend them this afternoon.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I am going to see that the regulations are broadened. The present regulations break up families.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I should like to bring to the attention of the minister a problem that I believe Canada should attend to now. For a long time we have as a nation been dreaming of the time when we should have a trans-Canada highway. I believe the time

has come to build such a highway, so that it will not be necessary for Canadians to submit to the indignity of going into a foreign country to get from their capital to their own coast. A great deal of interest has been generated recently in the four western provinces concerning a trans-Canada highway, and I should like to discuss that matter for a few minutes this afternoon.

Three routes have been proposed for a trans-Canada highway. The first one runs from Winnipeg to Saskatoon, Lloydminster, Edmonton, Yellowhead pass, and from there direct to Vancouver. This one is called the Evergreen highway by those who are enthusiastic for it, and sometimes the Yellowhead highway.

The second runs from Winnipeg to Regina to Medicine Hat and from there to Calgary, Banff, and then by a circuitous route through the mountains down to Vancouver.

The third one is the southernmost route. This one goes from Winnipeg to Regina, to Medicine Hat, to Lethbridge and to Fernie, and from there to Cranbrook, Creston, Nelson, Trail, Rossland, Grand Forks, Penticton, Princeton, Hope, Vancouver, a rather direct route from Winnipeg to Vancouver.

It is my judgment, Mr. Chairman, and that of a good many others, that the one which ought to be built first is the southernmost route. I believe that ultimately Canada will find it to her advantage, for one reason or another, to have the three of these routes finished, and I would be an ardent supporter of the completion of each of them. After all, we should have one of them built first. I believe the first one should be the southernmost route.

There are a number of reasons why I take that stand. The first one is that the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia have apparently looked on the southernmost route as being the most desirable transprovincial route, and have therefore devoted a great deal of attention already to the construction of highways which follow more or less the route which I have indicated. These highways, in some cases fully completed, would constitute a part of the ultimately finished highway and would therefore render the completion of the trans-Canada highway along this route less expensive than would be the highway if it followed a route such as the Evergreen route proposed, which would require the complete building of a new road.

There is another aspect of this highway which is worthy of a great deal of attention from all Canada. Because of the Chinook belt and the influence which it has upon the area over which it blows generally, a large part of this southernmost route would be easy to keep open throughout the year. I am not contending or arguing that there are not times when a highway, even the best of highways, in Canada will be blocked and will require clearing. But taking the matter as a whole I would say it would be much easier to keep this route open the year around than any other route that may be chosen.

Another argument in favour of this route is that it is direct, the shortest possible from Winnipeg to Vancouver, being only in the neighbourhood of 1,400 miles. This everyone will recognize as a real advantage.

Another advantage of this route is the high degree of industrialization which has been achieved in the past along it. If we start at Winnipeg and go out to Vancouver we shall be surprised how many well developed industries there are; not, of course, to compare with the highly developed industries in Ontario and Quebec, but even considering the fact that these are in the three or four western provinces, they are well developed. The lumbering industry has reached a fine degree of development; the mining industry has reached a high degree of development; smelting has reached a high degree of development, as has also fruit farming. Sugar manufacturing has reached a high degree of development; also canning and many other industries established from Regina, through to Vancouver.

Another aspect of this route worthy of consideration is its tourist value. It is well known to all hon. members that Canada depends in large measure for her tourist trade upon the United States. The United States people in most cases will come to Canada in cars. The result is that they will look for a highway as soon as they reach the border. If they have to go two or three hundred miles to get to the first trans-Canada highway after they cross the border, they will be apt to cross the border back again before they reach the highway; but if we have this trans-Canada highway running along the southernmost route, at no point far removed from the United States border, tourists will reach this highway rather soon after crossing the border and will be encouraged by the fact of a first-class highway to go farther into the depths of Canada.

Another aspect of this question worthy of consideration in respect of tourists is the large number of tourist attractions that are to be found along the highway. All the way from Regina west to Vancouver anyone will see items of great interest along this highway, especially after one reaches the mountains.

In the mountains he will find scenery as beauteous as is to be found anywhere in the Rocky mountains. That beauty will be found all the way along this highway. There are other items of attractions which I shall probably refer to in a while, and which would make this highway an interesting tourist attraction in its own right.

Another matter worthy of consideration in the construction of a trans-Canada highway is the population which will be found along it. It is one of the regrettable things in connection with our trans-Canada railways that they have to traverse wide spaces, sometimes hundreds of miles in extent, with hardly any people. In building this trans-Canada highway from Winnipeg to Vancouver we would find a more densely populated area than can be found in any other straight line all the way over the prairie provinces and British Columbia. Nearly everyone will agree that, by computing the population of such cities as Regina, Moose Jaw, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Cranbrook, Fernie, Nelson, Hope, Princeton, Rossland and other centres along that highway, we should arrive at a total of population which would render it quite obvious that we would not be building a highway for little use.

Another matter worthy of consideration is the feasibility of this highway. We shall find that at almost any point from Winnipeg right through to Vancouver the material is to be found near where the highway is to be built; gravel of high quality and other materials necessary to build a highway are at hand. This, of course, will render the construction of the highway much less expensive than it would be if we had to transport the materials from a more or less remote point.

In connection with my own constituency I think it would be well to point out, as an example of the constituencies through which this highway would pass, the truth of the general statements which I have already made. In respect of the Lethbridge federal riding the trans-Canada highway would be extremely useful. We have the sugar factories; we have the coal mines; we have canning factories and a great many other industries.

In the Lethbridge federal riding the route would be rather easy to keep open the year around compared with routes in other parts of the province. The route would go almost straight through the Lethbridge federal riding from Medicine Hat to Fernie.

As I have indicated, the industrialization which has been achieved in that area is of a high order. There are two sugar factories, one of which is at Raymond and one at Picture Butte. Each one turns out a great deal of sugar and is highly valuable in the economy of Canada. We have ranching of a high order in which we produce beef and mutton in great numbers. We have beef and mutton feeding, using the by-products which come from the sugar industry. We have three canning factories in the constituency; we have cheese factories and a considerable number of butter factories. Coal mining is extensively developed.

We have a great many fine natural resources in the Lethbridge federal riding. We have extremely good land. We have an abundance of water for irrigation. We have four irrigation projects in the Lethbridge federal riding now supplying water to upwards of 100,000 acres of land. We have under consideration, as hon. members well know, a new irrigation project called the Lethbridge southeast water conservation project, in which it is proposed to bring 350,000 acres more of excellent land under irrigation. We have a fine climate and good water.

The tourist value of the Lethbridge federal riding is of a high order. We have the Waterton Lakes national park, one of the finest national parks in Canada. It is only a few miles from the United States border, and not far from the Logan Pass highway in that nation. Naturally people would come over from the United States to go to this park. If they knew they could reach a fine highway without too much inconvenience they would be attracted to that part of the country and on into the inner regions of Canada. From the Waterton Lakes on to Pincher creek there is an exceedingly fine view as one drives along the road going north and looks to the lefthand at the mountain ranges. I have driven over that road many times; I never weary of looking at the great variety of mountain scenery to be found there.

We have other items such as Cardston Temple, built by the Latter Day Saints church. It is one of the most beautiful buildings to be found on the American continent.

Coming into Lethbridge federal riding is the highway which runs from the United States through Cardston straight north to connect with the Alaska highway. If we had the trans-Canada highway passing through Lethbridge it would cross the Alaska highway with all the possibilities which would accrue from that set-up. The population of Lethbridge federal riding is rather dense for a prairie constituency. We have 16,800 in the city of Lethbridge. We have a considerable number of people in the smaller towns like Cardston, Raymond, Magrath, Warner, Milk River, Taber and various other towns.

The provincial government of Alberta is spending a great deal of money this year on the building of highways in that area. It is proposed at an early day to finish off the highway from Medicine Hat to Lethbridge and to continue that highway from Lethbridge through Cardston to Waterton Lakes park, which would fit in exactly with the picture I was outlining a minute or two ago. There is under construction and soon to be completed by the Alberta government one of the finest pieces of highway to be found in western Canada, namely, that from Coutts to Lethbridge; that is to be a modern, standard highway. This highway would, of course, be tributary to the trans-Canada highway as it passed through Lethbridge. This fact would indicate how desirable the trans-Canada highway through that area would be, because a great many other subsidiary highways would cross and recross the highway, making it highly valuable from the point of view of tourists and from the point of view of general usefulness to the people. I could say a great deal more about this route for the trans-Canada highway, because I have given considerable attention to it, but I feel it would not be advisable for me to hold up the committee any longer. I should just like to offer a few suggestions and draw a few conclusions from what I have already said.

In the first place, I believe the trans-Canada highway route should be planned at the present time. All four western provinces are today spending a great deal of money and taking a good deal of interest in this highway. If the federal government, through the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply, were to approach the ministers of public works of the four western provinces and suggest that they have, with him, a round-table discussion to determine what would be the most desirable route and what would be the most desirable standard of highway to build, I am sure that the building programme which is in progress at the present time could be fitted into the broad general scheme in a way which would be impossible at any future time. I would, therefore, suggest that this highway be completely planned not later than September, 1947. The route should be finished not later than 1948. The construction of this highway has been long overdue. It should have been built before the war. It could not very well be built during the war. It should not be deferred any longer. Now is the time. This highway should be completed and in perfect running order from Winnipeg through to Vancouver not later than the end of 1948. I suggest that should be the goal set by the federal government.

The matter of costs enters in. It must be borne in mind that the four western provinces, not being highly industralized, do not have extensive resources from which to draw revenue. Neverthless they have great potentialities, and the contribution of wealth which they make to the dominion as a whole is great. It would, therefore, seem entirely appropriate that we suggest that the federal government pay one-half of the total cost of constructing this highway. Of course the provinces have been spending money on this highway for a great many years, but I would be of opinion that the provinces would feel quite happy with the situation if the federal government undertook to pay fifty per cent of the cost, from January 1, 1946, up to the time when the highway was finished, of the roads which would come to form that highway. That is, the federal government would say to the provinces, "Turn in a bill to us, certified and itemized, showing how much money you have spent since January 1, 1946, on the highways which will be incorporated into this trans-Canada highway. We will give you a dollar for each dollar you have spent since January 1, 1946 along this highway; then we will pay fifty per cent of the cost of this highway for the future." There will be those who will feel that would not be a wise expenditure of public money, but there are reasons why that might be the most advantageous expenditure of public money which could be considered at the present time in the matter of transportation.

I shall say no more at the present time, Mr. Chairman, but I would commend most earnestly to the minister that he give the most careful consideration at the earliest possible day to the planning and construction of a trans-Canada highway which will run across western Canada from Winnipeg to Regina, to Medicine Hat to Lethbridge and from Lethbridge through the Crowsnest pass to Nelson and Hope, British Columbia, and on to Vancouver.

Mr. HOWE: Before the committee proceeds farther, I would move that it rise, report progress and ask leave to sit later this day.

Progress reported.

CRIMINAL CODE

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS

On the order:

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 364, an act to amend the criminal code.

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice): A message was received yesterday from the senate informing this house that the

senate had passed Bill No. 364, an act to amend the criminal code, with amendments. A list of the amendments will be found at page 774 of the *Votes and Proceedings* of Thursday, July 10. A large number of amendments are proposed. They are all acceptable to the government with the exception of two. The two amendments which are not acceptable are the second and the fifteenth. The second amendment, by language which is not complete or accurate, seeks to restore the section to the form in which it was introduced in this house in the first instance. There was lengthy discussion of that amendment in the house, and it was the feeling of the house that it should not stand in the form in which it was introduced. Therefore the government has come to the conclusion that it should not accept that amendment of the senate. I may say that I am of the opinion that possibly the section, in the form in which it passed this house, is susceptible of some improvement; and I am convinced that the section, in the form in which it passed the senate, is susceptible of improvement. It would appear to me that the section would be the appropriate subject of a conference between managers of the two houses, and it would be agreeable to me if the other house took the necessary steps to bring such conference about. As I understand the rules, this would be done if they insist on their amendments. In any event I feel I have no option but to move that this amendment be not concurred in.

The second amendment is the fifteenth amendment which is in relation to a serious matter. It makes certain acts murder which are not now murder; and, if I understand the amendment correctly, goes farther in that direction than does the section as passed by the house. The government does not feel prepared to accept that amendment.

Mr. CROLL: Would the minister mind telling us what they did?

Mr. ILSLEY: The section amended is section 260 of the criminal code, which states:

In case of treason and the other offences against the king's authority and person mentioned in part II, piracy and offences deemed to be piracy, escape or rescue from prison or lawful custody, resisting lawful apprehension, murder, rape, forcible abduction, robbery, burglary or arson, culpable homicide is also murder, whether the offender means or not death to ensue, or knows or not that death is likely to ensue.

Then follow paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d); and (d) is the amendment we inserted in this house:

(d) if he uses any weapon for the purpose of facilitating the commission of any of the offences in this section mentioned, or the flight of the offender upon the commission or attempted commission thereof, and death ensues as a consequence of such use.

After all, this was an important amendment which extends the English law, which, if I understand the authorities, would make such an offence manslaughter rather than murder in certain instances; but the senate amendment goes farther and substitutes for (d) the following words:

(d) if he uses or has in his possession any weapon and death ensues as a consequence of its use.

The element of intent is taken from the section as passed by this house. The words "for the purpose of facilitating the commission of any of the offences in this section mentioned, or the flight of the offender upon the commission or attempted commission thereof" are omitted, it being deemed, I imagine, that it might be very difficult for the crown to prove intent in those cases. It is my opinion that, the matter being of such importance, probably proof of intent should be necessary when we are making a case murder which otherwise would be manslaughter.

Mr. MacNICOL: And what is the minister moving?

Mr. ILSLEY: I move:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this house disagrees with their second and fifteenth amendments to the Bill No. 364, an act to amend the criminal code, for the following reasons:

"In the first case the amendment which is sought to be made by the senate is in language which has already been rejected by the house and which for this reason the house cannot accept.

In the second case, that is their fifteenth amendment, the amendment extends the operation of section 260 of the act beyond what the House of Commons contemplated or is willing to accept."

Mr. BROOKS: Is the minister dealing with the other amendments now?

Mr. ILSLEY: We are agreeing to all the others.

Motion agreed to.

HUDSON BAY MINING AND SMELTING

WORKS DECLARED FOR THE ADVANTAGE OF TWO OR MORE PROVINCES—CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour) moved that the house go into committee to consider Bill No. 452, respecting the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Works declared for the advantage of two or more provinces.

Mr. MacINNIS: If this bill carries, will the minister say what legislation will then apply to this company and its employees? Will it be P.C. 1003 as amended, and then the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act when that order in council expires?

Mr. MITCHELL: It will be P.C. 1003 at the moment, and the new legislation when the order in council expires.

Mr. MacINNIS: Is P.C. 1003 to continue in effect until the new bill comes in?

Mr. MITCHELL: It will continue in effect until the emergency powers legislation expires, which I believe will be March 31 next. It may, of course, be extended.

Mr. MacINNIS: And you expect that the other bill will be in effect before March 31, 1948?

Mr. MITCHELL: I hope so. It will be introduced early next session, and it will depend upon the expedition with which we operate. I would assume, however, that like other legislation the emergency powers may have to be extended. I am, of course, speaking merely as an individual.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the said bill be read a third time?

Mr. MacINNIS: I believe there was an understanding with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that this bill would not be proceeded with until nine o'clock this evening. If the minister would agree to have third reading postponed until later this day I think that would meet the situation. I feel quite sure there is nothing in the bill with which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre would take issue or would want to debate, but if what I suggest could be done I would appreciate it very much.

Mr. MITCHELL: I would suggest that we let it go until tomorrow morning; then there will be no doubt about the matter.

Mr. MacINNIS: That will suit me even better.

Mr. SPEAKER: Next sitting of the house.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND RESOURCES

130. Departmental administration, $183,17?

Mrs. STRUM: I should like to draw to the attention of the government the necessity of doing something in order to provide roads. I am sure we have all been in the United States and have had the experience of feeling ashamed when our friends ask us when we are going to build highways in Canada. Not only do we lose a great deal of east and west traffic that we might have from the United States; we also lose a great deal of our own traffic. Many of us have been guilty of hitting south as fast as possible in order to use the United States highways to make the trans-continental. I have hit for the closest port to take advantage of the concrete highways that one finds everywhere in the United States. We lose a great deal of our own money, which Canadians might be spending here, and we lose traffic that we might have in the tourist trade.

There is another aspect of this matter that has not yet been considered. When talking about transportation we must think in terms of railways, airways and highways. We would not dream of making any particular area, apart from the rest of Canada, pay for the railway passing through that territory, because all Canada pays for Canada's railways, and the operating and buliding costs are spread over the entire system. When considering a trans-Canada highway we must share the costs and not leave it entirely to the particular province through which the highway passes. When we consider the concentration of population in central Canada, for various reasons, we must come to the point where we spread the cost of building highways right across the country and absorb it as a nation.

In the west, as I need not remind the minister, our settlement is based on our rainfall, and we must have larger farming units. Where I live you cannot make a living on less than a half-section. You would not attempt to farm less than 300 or 400 acres; in fact, a section, or 600 acres, is the usual unit where I live. This means that we are bound, by our climate and geography, to have a smaller population than Ontario or Quebec; and if you force the province to bear the cost of building highways, if you tie it to the motor licence fee, your expenditure will be limited, because, if you have a small population, as we have in Saskatchewan, then the number of cars you have will be comparatively small; so

will the volume of gasoline and, in turn, the gasoline tax which will form the basis of revenue for the building of highways. Therefore, if you tie yourself to the number of cars and the number of people, and force the province to bear the entire cost, then it will be a long time before you have the kind of highways that we should have in a trans-Canada hook-up.

I should not like to say that we should have only one trans-Canada highway. I should not like to say that you should put it through my constituency, although, if you utilize the hard-surfaced road that already exists, the only paved highway in Saskatchewan is in the path of my constituency, the one running between Winnipeg and Regina and going on through Moose Jaw and Swift Current. Number one, which is our best highway and the only one which has black top, and which has the heaviest population running alongside the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway from the oldest settlements, runs through the most heavily populated and the best built-up part of the province. It happens to run through my constituency, but I would not urge the government to build a highway merely because I happen to represent that area. But this is the highway which the province keeps open the longest. It has less snow than the northern route. The province has maintained this as the last highway to close and the first one to open in the spring, and as one listens to the weather reports, as we all do in the winter broadcasts, they always quote No. 1 as open when the others are closed.

I think we should try to have more than one highway; we should assist the provinces to have feeders running north and south, because, if we are to route traffic from the United States and Ontario to the prairie provinces, we shall have to establish some north and south highways too. But if you are thinking of the cost, I would imagine that the federal government would be interested in utilizing the best existing road to get the best highway established as quickly as possible. If they are doing that, then the number one, between Brandon and Regina, is the best existing road. It has black top through a part of it now, and it would be the easiest to maintain because it would have the least snow, and it already has a certain standard.

I would therefore ask the minister to consider building a road that we shall not have to apologize for. When you talk about roads in my province people all say, "What roads?" We really have no roads worthy of the name, when you consider the highways they have in every part of the United States. In January I travelled to the gulf of Mexico and Florida, and never saw a gravel road anywhere, and in many cases there was a four-lane highway. In our country gravel is considered a good road. It is time we moved up our standards and had a real highway from one end of Canada to the other, which would bear the kind of traffic worthy of a great, rich and growing nation like Canada.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I do not think I can add to what the hon. member for Qu'Appelle has said. We may not always agree with her, but no one could express the opinion of every Canadian on this subject better than she did just now. I am going to speak purely from the tourist point of view and, if you like, from the selfish point of view of dollars and cents. Last year we had $232 million brought into Canada through the tourist trade. Well, if we ship our lumber, wheat and everything else something is going out of our country, whereas if we bring in United States money through the tourist traffic we are taking nothing out of the country.

Naturally I am a little privileged in this connection, coming as I do from the most beautiful part of Canada, the Fraser valley. They even look at the flying saucers. We have something there. I believe the hon. member for Qu'Appelle is right. Last year I drove home, taking twenty days and going 6,000 miles through the United States. If hon. members will stop talking I will drive home again in a day or two all through the United States; and why am I driving through the United States? Because they have the roads. And I will spend all the money I have to spend in the United States. We are asking tourists to come here. Our scenery is the one thing we have to sell which takes nothing out of the country, but we do not provide the tourists with the highways they are used to. I do not know anything about Saskatchewan, but I know something about my own province, which is adjacent to the state of Washington. If we can build roads, the connecting links from the United States, we certainly have not done so. The roads that we expect United States tourists to travel on when they come into Canada are a disgrace. Vancouver is the third city in Canada, with the most vocal mayor on the North American continent, and we have a cow trail leading into that city.

Mr. MacNICOL: The most vocal in the world.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: We expect United States tourists to come in and travel on that trail. Why should the province be expected to build that highway when it would bring money into the country at a time when we

are hearing so much about foreign exchange, and are being told that we cannot do anything about that situation? Apparently the federal government is afraid to spend money to build highways. I believe it is good common-sense business to expend money in the construction of highways across Canada that would connect with the United States border. This would encourage the tourist traffic and enable us to sell them something which cannot be equalled in any other part of the world, our Canadian scenery.

Mr. McKAY: I have a few words to add in support of what has been said already with regard to the construction of a trans-Canada highway. It seems to me that in this day and age good highways are almost indispensable. Modern civilization is almost wholly dependent upon good transportation. To build roads anywhere in Canada is an expensive undertaking, and the completion of the trans-Canada highway would be a costly venture for the provinces to attempt. That is why I advocate that something should be done, preferably at this session, but at least by next session, to expedite the construction of a trans-Canada highway through the western provinces at the earliest possible moment. This should be on the basis of a fifty per cent contribution by the federal government, because I believe it is generally considered that the trans-Canada highway should be a national undertaking and not left to the individual provinces to complete.

I may say that neither one of the highways which have been referred to in Saskatchewan runs through my constituency, but I would be inclined to favour at the moment the construction of the highway passing through Moose Jaw and Regina. The present No. 1 highway enters at Fleming and goes through to the western border where it links with the Alberta highway system. It is approximately 450 miles long, and I question if there is any place in Canada where highway construction could be carried on as cheaply. Approximately 110 miles are surfaced with what is called black top. This probably does not measure up to the standards of better highways, but it serves our purpose and is much better than the roads we have been using in past years. The rest of the highway is gravel. The government of Saskatchewan is paving some 239 miles of road this year and some of that paving will be on that particular highway. Another bit of paving will be on highway No. 39, which links up with a United States highway coming up from Minneapolis and St. Paul and passing through Weyburn. It is proposed to complete that road by 1948, and that is another reason why I advocate the completion of highway No. 1. This would provide a link to the east and west for people, tourists in the main, coming from the south. They could then continue on their way into Alberta, to Banff, Calgary and Vancouver or Winnipeg to the east.

There are many other arguments in favour of the completion of the highway which I shall not go into now. Everybody knows that highways constitute a great national asset. They encourage tourists among other things. These days much of our freight is handled by trucks and good highways facilitate their movement. We have great hopes of irrigation programmes in the west. When that day comes—and I hope it will in another two or three years—thousands of good people will come to southern Saskatchewan and there will be an additional need for good highways. That is another reason why we advocate the construction of a paved highway through the southern part of the province.

Saskatchewan is regarded as a prairie province with very little attraction for the tourist, but a person passing through there might be greatly surprised if he took No. 1 highway and stopped at the points of interest. For example, there is Moosomin, a town of some 2,000 people, which was the birthplace of that great Canadian, General McNaughton. Then there is the Indian Head experimental farm. I need not mention Regina, because the hon. member for that riding is capable of doing that. Moose Jaw is on that same highway, and the hon. member for Moose Jaw has told the committee a great deal about that city. There are also Swift Current and Maple Creek, both of which are famous, not only for the meat packing plants that are located there, but because of cowboys, rodeos and that sort of thing. There are a number of attractions in Saskatchewan. I appeal to the minister to get on with the job of constructing the trans-Canada highway. If it is not feasible to build both roads, let us have one at least.

Mr. BENTLEY: I want to assure the committee that this is not a filibuster, and I want also to tell our northern Canadian neighbours that neither is it an attack on their estimable selves. We would like them to have a highway as well. I want to continue the support for a project which we believe is necessary. Other hon. members have given reasons why this highway is necessary and I agree with them. We probably need more than two trans-Canada highways, but we certainly need one immediately to follow the route of highway No. 1.

The paving of that highway is partly completed, and it is the most direct route to those

going to the third largest city in Canada located on the west coast. We believe it is the proper one to build. If that one is completed, as recommended by the hon. member for Lethbridge, by 1948, that in itself would lead to the more rapid completion of the northern highway. If feeder roads are built running north and south by the province and the municipalities that would create more demand and pressure for the northern highway. I assure you that I am not trying to create a division. As I say, the reasons why this road should be completed have been stated before. I speak with authority only for the little area I represent, but in that area we have many of the attributes mentioned by other hon. members.

I will admit that our population is not as dense as that of Toronto, Montreal or even Ottawa; in fact it is not as dense by any standard of measurement you care to use. But they are energetic and, because of that, they have created a number of interesting industries and are in the process of creating others outside of the agricultural industry which in themselves are well worth seeing. Anyone who would like to see a large flock of sheep handled by an expert shepherd and expert dogs will be well repaid for taking a trip through there. Anyone who would like to see large herds of beautiful white-faced cattle travelling and grazing over the lovely ranch lands in the Cypress hills would be well advised to take a trip through there. To see beauty one does not necessarily have to go to the mountains or to the St. Lawrence river. Come to our flax-growing areas when the flax is in bloom, and you will see no more beautiful sight as a tourist attraction. Our irrigation projects and other industries are opening up new avenues for human energy to be expended for the expansion of our country as a whole. When these things are taking place, if a highway goes through there, it will not only lend itself to tourist traffic but facilitate the development of those industries, and, by so doing, will open that particular gateway to further highways further north, as far north as it is necessary to have them.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Chairman, I have been studying the face of the minister while this discussion has been going on and trying to guess from his granite countenance whether he intends to build any highway at all. Not having been able to come to a conclusion from looking at him, I am going to address a question to him in regard to the matter. It would appear to me that there has been a sort of inter-party conspiracy to talk about a southern highway through the dust-bowl of Canada, where there is no beauty and very little wealth.

Mr. PROBE: Have you seen our girls?

Mr. IRVINE: I think it may be taken for granted that we all really want a highway across Canada, and perhaps more than one. I hardly expect, however, that the minister will build more than one before the next session. But if he is going to build only one I think we ought to know which one it is to be.

I want to draw to his attention that most of the beauty and most of the wealth of the western provinces lie in the northern section, and I would ask him, before building any highway across Canada, to give some thought to a trans-Canada highway via Jasper and from there on to the coast—

Mr. LOW: Over the Evergreen route.

Mr. IRVINE: Yes, that is the kind of route we want to get. I could speak at length on the merits of the different routes, but I do not wish to take up the time of the committee. I suggest that the minister assure us that he will at least give consideration to that route I mentioned before he plunges in any wild way into building a road to the west across Canada. I would also ask him to consider joining that road to the great Alaska highway, so that we may have a complete crossing, not only across Canada, but right up north to Nome.

Mr. HOWE: I can assure my hon. friend that a great deal of consideration will be given to the matter before we build any such roads. When the decision has to be made as to the route, the provinces involved will be consulted, and an attempt will be made to reach an agreement.

Mr. LOW: That is the proper way.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: If consideration is being given to the building of a highway across this country I should like to bring out one or two points. All the transportation facilities of this country run north of the 49th parallel of latitude, so that one would think that all Canada consisted of was that northern fringe which exists north of the United States. A mistake was made originally in putting two railroads across Canada just north of the 49th parallel. They should have been laid farther north, so that feeder lines could have served them from both north and south. In view of the development that has taken place in the north and the desire of the government to develop the north I think consideration should be given to a more northerly route for a trans-

Canada highway. There is also this advantage that the grades are better through the mountains. That has been proved by the Canadian National Railways, as anyone who has taken a trip through the Crowsnest pass can see for himself. One farmer decided, after going through the pass, that if he wanted any further excitement he would run up two poles to his barn door and run up and down on them. So I would urge the minister to consider the Yellowhead pass route.

Mr. WYLIE: After listening to the remarks made by the hon. member for Cariboo, I must say a few words about the so-called dust-bowl to which he referred. I believe that in that so-called dust-bowl we have more scenery than there is in the north country. Go through one of the irrigation districts and you would think you were down here, the scenery is so beautiful. The only difference between our irrigation areas and the country down here is that our soil is much better.

The minister has been given many suggestions as to routes through the western provinces. I believe that three routes have been suggested. I feel that it should be a southern route to start with. However, in the past I have supported a route through Calgary, which, of course, is not the one that has received most support this afternoon. I believe that the highway should not be built too close to the southern part of the western provinces but should go perhaps through Calgary. We in Medicine Hat are on the "Y" of the trans-Canada highway, as the road is sure to go through there whether it branches out to Lethbridge or Calgary. The main thing is that we want a trans-Canada highway, and I am sure that Canadians generally want it as soon as they can get it. There is no reason why we should have to travel through the United States to get home from Ottawa.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: The route of a trans-Canada highway west of Winnipeg naturally would cause some division between those who represent the northern portions and those who represent the southern portions of the western provinces. I think each of the routes has some qualification, and naturally many people in the area would like to see the route through there. The Evergreen route is one which now passes through the great populous areas of these provinces in the west. I do not say that because we wish to take away from the southern routes. We should like to know from the minister whether there is any possibility of building a trans-Canada highway within three years. If the minister can give us that information, perhaps we can come to some agreement. We appreciate his statement that when the government is deciding which route should be built or what routes shall be built through these provinces the provincial governments will be taken into consideration. Along with that they will be working on a plan which will meet with general satisfaction.

Mr. HOWE: In reply to the question, the government has from time to time given assistance to the provinces in the building of highways. As far as the federal government is concerned, the decision has rested in part, on the level of unemployment. When the unemployment situation was beyond the power of the provinces to deal with, the government has joined with the provinces in a programme of public works. Naturally, the programme of a trans-Canada highway has had an important place in such programmes. My hon. friend knows that a new financial agreement has been made with certain provinces, which has placed those provinces in a better financial position than previously. It has not been possible to obtain agreement with all the provinces on a programme of public development. At the moment, the government is not in a position to make any commitments as to when or whether it will join with the provinces in a programme for a trans-Canada highway.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: A relief project.

Mr. HANSELL: Living as I do in the southern part of Alberta, and having a constituency which is in the foothills of the Rockies, it seems to me that I, too, should get into this debate on an appropriate all-Canada highway. I must confess that I was a little shocked and surprised to hear the minister almost confess that a trans-Canada highway was dependent upon the next depression when unemployment would be a problem.

Mr. HOWE: If I may reply, I would say that I am astonished that my hon. friend suggests that the provinces could not possibly build any highway without federal help.

Mr. HANSELL: I did not suggest that; somebody else may have done so. But I am shocked to think that the present government is looking forward to doing something in respect of highways by a method of relief camps. That is a vital principle. However I do not suppose that any public moneys can be spent for public works any more advantageously or appropriately than for an all-Canada highway, and one that is adequate to maintain real tourist traffic and attract that tourist traffic to Canada.

Not so long ago I remember reading one of the reports of the senate committee on tourist traffic. I was really amazed to find

the evidence submitted to that committee showed that there was more money coming into Canada from tourist trade than through all our foreign trade combined. When we think of that it is amazing. Our government seems to spend a great deal of time, energy, effort and argument on the building up of foreign trade. It has its trade commissioners in almost every part of the globe to maintain trade at a huge expense, and yet it is a bigger business for Canada to deal in tourist trade and tourist attractions which bring in more money than all our foreign trade combined. That was the evidence brought out in the senate committee. That is quite a thing. Therefore we have need to think of this highway in the light of our tourist trade.

I have heard arguments sometimes that all hon. members will want such a highway to go through their own constituencies. I do not have to argue the point very much because I know very well it is going through mine. There is no doubt at all. When anyone thinks of tourist trade throughout Canada itself, he does not think of it without thinking in terms of Banff, Lake Louise, the Columbia ice fields, the Windermere highway, and so forth.

The hon. member for Cariboo says that it should go through Cariboo. I know that when I talk with people and mention Cariboo they say, "Who is he?" Or if I should mention the Evergreen highway, they do not know anything about that. If I should mention the Yellowhead highway they will say: "We have heard of redheads; we have heard of roundheads; we have heard of fatheads; we have heard of all sorts of heads, but a yellowhead is a new one on us." But if we just mention Banff, Lake Louise, the Columbia ice fields or Windermere or even the Prince of Wales ranch everybody knows where it is. People sometimes ask me where I am from. If I give them the name of my own town they do not know where that is; but if I say, "You have heard of the Prince of Wales ranch," they will say "yes." When I say, "well, he is my neighbour", they then know where I live.

The southernmost highway is bound to connect with those great tourist attractions therefore I know it is going through there anyway. The minister should get busy on this. He will be able to make a lot of money for this country if he does. Do not leave it, please, for a hand-out in the way of dole when it comes to relief.

Mr. HOWE: I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

[Mr. Hansell.]

Mr. MacNICOL: Before you leave the chair, Mr. Chairman, I should like to know if the committee is to sit at seven o'clock.

Mr. HOWE: There is a bill having to do with radio broadcasting which will be introduced by the appropriate minister at seven o'clock.

Mr. MacNICOL: I have been sitting here all afternoon. I should like to see the minister's estimates get through. We have had a talk on everything under the sun except these estimates.

Mr. HOWE: I agree.

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not like to waste time in this way. I cannot be here tomorrow, and I want to say something on one item.

Mr. HOWE: We expect to go on shortly after seven o'clock.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am not going to permit the radio bill to be introduced if it will cause a discussion. I will permit the introduction, but that is all.

Mr. HOWE: Permit the resolution to get through and the bill to be introduced.

Mr. MacNICOL: If it means that the minister will make a speech, no; we want to get on with the business of the house.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at seven o'clock.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR CREDITING TO C.B.C. GROSS AMOUNT OF MONEYS RECEIVED FROM LICENCE FEES

Hon. J. J. McCANN (Minister of National Revenue and Minister of National War Services) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a measure to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936, to provide that the Minister of Finance shall deposit to the credit of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation the gross amount of the moneys received in each year from licence fees in respect of private receiving licences and private station broadcasting licences without deducting there-

from any costs of collection or administration; with a consequent charge to the government for such costs of collection and administration.

Motion agreed to, and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

Mr. FLEMING: On the understanding which the minister has indicated privately, that on the second reading of the bill there will be full opportunity to discuss the two reports on radio broadcasting, we are not offering any remarks on the resolution stage.

Mr. McCANN: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HANSELL: Before you leave the chair, Mr. Chairman, I have one additional question. When is it expected that the bill will be presented for second reading? I am in the same position as the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming). I want to have something to say on this bill. I can say it now, but I wish to accommodate the minister and the house; if I can; and I am quite willing to say what I have to say on the bill, on the assurance which has been given. When will the bill be presented for second reading?

Mr. McCANN: We assume that, after the passing of the resolution, we shall have first reading. Then second reading of the bill will be called; and if the house is agreeable and if we have unanimous consent, we would be prepared to go ahead with the second reading. Of course it is necessary to have that consent. If we do not have it, second reading will have to be put over until a later day. In any event, the undertaking still holds, that on second reading of the bill there will be free discussion both of the bill itself and of the report of the radio broadcasting committee.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. McCann thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 453, to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first time.

Mr. McCANN: Mr. Speaker, if we may have the unanimous consent of the house, we should like to proceed with the second reading of the bill.

Mr. MacNICOL: I should like to give that consent, but the Acting Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Howe) sat in this house all last evening and he has been here all day. Others have also sat here to take part in the discussion of his estimates. I for one will not give consent.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read a second time?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Next sitting of the house.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND RESOURCES

130. Departmental administration, $183,173.

Mr. HERRIDGE: I wish to make a few brief remarks in connection with this item, and to support the remarks made this afternoon by the hon. member for Lethbridge and others. I think there is general agreement with regard to the necessity for the building of a trans-Canada highway and the improvement of a trans-Canada highway system. If you will read the history of the Roman empire, Mr. Chairman, of the British empire, and of the United States, I think you will find that the development of any country depends upon the development of a satisfactory highway system. If you read Roman history you will find that, when the Romans occupied Britain, the Roman consuls and other officials of that kind pointed to the fact that if they were to develop Britain they would have to develop the highways of that country. The same applies to the British empire. With regard to India particularly, I remember reading some remarks made by one of the prominent officials governing India who, in the British House of Commons, pointed out that the development of India must be based on the development of the highways. The same thing goes for the United States. Quite recently the United States passed a large vote for the development of highways by the cooperation of the federal and state governments. In the last month or so, even the small republic of Mexico has voted $500,000,000 for the development of trans-Mexico highways. I think there is general agreement that we need to develop our trans-Canada highway system. I do not believe there is any opposition to that from one end of Canada to the other, if we are to develop our natural resources and take advantage of our tourist possibilities in the future. In that connection I wish to quote the report of the senate committee of last year on the tourist traffic:

> Almost every witness appearing before your committee stressed the need of better roads if tourist traffic was to expand. The prevailing opinion was that Canada had unlimited tourist attractions. To make them accessible, all-weather highways were necessary and federal assistance would be required to assist in the provision of the main arteries of approach, particularly from the United States.

I do not think there is any question about that. As a member representing a British Columbia riding, I want to deal with aspects

of the question that refer particularly to my province. I say without hesitation that if British Columbia is to be satisfactorily serviced with highway transportation we shall require to have three routes through the mountain areas of that province: First, the southern, transprovincial route; second, the Kicking Horse pass or Big Bend route, and, third, the Yellowhead pass route. In this connection, while we believe that one of these routes should receive priority when it comes to construction, I do not think we shall be satisfactorily served, owing to the nature of the country, until all three routes are constructed.

This evening I wish to refer briefly to the southern transprovincial highway between Hope in British Columbia and Lethbridge in Alberta. As far as the physical possibility of building the route is concerned, that has been proved, because we now have a highway of a sort in existence between Hope and Lethbridge. There might be some criticism of that route, because at one point at the present time it has to cross the Cascade mountains at an elevation of 5,400 feet, and the Rossland summit at an elevation of 4,400 feet. As a solution of those two difficulties, however, first of all we have the suggestion by the Rossland board of trade that arrangements should be made for a diversion into United States territory for a distance of five miles in depth and thirty miles in length between Rossland and Grand Forks, British Columbia; or, second, there is the possibility of building a tunnel to reduce the elevation to which the present highway goes in the Cascade mountains.

That is a very small matter when one comes to compare it with the possibilities which would result from the development of the whole highway. As far as the Big Bend or Kicking Horse highway is concerned, that is much more difficult to keep open under winter conditions, owing to the greater fall of snow, than the southern transprovincial highway. Further, in support of the remarks of the hon. member for Lethbridge, I would say that the distance between Winnipeg and Vancouver is shortened by the use of this highway to 1,400 miles.

When it comes to the question of population, anyone who has studied the population of British Columbia realizes that, with the exception of the coast cities, the great bulk of the population resides south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway, and if this highway were built it would serve a population of about 125,000. In addition, there are certain definite economic advantages. Along the route of that highway we have the smelter of the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, which last year produced $60,000,000 worth of mineral and other products. In addition, we have various other subsidiary industries in connection with the production of poles and, in the near future, the production of pulp throughout that area. As far as mining is concerned, if the road between Lethbridge and Hope were built it would serve one of the richest mining districts in British Columbia. As far as the lumbering industry is concerned, between Lethbridge and Hope at the present time about 200,000,000 feet of lumber are produced, in addition to large quantities of cedar poles which are supplied to markets in Minneapolis and New York, as well as other timber products. As far as agriculture is concerned, taking the Kootenay, Arrow lakes and Okanagan valleys we have a total production of fruit products amounting to some $25,000,000. As far as tourist advantages are concerned, we are very close to the international boundary. Our feeder roads would connect with United States roads and permit the influx of large numbers of tourists who wish to visit the national parks; who wish to see the beauties of the Cascade range, the Monaskee range, the Selkirk range and the Rocky mountain range and also the many hot springs that abound throughout the district. The fishing and hunting in the area between Lethbridge and Hope is unexcelled in any part of Canada.

There is no question but that the development of this route will service the greatest commercial and industrial area in the interior of British Columbia; and, for the money expended, will produce greater returns than the development of any other area in British Columbia at the present time. Last year the government of British Columbia expended some $600,000 on the development of this route between Hope and the Alberta border of the province, and this year they are expending some $100,000.

We in the southern part of British Columbia realize that, before our province can be adequately serviced with trans-Canada highways, we must have the completion of the three routes I have mentioned. I believe all three should be included in the plans for the construction of trans-Canada highways in the future. But because of the large population in the interior of British Columbia south of the main line, because of the large industrial, agricultural and lumbering developments, we believe the route between Lethbridge and Hope should receive priority. The construction and improvement of this route have the support of all the boards of trade between

Vancouver and Lethbridge, of all the service organizations, of all the farmer organizations and all other groups within this area, and I urge early action by the government on this project. I urge that the minister give serious consideration to the opinion of these people. As was evidenced this afternoon, we have the support of hon. members from Alberta, from Saskatchewan and from Manitoba. So far as the extension of the trans-Canada highway is concerned, I say the southern provincial highway through the mountains should have priority.

I urge that the minister consider on a fifty-fifty basis early action on the southern route in British Columbia, and that, in addition to that, preparation and plans be made for the development of the Kicking Horse pass and Yellowhead routes.

Mr. HOWE: I would call to the hon. member's attention the fact that, whereas Canada has not made provision for the construction of the trans-Canada highway at this time, it has introduced in the supplementary estimates a vote of $200,000 to commence the surfacing of the Windermere highway, which is a start in the direction my hon. friend is advocating.

Mr. HERRIDGE: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): Mr. Chairman, it is agreed on all sides that a programme of highway construction for Canada is needed at this time. I have received a number of communications from different organizations in my constituency, and I feel I should say a word with respect to this particular project. I am not at all opposed to the construction of highways across Canada, whether it be by the southern route or the northern route. But, inasmuch as the southern route would go through the most densely populated part of my constituency, I feel naturally that that highway should have priority in construction. When that work is done we should look toward the building of other highways; whether they should be through the northerly or the central part of the province remains to be seen.

In the riding which I have the honour to represent, and through which this southern highway now runs we have a highly industrialized area. We have the coal mining district of the Crowsnest pass; we have the hard-rock mining of Kimberley, the area from which all the ore is extracted for the Trail smelter.

We have, too, a great deal of lumbering in that part of the country, which is contiguous to the southern highway. Not only that, but it runs through a highly productive fruit belt known as the Creston valley area, in which some of the finest fruit of British Columbia is produced.

One hon. member this afternoon tried to leave the impression with the committee that all the scenic beauty is in northern British Columbia. I can only say that he has not yet travelled through the southern area, because, if he did, he would learn that his remarks were just sour grapes. The scenic beauty of southern British Columbia stands unrivalled.

Entering this area is one of the main highway routes from the United States, crossing the international boundary at Kingsgate. We have a splendid road system through that area, bringing the tourists into the famous Kootenay national park, and the Yoho and Banff national parks. Not only so, but in the district contiguous to this southern highway is one of the big-game areas of British Columbia. It is the area to which tourists and big-game hunters are coming from all parts of the world, whether they are looking for moose, elk, or grizzly bear.

Mr. IRVINE: They just pass through there on their way to the Cariboo.

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): They do not pass through, because they do not need to go beyond the area about which I have been speaking.

We already have the southern route through the Crowsnest pass. All we ask the minister to do is to give consideration to the standardizing of this particular highway. So much has already been constructed, and I know others have spoken of the service which this highway could render.

Let me repeat that I am not opposed to the construction of other highways as they become necessary, but anyone passing through the southern part of British Columbia will find that that is the most densely populated area. This particular highway is now serving that area, and greater development lies ahead. I should think that everything in the area about which I have spoken would commend itself to the department, when it is considering the construction of highways.

I am pleased to know that the minister is considering highway development and construction; and we feel sure that when the merits of these various localities are fully considered the southern highway will stand foremost in their consideration.

Mr. PROBE: I appreciate the fact that hon. members in the committee are anxious to make headway, and I shall be brief. However I wish to impress upon the government the need for an enlightened attitude toward

the building of highways. It seems to me that a trans-Canada highways policy is decades overdue. One remembers the golden age of Canada's expansion and development which followed the building of the railway systems some sixty or seventy years ago, when the Canadian Pacific railway was built across the country, followed by the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern. The terrific impact of motor transport improvement and development compels a changed federal attitude toward the building of durable highways, something which is as important as the development of ports, harbours and foreign trade.

Perhaps the corduroy roads of the early pioneers were sufficient for those days. They made it possible for those early settlers to get to the store, to the church or to the school. But we have passed the horse and buggy days—never to return, I hope. I maintain that the provinces are not in a position adequately to finance road building today, any more than they were able six decades ago to finance the building of the railways. For example, only seven per cent of the population of Canada lives in Saskatchewan, but in that province is found thirty-eight per cent of the road surface. It is ridiculous to think that that province can maintain a standard of road building as high as that of other more densely populated areas.

This afternoon we discussed immigration. We need immigration, for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the giving of more traffic to our railways so that they may be more self-sustaining. The same might be said with respect to the development of super-highways. I see no reason why immigrant labour forces languishing in displaced persons camps in Europe could not be transplanted to this country, so that a benevolent government in Canada could give its citizens a highways system in keeping with the place Canada is expected to hold in the commonwealth of nations. The immigrants could help in the building of these highways.

I should like to be more specific with regard to the type of programme that we should have. When we passed the defence estimates the other night I drew the attention of the Minister of National Defence to certain gaps in our defence programme. We are spending a quarter of a billion dollars in the way that we followed in previous years. We are still carrying on the barrack-room type of training of our troops. If we are really going to defend this country we must be realistic. Those of us who have been in the services appreciate what it means to have a highly mobile force. We are satisfied that the railways do not permit the moving of huge supplies of materials and large masses of men at a rapid rate from place to place. From the point of view of mobility we are defenceless, because the railways are vulnerable at their marshalling yards located at points like Winnipeg. If they were put out of working order it would immobilize hundreds of miles of defence regions.

We should have ancillary highway sytems. Standard or superstandard highways should be built and maintained, at least partly at the expense of the Department of National Defence. The engineers in the services could obtain worth-while training by actually constructing these highways. One system of highways right across the country should be built and maintained by the Department of National Defence as part of our defence programme. In addition—I am not speaking in terms of local patriotism, because Regina is on what is officially considered the trans-Canada highway—to that one main artery for the movement of vehicles to be maintained by the Department of National Defence—shall we say this would be highway No. 1?—there should be a colonization highway system to open up those areas of Canada so rich in natural wealth—these were mentioned by the hon. member for Cariboo—and this should be the joint responsibility of the federal government through the Department of Mines and Resources or the Department of Reconstruction and the provincial governments.

I think this is a practical suggestion, because it would permit the movement of troops from the defence point of view and would also tap our natural resources and open up colonization areas which are still unsettled. We should then have arterial roads running from the international border, roads which would link up with the excellent United States roads, through to our northland. These roads could be financed by the provinces perhaps with loans from the federal government. If necessary, tolls could be charged on these lines originating at the border and running northward until capital costs were realized.

The programme I envisage is one main motor highway to be maintained by the Department of National Defence. Then there would be another main east-west built jointly by the provincial governments and the dominion Department of Mines and Resources or the Department of Reconstruction for the purposes of opening up new areas and giving impetus to immigration into this country. Then there would be feeder lines running north and south to our rich lake lands and mineral resources which would be constructed, in the first instance by means of funds lent to the provinces and then paid for, if such were felt

necessary, by means of tolls. We would then have a comprehensive over-all system which, in terms of motor transport, would take us out of the horse and buggy days or, what is worse, the oxcart stage.

Item agreed to.

Mines and geology branch—
131. Branch administration, $40,068.

Mr. MacNICOL: First, I should like to congratulate the department upon the good work it has done in the discovery of oil along the Athabaska river. Last session we voted some thousands of dollars to continue the drilling for oil in this area. In January last I read in the Windsor *Star*, than which there is no better paper in Canada, a most interesting article in connection with the work of Doctor Hume, one of the departmental geologists. This reads in part:

> Liquid bitumen of high quality, from three to 52 feet in thickness, carrying from 12 to 18 per cent bitumen by weight, in bituminous sands up to 220 feet thick, and tentatively considered to contain from 400 to 500 million barrels of bitumen, has been developed by recent diamond drilling over a two square mile area.

A company, I believe called Oil Sands Limited, has found equally large reservoirs of oil near that same area along the Athabaska river. The acting minister is familiar with the production of oil from the sands of the Athabaska river and he knows of the world-wide search for oil. The department of interior of the United States recently called together a conference of oil geologists, engineers and oil production men from all over the country, to ascertain whether all the known fields in the United States were being searched and whether full development was being carried on. As a result, the announcement was then made by the department that it was calculated that the total oil resources of the United States were about twenty-one billion barrels and that the known resources of the world were about forty-two billion barrels. Those are not very great resources, and therefore it is imperative that our Department of Mines and Resources should use every effort—and I believe it is doing so—to discover new sources. We have as good geologists and oil engineers in our department as there are in any other geological department and we should use every effort to try to find more oil.

At the moment people in Toronto—and I presume this would apply to other cities—are fearful over being able to obtain sufficient oil for their home furnaces, not to mention business requirements. I tried recently to buy four oil burners for buildings which I own. I assume I could have bought the burners, but the large company with which I deal—I believe in dealing with companies which are strong—advised me that they were unable to take on any more customers. The situation is really acute, and I hope the minister will be able to reassure the committee that there will be a greater production of oil in Canada.

In Washington they are making every effort to follow up every possible method for the synthetic production of oil from coal and oil shale. I see in their reports that they say there is more than half the coal in all the world in the United States. Canada, too, has an almost inexhaustible supply of coal, great coal beds that have not been touched at all, and if oil is to be produced from coal there is no reason why our department through its plant on Booth street, for which we shall be voting a sum of money shortly, should not make every effort to ascertain the most feasible method of extracting oil from coal to make it available for use in furnaces throughout Canada.

To me the problem before this country seems tremendous. If any other country—I shall not mention which one—wanted to make an attack on Canada, all it would have to do would be to shut off our coal and oil supplies and we would be through. Yet we have vast quantities of coal in this country, and according to departmental reports we have in the oil sands more than five times as much oil as there is in all the rest of the world combined. So I hope that some method will be developed whereby oil can be extracted from the sands. If as Doctor Hume's report says we have vast beds of pure bitumen, the minister must know that is something worth while. It is no great trick to take the oil out of bitumen, and if we have that quantity of bitumen there, there is no reason why we should not produce oil from it.

One company in Edmonton on whom I called last January and will likely call again next January, told me that they owned a property approximately 35 miles in length along the Athabaska river on the east side, three-quarters of a mile in depth back from the river and 250 feet in depth in the ground. Their tests show that they have a large volume of almost pure bitumen in vast quantity. During the war the company went to Washington and got in touch with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for an investment of $30,000,000. I know the minister is familiar with that, because I saw a letter from Washington saying that if the company could get his approval the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would invest the $30,000,000 to develop these oil resources. They should be

developed. If the departmental engineers were correct—and I have no reason to doubt that; this country spent very large sums of money to enable them to make their investigations during the war—there are vast quantities of oil up there. It cannot be extracted by any simple A B C method; but there is a proper method of extracting the oil, and after forty or fifty years of dealing with it and parliament having voted during the last few years quite a few hundreds of thousands of dollars for the construction of a small pilot plant on Booth street, I think it is high time that those engineers brought something forward. They are taking a long while to do so. Methods are known by which the oil can be extracted.

I had a letter yesterday from Utah—I am going there on my trip west—where they are making a great success with the McClave method which was developed by the very same man who had been in control of the Abasand plant at Fort McMurray. It was said that the plant at Fort McMurray was burned down. There was little to show that it achieved anything. But the McClave method is proving a success. I have a letter from the oil people at Vernal in Utah to visit Vernal to see their success in extracting oil from oil sands, and when I return home in the fall of the year I shall know a whole lot more about it.

I think it is up to this department, laying everything else to one side, to exert itself, and speedily, in defence of the homes of this country by developing some method of extracting oil from bitumen. In the report in the Windsor *Star* which I quoted, the department itself says there is a large volume to start with, four to five hundred million barrels of bitumen.

The other company to which I referred was Oil Sands Limited. I saw their construction plans, which included a pipeline. They were going to extract the oil out of the sands and pipe it to Edmonton, which I think is the right thing to do, and construct a refinery at Edmonton. Their plans called for the delivery of 8,000 to 10,000 barrels of bitumen a day at Edmonton, there to be refined into oil. What I wish to impress on the minister is this, although he knows a lot about this, perhaps more than any of us, to push along his engineers and geologists and tell them to get on with the business as rapidly as they can. The Alberta government is making every effort to do likewise. When I was in Edmonton last winter I went to the university and saw their small pilot plant and discussed the question with their professors. They feel they have a good production method. The trouble has been to get a refinery but they expect to have a refinery in operation down the river. In any event, no matter who does it, the Alberta government, Oil Sands Limited, or Abasand if it is ever resurrected—I believe it is out of commission now—they should push on and make every effort to overcome this country's oil fuel problem. For thirty-five or forty years this department has said and has been putting out circulars stating that there is a lot of oil up there and I think it is pretty nearly time we started to get some results. We cannot go on buying oil indefinitely from the United States. If that country ever shut off our supply we should be through.

There is another part of Canada in which there is oil. I spent some time in Hillsborough, New Brunswick, last September. I do not know if the minister was there but they spoke of him at different times. There I saw quite a substantial oil field with eighteen wells in operation. They were producing only seven barrels of oil a day per well but that is the United States average. There are 30,000 paying wells in the United States producing seven barrels each per day.

Mr. HOWE: It is mostly fuel gas, is it not?

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes, they produce gas and oil; they ship the gas to Moncton and heat the city with gas. I heard down there that the gentleman who owned it lived in England and that he was not well. I have since heard from the hon. member for Royal that he has passed away. I heard also from other sources that the whole field and plant have been taken over by the Shell Oil interests—I am not sure that that is so—and that they are producing a lot more oil than was produced a year ago. If that is so, then there is another field, and goodness knows the maritime provinces need something like that to put them on the map. I should like to see them strike three or four big gushers down there that would put them on the map so far as oil production goes.

I do not want to delay the committee any longer, but I felt it my duty to talk about this. I know a good deal about it myself. I hope when I come back from Utah, I have a better report that a real improvement has been made in the method of extraction. I am going to suggest to the department that they communicate with the company. If they do not know the name of the company I shall be glad to give it to them. I suggest that they communicate with the company and get a report from the geologists and engineers down there, showing that they are getting results. I suggest that they send one or two geologists

and engineers down there to see what they are doing. The fact is that we have to do something. If we have a resource to develop we should be making every effort to develop it. I am not going to find any fault with anything that has been done in the past. That does not do any good. I want to encourage those in authority to go forward, to look up and do the best they can to provide oil either from oil wells or from oil sands or coal. If the method that is now in operation in the United States for taking oil out of coal is to be used, and we have to get oil production from coal, let us do so. The fact is, we must become self-sufficient and independent so far as oil is concerned.

Anyone can visualize just what a tremendous thing it would mean in Canada. I said a moment ago that I recently tried to buy four oil burners. I could have obtained the burners, but the company told me they could not get the oil. There are many thousands of people in Canada in the same position. The production of oil burners would bring a lot of business; the production of pumps, tanks, steel for oil tanks and so on would mean a lot to this country. This country would bound along fast if we could only get oil, and this would be one source of production. Then we could also have oil produced from coal and shale as they are doing in Utah and Colorado. There is a lot of shale in New Brunswick. I know the acting minister is an engineer and knows a lot about these things. He knows more about them than the ordinary cabinent minister does. Our trouble in Canada is that we have appointed men to cabinet positions who are not always familiar with what they direct. Some of them do, but not all of them. I am not referring to the present minister. I know the acting minister does know something about these things. I suggest to him that he look carefully into all these problems of oil production and encourage his engineers and geologists, who are as good as the best, to put our country on the map in all these various items to which I have referred.

Mr. HOWE: I should like to say a few words on this subject. As hon. members know, the Department of Mines and Resources has a strong geology branch, and particularly strong in the matter of oil geology. The results that are now being obtained in Alberta are due in no small part to the study made by the officers of this department, and to their cooperation with private industry.

I quite agree with my hon. friend that one of the great weaknesses in the Canadian economy is the lack of sufficient oil to support our economy. That lack is even more serious than the lack of well distributed supplies of coal. During the war years the government spent about two and a half million dollars in a thorough exploration of the Abasand situation; that is, an exploration of the tar sands of northern Alberta. The department had been working on the problem in a small way for some twenty years. It was recognized that, when war broke out, the need for oil would be paramount. Exploration was speeded up. The exploration brought some excellent results. A thorough drilling of the location resulted in delivering and mapping areas high in bitumen, areas that had considerable quantities of free bitumen. The programme has also perfected the process for separating bitumen from the sand. Unfortunately, just as the work was being finished, a fire burned down the separation plant and brought a halt to the investigation; but at that time practically all the results that had been hoped for had been achieved. We knew where the oil is located; we knew the approximate cost of recovery; we know a satisfactory process for separating oil from the sands. The department then decided that it had done its work as far as acquiring data on tar sands is concerned. The department was successful in making a very satisfactory agreement with the owners of the property under which, if oil is ever produced, or if other valuable substances are ever produced from the area, the government will recover all the money it has spent in the area. The government then retired from the tar sand situation.

The situation regarding petroleum, as it seems to be developing at the moment, is that it is expected that petroleum from wells will not last indefinitely. At the present time supply is below demand. That is a temporary situation which it may take two years to correct. The fact seems to be that drilling and development work have not kept up with the sharp increase in post-war demand. It seems to be the view of industry that in time, not in the time of myself or my hon. friend, oil will become scarce to the point where hydrogenation will be a practical development and when the tar sands will be a very valuable source of oil. At the moment, oil from tar sands is a matter of price. The price of oil from free flowing wells or pumped wells is so much below the cost of recovering oil from tar sands, or the cost of manufacturing oil by hydrogenation, that the latter are not within the economic realm.

As far as the Canadian situation is concerned, we are all feeling very much cheered by the recent discovery at Leduc, Alberta. It

is believed by those responsible for the development of that field that we may have in Canada a very great field, one that within the coming year or two may produce oil sufficient to supply the prairie provinces, plus considerable quantities for delivery outside that area. That would be a great relief. The supply of oil to the prairie provinces has been increasingly difficult, as production in the Turner valley field has diminished. It is a relief to know that our supply problem on the prairies may be taken care of. It will be a tremendous help if we have surplus oil from that area which can be either exported in exchange for oil delivered to eastern Canada or perhaps piped down to eastern Canada for delivery direct.

Mr. MacNICOL: Has the department kept in its own control the method that it promoted for taking oil out of the sand?

Mr. HOWE: No. Any discoveries that we have made have been given freely to the industry. It is the business of the department to promote production and not to make money out of discoveries.

Mr. KNOWLES: On this same item may I ask the minister if he will make a statement regarding modern methods and devices of surveying the areas to determine mineral resources that might be located in them? I have in mind reports that are current about new ways of discovering rather quickly and easily whether there are valuable mineral resources underground. If he can add to that some remarks as to who is doing this in northern Canada and to what extent it is being done both by private industry and by his department, I should appreciate it. In asking for this statement I have in mind two points: first, the desire that we proceed with as much development as we can of the resources we have in northern Canada; second, the desire that the values which are there be conserved, so far as possible, for the Canadian people.

Mr. HOWE: I assume that the device to which the hon. member refers is the flying magnetometer. It is more or less experimental in nature at the moment, but it does detect major changes in the structure of the earth and indicates areas which are likely to be mineralized. It is no more accurate than that, but it is a great help in exploring areas which can later be prospected more accurately. We have $30,000 in the estimates for experimental work on the flying magnetometer in Canada during the next current year. I might say that a licence has been issued to a United States firm which is doing work on the flying magnetometer on the property of the International Nickel Company. My deputy tells me that there are three areas in Canada where work is being done. It is a means of prospecting which may turn out to be exceedingly important, and Canada expects to be in the forefront of the development.

Item agreed to.

Lands, parks and forests branch—
Airports, roads, buildings and water systems—construction and improvements—

147. Roads, $1,130,000.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: This item provides $1,130,000 for the building of roads at Yellowknife. Will the minister give us some of the details with regard to the length of the roads, the type of road, who the contractor was, what the excavation was, whether the roads for this $1,130,000 are serviceable now, or whether they have been completed?

Mr. HOWE: This road is being built by the province of Alberta. It is built under agreement with the Department of Mines and Resources. The problem is unique, in that the purpose of the road is to connect the highway system of Alberta with the Yellowknife area of the Northwest Territories. There are about three hundred miles in Alberta and about eighty miles in the Northwest Territories. The federal government is, of course, responsible for the full cost of building roads in the Northwest Territories; but owing to the importance of the road in opening up an important section of the Northwest Territories, the government agreed with the province of Alberta to pay at least half of the cost of the road in the province. I am told that this particular vote is for the road in the Northwest Territories. It is the full cost of the Northwest Territories section. In addition to that, we have an agreement with the province of Alberta to pay an amount which represents fifty per cent of the cost of the section of the road lying within Alberta, which is being built by the province of Alberta. I believe there is another vote for that. I have no information as to the contractor or the cost of the work.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: What is the length of the road which is dealt with under this particular item?

Mr. HOWE: Eighty miles.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: That is the eighty miles of the road in the Northwest Territories?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: It has nothing to do with the Alberta section?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Is the road completed?

Mr. HOWE: This road and the road within the Northwest Territories are not started. My officers tell me that, as usual, I am wrong. They tell me that it is started and is likely to be finished this year.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: This $369,000 was expended on that last year.

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Is this estimate supposed to complete the road?

Mr. HOWE: This will complete it, yes.

Item agreed to.

Lands, parks and forests branch—
Government of the Yukon territory—
149. Administration, $155,000.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Has the British Columbia government notified the Department of Mines and Resources that it has $200,000 to spend on a road between Atlin and the Alaska highway? If it has so notified them, has it also asked them for the use of their machinery to work on that road?

Mr. HOWE: The position is this. About half of this road is in the Northwest Territories and half of it is in British Columbia. The estimated cost of the road is about $600,000, being about $300,000 for the Northwest Territories part and about $300,000 for the British Columbia part. The province of British Columbia have offered us $200,000 and told us to build the entire road. At the moment we have no provision in the estimates for that. It is now too late in the season to undertake a project of that kind. We are now in the middle of July. All I can say to my hon. friend is that we shared with the British Columbia government the cost of the survey. We made no commitment beyond that point. But now that they have shown an interest in constructing the British Columbia end of the road, we shall consider with them further the division of the cost, and endeavour to make some provision for it for next season, starting early in the season.

Item agreed to.

Lands, parks and forests branch—
Land registry—
154. Land registry, seed grain collections, administration of ordnance, admiralty and public lands, $91,940.

Mr. BENTLEY: Before I say anything on this particular item, I wish to ask the minister a question. If he replies favourably, I shall not need to say any more. Is the government giving any consideration to cancelling the seed relief debts of from 1912 to 1919 and along about that time, which were incurred before there were other relief measures in the prairie provinces?

Mr. HOWE: This is an old account dating from years away back when the government was in the seed grain business. All we are trying to do is to collect these accounts. It is an inactive branch of the department, except that we are owed this money and we should like to collect it.

Mr. BENTLEY: That is, I am sorry to say, the answer I expected to get.

Mr. FULTON: What does it mean?

Mr. BENTLEY: I wish the minister could have been a little bit more encouraging. I want to point out that these liens were taken against the land and sometimes—in fact, quite frequently—the land has changed hands. The present tenants, when they think they have the debt paid up now find that they actually have not, because in applying for their title they find they have quite a debt to pay. In the main I agree with the minister, that when a person contracts a debt he should pay it; but I know there have been occasions and circumstances when not only farmers but other people have been relieved of an old debt because of the passage of time and because of economic circumstances which have intervened between the time of the contracting of the debt and the present day.

I know the minister is acting on behalf of the other minister who is ill; and I am sorry that the regular minister is not here. I wish the present minister, who is doing a very good job, would give serious consideration to the matter. I want to give just one concrete case. I could give a great many, but I do not want to take up the time of the committee. The case I have in mind is that of the northeast quarter of section 16, township 28, west of the third meridian. Nearly thirty years ago, in 1918, this land was purchased, and at that time the principal amount owing was $465.90. As of January 8, 1947, the interest amounted to $740.50 making a total debt of $1,207.40. In this case the debtor has had a compromise offered by the department, in which compromise I have no doubt the department went as far as it had authority to go. That compromise offer was a cash settlement of $744.75. This piece of land is located in an area which is frequently subject to drought. Occasionally it gets a crop, but in the main one can say it just gets by. After a succession of bad years in the thirties, when we had both low prices and poor crops, people in that district

could not even get by and did anything and everything possible to get some little income on which to live.

A great many accounts are in a similar position. I have given what I think is a typical case. The man who owns this land has worked very hard. He has raised a large family and done a pretty good job as a citizen. Consequently I believe he should be relieved of this debt. He has done all the other things that have been necessary to carry out his obligations. He has paid his municipal and school taxes; he has paid off his machinery debt, his mortgage and so on. He has paid the interest and all the rest of it, and finally he thought he was clear of debt and relieved of these obligations in his more than middle age. Then suddenly he found that, even under the compromise settlement, he still owed $744. That may not sound like a great deal of money to members of this house when they are dealing in these estimates with nothing less than a few thousand, which is just chicken feed, and on up into the millions; but it is a lot of money to struggle to pay after a lifetime of hard work. So I ask the minister to give serious consideration to instructing his department to cancel these debts. If these people are still involved it is because they have not been able to discharge these debts, no matter how hard they have tried. Other people, such as the grocer and the machinery man, have accounted for their money up to the present. These people should be relieved of these debts now, because everything that could be done by the debtors has been done, and they should not have to continue to struggle to pay this money. I can appreciate the difficulties of trying to collect debts. I wish I could collect all those owing to me. I would be tickled to death and would offer an even better compromise than this on some of them. But I do not expect to collect, and I will not press for payment. I should like the government to be as lenient with those in difficult circumstances as I have been personally with some people in the same position, in a much smaller way but equally important. Will the minister give some serious thought to that suggestion?

Mr. HOWE: I would point out to my hon. friend that there is a debt adjustment board in every province, made up of citizens of that province who in each case know the debtor and are sympathetic toward his problems. Adjustments are being made almost every day in connection with these loans, and I know of no case in which there has been absolute hardship on account of them. My hon. friend said they suddenly found themselves in debt. I think he will find that these debts go back quite a number of years. The prairies were never so prosperous and the people of the prairies were never so well able to pay their debts as at the present time, due, I think in large part, to the careful administration of this government. We sincerely hope that in their days of prosperity they will liquidate these small debts and relieve the department of the necessity of dealing with these matters.

Mr. BENTLEY: I cannot let it go quite as easily as that, though I do not suppose I can change the minister's mind. He may think he has said something fairly wise, but it is not quite so wise as one might expect from a man in his position and with his capabilities. When I said these people suddenly discovered themselves in debt I meant exactly what I said. Many of them did not know or had forgotten the loans were there. They had struggled through the years to provide the minimum necessities, and they thought they were clear; then they found they were not.

The minister said the prairies were never better off than they are at the present time. I am not going to dispute that statement; probably it is true. But when one considers all the years they were so badly off, to be a little better off now may not mean a great deal. A person in the gutter, hungry and broke, is better off if someone gives him a cup of coffee and a couple of doughnuts, but that is not good enough. A great many more years of prosperity—and I agree it will have to be in spite of the government over there—will be required before we can say the prairies are really well off. It is true that they are better off than they were and that they have paid some of their debts. Here is a debt, however, that many of them have not been able to pay. I am sure, if the minister were dealing with these matters on a purely personal basis or as the manager of a concern he would give them a great deal more consideration than he appears to want to give them at the present time. As the head of a department representing the people of this country, I believe those he represents would appreciate it if he extended the same leniency to these people as I am sure he would if he were the manager of a business with which people were involved in this way, and in which he had come out so well.

It is all very well to say the farmers were never better off than they are now. I would remind the committee of what the Minister of Finance said in presenting his budget speech, that never in the history of Canada had the people such a surplus. Therefore we are all better off than we have ever been before. That goes for all the people. A great many

accounts have been cancelled, and I think these small accounts could be cancelled as well without the financial situation of Canada being affected.

Item agreed to.

Lands, parks and forests branch—
National parks bureau—

155. National parks and historic sites services, including authority for commitments against future years to an amount of $194,000, $1,821,626.

Mr. WEBB: When these estimates were before the committee last year I discussed at some length what are known as the Thousand Islands national parks, their development and maintenance. While they are not large, I consider them important. They lie in a very good district, with a heavy tourist traffic, and we need all the accommodation we can possibly get in connection with them. As I said last year, during the war they were allowed to run down, no doubt because of the shortage of material and labour, but I think now the time has arrived when they should be further developed. Definitely they should be maintained in much better condition than is the case at the present time. This year, of course, with conditions as they have been, the docks are under water and very few of these parks can be used at all. Last year when I brought this matter up, the minister stated this, as reported at page 5470 of *Hansard* for August 27, 1946:

> The hon. member knows that we have had investigations made by our officers, and that investigations are being made by United States officers. Separate reports are being submitted independently by the investigating officers, one for the United States and one for ourselves. Those reports have not yet been considered, and I am therefore not yet in a position to say what the result may be.

I am wondering if at this time there is any report which the minister might have with respect to these parks, which really need attention at the present time.

Mr. HOWE: I can say we are spending considerably more money on the parks this year than we have done in the past several years. I have before me a list of items which I could read, but I doubt if it would be worth while. I will say, however, that we will do all the work this year for which we can get the materials, and which will come within the amount of money provided.

Mr. WEBB: When we hear so much talk about the value of these parks for tourist traffic—and we all agree that it is becoming a great industry—I am wondering if, through the cooperation of the provincial governments, it would not be wise to open a really large park in the Rideau lakes district not many miles from here. It seems to me that we are arriving at a stage when, possibly through good advertising and because of the way in which tourists are being treated—and I hope that is true—we shall have more tourists in this country than we shall be able to take care of. I understand that the provincial government must donate the land, but that the federal government would then look after the development and maintenance of the park. I believe this is worth while keeping in mind because, in my view, in the not too distant future a park of substantial proportions should be developed in the Rideau lakes district adjacent to the highways leading from the Thousand Islands bridges. In this way we would be able to take care of many thousands of tourists in one of the finest districts of Canada. I am suggesting that something should be done about this.

Mr. FULTON: I do not find in the details of the item any amount for roads in national parks.

Mr. HOWE: This item covers the maintenance of roads in parks. The provision for new expenditures in that direction is in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Will any part of this vote to be used for renovation of the old northwest mounted police barracks at Battleford, Saskatchewan?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. ROBINSON (Bruce): In my constituency is a district known as Bruce peninsula, on one side of which is Georgian bay and on the other side lake Huron. That peninsula, as hon. members know, has caused much comment from different historians and mineralogists on the North American continent. We have rare rock formations up there, and also types of flowers found nowhere else in North America except in New Mexico. In recent years many professors have looked through that section of the province, and it is generally agreed that it would be an ideal spot for a national park. Great numbers of tourists are already visiting the peninsula, and I am wondering if the department has ever had drawn to its attention the fact that this spot is well suited for purposes of a national park. If one were established in that location it would have the tendency to decentralize. What steps would be required toward having a park established, and in the event of this taking place what would be the status of the people in that area?

Mr. HOWE: The initiative must come from the province. The requirement comes from there, and the province donates the land involved. I believe Ontario is the only province which, with the exception of this small park and one in the Georgian bay area, has never made a request of this kind. If the people of Bruce peninsula wish to take the matter up with the province we would be pleased to consider any representations the provincial government might make in that regard.

Mr. ROBINSON (Bruce): How would the people on the lands taken over by such a park be recompensed?

Mr. HOWE: That would be a matter for the provincial government. If there are any settlers in the area they would be removed by the provincial authorities.

Mr. HAZEN: Has a site for a national park in New Brunswick been selected; if so, where is it to be located? I ask this question because of an article appearing in the Saint John *Telegraph-Journal* of July 4, headed "National park site in New Brunswick has been selected". The minister of lands and mines of the province is reported to have said, "We have decided on one place now"; but he did not say where it was. What is the situation?

Mr. HOWE: I have been approached personally in the matter. A letter from R. J. Gill of June 24, 1947, addressed to me is as follows:

Dear Mr. Howe:

We are most anxious to push forward the establishment of a national park in this province. Mr. Smart from the Department of Mines and Resources has made several trips to various proposed sites, and has finally made a definite selection. His report should be before you for consideration quite soon.

I would ask you to kindly give the matter your attention, as I understand you are now Acting Minister of Mines and Resources. It is most important that we should have your approval without delay, as this will finalize the acquiring of certain parcels of privately owned real estate within the proposed park area.

I have not seen Mr. Smart's report, but I am told it has been received by the department and is now being considered.

Mr. HAZEN: Who is Mr. Smart?

Mr. HOWE: He is chief of the national parks bureau.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not like to press further because, if the land is to be acquired, perhaps it would be just as well if the location were not announced until the land is acquired.

Mr. HOWE: Probably so.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. A. E. Robinson.]

Lands, parks and forests branch—
National parks bureau—

156. Administration of Migratory Birds Convention Act, $57,100.

Mr. BLAIR: What measures are being taken to preserve the duck population of Canada? In a recent publication of the Ontario department of lands and forests it is stated that in 1943 our duck population was 145,000,000, and in 1946 it was only 80,000,000. From that it would look as though our ducks were being seriously depleted. What steps are being taken under this act to preserve this population? I should like to know also if Cuba has entered into an agreement under the Migratory Birds Convention Act?

Mr. HOWE: We are faced with a difficult situation, due to the startling reduction in the known migratory waterfowl population on this continent. For the past two years, various adverse natural factors operating in Canada and in the United States have decimated the waterfowl to such an extent that increasing numbers of hunters have killed more ducks than were produced. The breeding stock has been cut into seriously.

This subject was probably the most important discussed at the provincial-dominion wildlife conference in February last, when top-ranking wildlife officials from all the provinces, and from the United States, presented the results of their surveys. It was agreed by all who were familiar with the situation that, unless the harvest of waterfowl in 1947 is greatly curtailed, this season may witness the collapse of this great sport. Some authorities have recommended a completely closed season until improved conditions permit restoration of a normal duck population.

In dealing with this situation on this side of the line the dominion, as the authority charged with responsibility for the administration of the Migratory Birds Convention Act, collaborates with the provinces which are responsible for the wildlife and, by consultation and exchange of information, it is possible to arrive at dominion and provincial regulations which are identical. Before the regulations are promulgated in Canada, we usually know what action is being taken on the United States side of the line. For a number of reasons, the conditions imposed there are always more drastic than those imposed in Canada. We do not know yet whether the United States will have an open season for migratory birds this year. In Canada it seems likely that we shall have a short open season with greatly reduced bag limits.

Mr. BLAIR: I am given to understand that the slaughter of canvas-back ducks in Cuba

is terrific during the tourist season because of the great influx of hunters. Then United States hunters are coming into Canada. This same article from the Ontario lands and forests departmental publication states that more birds were exported on ice than migrated on the wing. It would seem that something will have to be done when there has been a drop from 145,000,000 to 80,000,000 within two years and with additional hunters coming into the country. If not, we are going to lose this great game sport of wild duck hunting.

Mr. HOWE: I agree that the situation is terrible. At least we are aware of the situation and will take steps. My hon. friend will appreciate the desirability of working along with the United States. I am sorry I have no information as far as the situation in Cuba is concerned.

Item agreed to.

Surveys and engineering branch—
159. Branch administration, $26,856.

Mr. MERRITT: I notice, in the estimates for roads in the Northwest Territories, a number of votes with which I am in complete accord, but I do not find any vote for the development of mining roads in the Yukon. There is one road there in which the citizens of that country and the British Columbia-Yukon chamber of mines are very much interested. I refer to the road from Whitehorse to Carmacks, to Mayo Landing, to Dawson City. They believe that this road would do much to help in developing the Yukon. The British Columbia-Yukon chamber of mines wrote to the minister in February last, asking for his consideration of this matter, and I should like the minister to state what are the plans for the developments of roads in the Yukon territory.

Mr. HOWE: A survey of the road in question was made last year, and the supplementary estimates contain an item of $170,000 for roads in the Yukon Territory. I cannot say how this money will be spent, but I dare say some work will be carried out on the road in question.

Mr. MERRITT: I cannot find any item in the supplementary estimates for roads in the Yukon Territory, but there is a grant of $170,000 to the Yukon council.

Mr. HOWE: It is included in that grant.

Mr. MERRITT: Could the minister state what that $170,000 will be used for? Has it been determined whether this road will be built?

Mr. HOWE: The Yukon council determine the method of spending their revenue, and they have an item of $170,000 in their subsidy for roads. I assume that they will spend this money to the best advantage of the territory.

Mr. MERRITT: Do I understand that the Yukon council decides these matters and that the department does not make decisions or would not make a special grant for what I would consider to be a major road project? This is not a minor job.

Mr. HOWE: The department has general supervision over the expenditures, but it usually accepts the advice of the council for the Yukon. It is not unusual for the department to make special grants for special projects, and in this instance it has made a grant of $170,000 to be spent on roads, following the advice of the Yukon council.

Item agreed to.

Surveys and engineering branch—
162. Dominion water and power bureau, including the administration of the Dominion Water Power and Irrigation Acts, and including grants of $350 to the international executive council, world power conference, $298,760.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is it intended to develop power in connection with the St. Mary river dam, the same as they do with their irrigation works in the United States?

Mr. HOWE: There is no plan to develop power at the moment. The P.F.R.A. is carrying out this development. As my hon. friend knows, work has been commenced on the main dam, and whether the overflow will be found sufficiently reliable in the future to warrant the generating of power is a matter for the future.

Mr. MacNICOL: The development of power there would be beneficial to the small towns in the vicinity like Cardston and Raymond.

Mr. HOWE: It is a pretty small creek.

Mr. MacNICOL: It has an average flow of 1,400 second feet, but in the summer time it is down to about 450. The lake will contain about 300,000 acre feet of water, and even in the summer time it should be possible to develop some power.

Item agreed to.

Surveys and engineering branch—
163. To provide for studies and surveys of the Columbia river watershed in Canada, $280,000.

Mr. FULTON: Coming from British Columbia, I certainly would not criticize any expenditure of public funds being made out there. I am glad to see that they are going to do this work on the Columbia river, but I want to

make the request for some similar expenditures on the Fraser and Thompson rivers system. I have pressed for a similar survey of all that area as an integrated project. In comparison with the Columbia river, the Fraser river system, as the hon. minister from British Columbia knows, includes both the Thompson, the North Thompson and the Adams rivers. There is far more agricultural land served by the Fraser river system than by the Columbia river system. As far as the river in Canada is concerned, there is far more value in the fisheries, in the salmon run on the Fraser river, than there is in the Columbia river system. As I said at the outset, I would not oppose the expenditure of this money on the Columbia, but from the point of view of Canada there is more to be gained by having a similar survey of the Fraser river system. So far as the people in my part of the country are concerned, they are worried over the removal of the dam in the Adams river by the fisheries department at the end of 1945. It has already produced a tremendous lowering of the level of Adams lake and a rapid run-off in the spring, which increases our problems of irrigation in the fall. I think all three departments, mines and resources, agriculture, and public works, and to a lesser degree fisheries should cooperate in the survey of that area. Can the minister say whether any reports have been received or whether any work is contemplated on the Fraser river system similar to the work that is being done on the Columbia river?

Mr. HOWE: The Columbia river is an international one and comes under the international joint commission. For that reason it is a federal responsibility. The Thompson and the Fraser, as my hon. friend knows, are rivers within Canada and practically within one province of Canada, and the work on the Fraser river would therefore come under the province.

Mr. FULTON: The fisheries aspect of it is international. What is the international aspect of the Columbia river which makes us spend $280,000 if we cannot spend a similar amount on the other river system?

Mr. HOWE: The mouth of the Fraser is international, but the river itself is wholly within one province.

Mr. FULTON: What are we getting out of this to justify spending $280,000?

Mr. HOWE: We are carrying out an international obligation.

Mr. FULTON: What is the obligation that we are carrying out on the Columbia river?

Mr. HOWE: If we did not do this the Americans could use the water on their side in any way they liked. They could shut off the water. The Columbia river rises in the United States, flows into Canada and down through Spokane into the ocean. Unless we are prepared to study the river and determine the use which we wish to make of our share of the water of the river, the Americans would be justified in using the water on their side as they liked.

Mr. FULTON: What do we do with the money?

Mr. HOWE: It is spent on surveys of various kinds, keeping water records, stream measurements and power possibilities.

Mr. FULTON: Have we actually built any projects on the river, or is the money all spent on surveys?

Mr. HOWE: Just surveys.

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): I should like to correct the minister in his geography. He says that the Columbia river rises in the United States. I beg to correct him. It rises in the riding of East Kootenay in Canada.

Mr. HAZEN: For how many years has this survey been going on? Was the amount that was voted last year the first vote, or has this survey been going on for a number of years?

Mr. HOWE: There used to be a vote under external affairs. Last year $300,000 was voted. There was a vote in 1944-45 of $50,000 but very little of it was spent.

Item agreed to.

Surveys and engineering branch—

169. Snow lake mining road, Manitoba—amount required for dominion contributions in 1947-48 for construction, under terms of agreement with the province of Manitoba, $125,000.

Mr. MOORE: Does the federal government intend to give any assistance to the government of Manitoba for the completion of No. 10 highway to Flon lake?

Mr. HOWE: I know of no appropriation for that.

Item agreed to.

Surveys and engineering branch—

170. Grimshaw-Great Slave lake road—amount required for construction of provincial section in 1947-48, under terms of agreement with Alberta, $950,000.

Mr. MacNICOL: Canada is supplying under this vote $125,000 toward the construction of the road from Grimshaw to the Alberta boundary, 247 miles north.

Mr. HOWE: In 1946-47 we voted $450,000, and this year the vote is $950,000. Our share is about $1,300,000.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is this to be a concrete or hard-surfaced road?

Mr. HOWE: No, it is a road of 300 miles.

Mr. MacNICOL: It is 247 miles from Grimshaw to the 60th parallel, that is the Northwest Territory boundary, and eighty miles from the Northwest Territory boundary to Hay river. This is purely a winter road.

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes. It was first constructed to be used in winter by tractors crossing Great Slave lake to Yellowknife. Does the minister know whether plans have been prepared for the construction of the road from Hay river west to Providence or Mills lake and from Mills lake by road to Yellowknife? That would be another eighty miles to Providence and twenty-five miles to Mills lake, 100 miles from Mills lake to Rae, and 100 miles from Rae to Yellowknife. That road is projected. Has any engineering work been done on it?

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend is not correct in saying that the Grimshaw road is only a winter road. It is being gravelled. It is an all-year road. It goes only as far as Great Slave lake and, after that, travel is by boat. No extension is proposed. There is no development in the country which would warrant an extension at this time.

Mr. MacNICOL: It is a winter road inasmuch as it was first cut through for tractors. I have all the pictures.

Mr. HOWE: But it will also be used in the summer.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes. In the summer by boat from Hay river to Yellowknife and in the winter by tractors across the lake to Yellowknife. Are any plans being projected to carry the road around Great Slave lake to Mills lake?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. MacNICOL: The minister himself said that last year when I asked him the question. I have been there. The great value of that road is this, if we extend it from Hay river to Mills lake. Mills lake is on the Mackenzie river, about twenty-five miles west of Providence. The river itself is open from two to three weeks earlier than the lake. The lake does not open so early in the summer. If the road were constructed it could be used as a winter road, as a tractor road to Mills lake, carrying tremendous quantities of freight to be put on boats to go down the Mackenzie in the spring to Norman Wells and several other posts three weeks earlier than now. I think that is an important road. The lake itself is frozen up longer. The lake just freezes up and remains frozen in the fall of the year three weeks earlier than the river. In other words, the Mackenzie river could be used for six weeks longer than it now is if we had a river road to Mills lake. There is a substantial harbour at Mills lake.

Item agreed to.

Surveys and engineering branch—
Hydrographic and map service—
174. Hydrographic service, $778,049.

Mr. WEBB: This is a large item. Can the minister give us some idea of the service rendered by this item?

Mr. HOWE: The hydrographic service was formerly operated by the Department of Transport and was transferred to the Department of Mines and Resources about 1937. Its duties are to map the ocean beds on both coasts of Canada. It operates several survey boats and keeps a considerable crew working on mapping. It has echo sounding equipment and mapping equipment. It does a first-class job to keep Canada's hydrographic maps up to date. The item is a little larger than during the war years. Naturally the work of surveying was curtailed during the war years. The vote is not out of proportion to that of pre-war years.

Mr. WEBB: Does it keep any records of water levels?

Mr. HOWE: Yes, it does that work on tidal waters. The water and power bureau, which is also in the department, keeps water levels of streams within Canada, but the water levels of oceans are kept by the hydrographic survey.

Mr. WEBB: They do not make any prophecies of water levels in the coming years?

Mr. HOWE: So far as the ocean is concerned, of course there is practically no change. We have a record of the tides, but there is no change in the water levels of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, which is the area in which the hydrographic survey operates.

Mr. HAZEN: The minister may not have the figures there, but is he in a position to tell the committee how far the continental shelf extends from Canada both on the Atlantic and on the Pacific coast? Does the hydrographic survey give that information?

Mr. HOWE: The hydrographic survey probably has it charted, but it changes in almost every mile of coastline.

Mr. HAZEN: Is there a map of it? If there is a map of it I should like to examine it at some time.

Mr. HOWE: I would suggest to my hon. friend that he call the hydrographic survey in the Confederation building, and I think they can quickly give him the maps which he requires.

Mr. HAZEN: You might ask them to send me a copy, which would save a call.

Mr. HOWE: You had better call.

Item agreed to.

Surveys and engineering branch—

176. To provide for the payment of fees of the board of examiners for dominion land surveyors, of the secretary and of the sub-examiners and for travelling expenses, stationery, printing, rent, etc. (the fees of F. H. Peters, J. E. R. Ross and R. H. Montgomery, members of the board, and A. W. W. Cole, secretary, are to be paid out of this sum, $2,100.

Mr. FULTON: I notice that this appears to be an item to provide for the payment of fees to several examiners. On looking over the names, it seems to me that they are the names of people who are already on the staff of the department. I believe Mr. F. H. Peters is the surveyor general of Canada or holds some such position. If his duties are to be increased permanently, then I suggest that he should get an increase. Surely it is not proper that a permanent civil servant should be able to get proper recompense for his work only by a sort of occasional item of this kind. If he is a civil servant—and I suggest that he is president of the board of examiners—I do not think he should get an extra fee for that. If it becomes part of his permanent work, then his salary should be increased. Subject to an explanation by the minister I do not think this is the way to do it.

Mr. HOWE: This is work outside the line of duty. I know that Mr. Peters is the surveyor general of Canada. I think some of the other men are not members of the department. Whether Mr. Peters gets paid or not, I cannot say.

Mr. FULTON: It says so here.

Mr. HOWE: It will be noted that the item also includes travelling expenses, so that whether compensation is given or not, it would not be very high compensation.

Mr. FULTON: My point is not to quibble over the amount. If this is to be permanent would it not be better to do it by way of increasing his salary and so avoiding the auditor general's comments and trouble of that sort, rather than have a separate item each year?

Mr. HOWE: I shall be glad to call the hon. member's remarks to the attention of the minister of the department and have him explore it.

Item agreed to.

Indian affairs branch—

177. Branch administration, $92,371.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I was attempting to speak on this item this afternoon. At that time I reported the fact that there exists in Canada a situation of which a good many Canadians are not fully aware. I am referring to about 132,000 of the native inhabitants of this continent, the North American Indians, who in Canada are undoubtedly suffering wrongs and are denied certain human rights that we consider an essential part of the existence of every human being. Because of Canada's reputation in this matter, I think it is well that the department which has this responsibility should understand that this is not just a technical job; it is a job of rescuing a race of people who, I am convinced, have been seriously wronged. I am convinced that the Canadian Indian could be restored to a position of dignity and pride. My experience with these people, in studying and working with them, has convinced me that they have many fine characteristics which, if properly developed, could make a splendid contribution to Canada. The Indian people have been subjected to a term in reserves which has degraded and relegated them to a position of inferiority and almost to a position of dependence, such as might well be meted out to pariahs who have become outcasts from society. That is not good enough.

The thing that stirs me about this is the fact that the whole thing is unnecessary. Some years ago the United States took hold of this situation and has already made great strides in restoring these people. The New Zealand people, by their treatment of the Maoris, have rescued a very fine race of people who are making a splendid contribution to that country. I am somewhat discouraged at times in speaking to the people of Canada, and to officials of the department, who refer to the Indian as a useless, lazy chap who will not work. That is not true. Medical men who have made a study of the situation among our Indians have come to the conclusion that our Indian is a sick man.

The responsibility for the welfare of the Indian has been placed upon this government

and particularly upon this department. I am making a special plea, because I think there is a challenge here for officials in this department, to go out and rescue a race of people who have been seriously wronged by the administration of Canada in the past. I am sure the Canadian people would not permit the condition which exists to continue to exist if they were aware of it. The fact that we have finally set up a committee of this house, which has been sitting for the past two years and which tabled its report the other day, reveals that the Canadian people are at least becoming aware of a tremendous responsibility in this field. That committee has found that there are conditions existing which they had not dreamed of before. I have been pleased with the attitude of the members of that committee toward this Indian problem. There seems to be an earnest desire on the part of many hon. members to do a real job of restoring these people. There is extensive want among these people; there is a neglect of the ordinary human needs. The rights of the Indian have been denied to him. He is placed in a position of dependence. He is not allowed to develop any of his talents in a private way. He is given no rights with regard to government or control of his own affairs. He is placed under the direction and control of an Indian agent. Often these Indian agents are unqualified with regard to any scholastic ability, and I am sure that in many cases their attitude with regard to the Indian is altogether wrong. The Indians are resentful of the treatment which they have had, but they have no redress; they have no avenue of approach to get redress for their grievances.

One of the greatest functions which this committee has performed in the past two years is that of being a sort of court of appeal to which these people could come and submit their grievances and, for the first time in a long time, inform the government of this country and the members of parliament of some terrible conditions which exist. If you will go back over your history, Mr. Chairman, you will find that the Canadian government made treaties with these people. Treaties were made with the Indians of this country before it was British territory. After the British came, they made treaties with these Indians. Evidence was presented before that committee to the effect that those treaties have been broken and that the promises which were made to these Indians have not been fulfilled. Hundreds of treaties with these people were signed. They had faith in the government officials and the officials of the Queen when the promises were made. Now they have no way of forcing the government's hand. They have no way of compelling the government to fulfil its obligations. The condition of neglect which many of them are in is disgraceful. The living conditions in some of these reserves are deplorable. Medical attention had fallen to a low ebb. One of the good things this committee did was, I believe, to awaken the officials of the department to a realization that something was wrong. The committee has been pleased to notice that, in recent months, the government has taken hold of this matter of the health and welfare of the Indians and placed it under another department, and is spending a considerable amount of money in attacking the situation. But something will have to be done and done quickly. We cannot neglect the problem.

Among the recommendations which the committee handed down to the house yesterday was No. 2, which reads as follows:

> That a commission in the nature of a claims commission be set up with the least possible delay to inquire into the terms of all Indian treaties, in order to discover and determine such rights and obligations as may herein be involved (or any subsequent substitution therefor) and to appraise and settle in a just and equitable manner any claims or grievances arising thereunder.

That is a valuable recommendation. The Indian people have lost faith in the white man. The Indian is distrustful of him. He resents his treatment, and you can hardly blame him when you go over the record of the department. Reserves were set aside, but we find that these reserves are being infiltrated by white people. Valuable property is being taken away from the Indians. Sometimes the band has consented and sometimes it has not. Proper records are not kept. In the matter of education and training there is a great deal which must be done. One of the Indian delegates who appeared before our committee said this: "The measure of the democracy of any nation may be judged by the measure of democracy it allows its smallest minority to enjoy." These 132,000 people are enjoying no democracy. Canada is making itself liable to charges in the united nations council as a result of the way in which it treats a minority people of a different race within its own borders. That is how serious the situation is. If our treatment of these Indian people is the scale upon which we are to judge democracy in Canada, then Canada stands low indeed.

My plea with the government is for them to see that the commission recommended by the committee is set up. I should like to see upon that commission a representative of the

Indian race chosen by the Indians themselves. Of recent years the Indians are beginning to organize, but they have been left illiterate. They were supposed to be trained. The educational system among our Indians has fallen down miserably. The evidence given by government officials shows that there were 12,000 Indians in Canada who had no opportunity of any education whatsoever. How can you make a race of people with the situation like that? Education is a fundamental and basic thing upon which we must build these people if we are to make anything at all of them. They are largely illiterate. They have no power or ability to speak for themselves. They do not understand organization. They have often been fooled and tricked, and they have no avenue of redress; as a result, they are sinking into hopelessness. There was plenty of evidence, however, that certain groups—and I am speaking of agencies such as the Caughnawaga, the Six Nations at Brantford, a few of the Blackfeet Indians in Alberta and some of the Haida Indians on the western coast—had been able to achieve some possibility of progress. Those Indians showed remarkable characteristics and remarkable ability.

Mr. MacNICOL: And the Moraviantown Indians.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Yes. The capacity is there, but the treatment of these Indians by the administrations of this country has been such as to keep them submerged and inferior. They are people with great possibilities.

My main theme is this: give these people a chance. Give them the ordinary fundamental human rights which should be allowed to every human being and you will be repaid a thousand-fold. The disgraceful conditions which have existed, and which exist today—even this very day—in spite of what has been done, are something of which Canadians cannot be proud. With some restoration of the ordinary rights of human beings, with some part in control and some responsibility with regard to the administration of their own affairs, even within their own little bands on their own reserves, and with some opportunity to train themselves, I am sure the results will be good. The Indians who have been taken off our reserves or who volunteered in the forces, and who went out and got proper medical care and proper food, made splendid records for themselves. However, when they come back to the reserves they find themselves relegated to positions of inferiority, and they deeply resent that.

I think it will also be found that when Canada made her treaties with the Indians she promised them certain rights with regard to natural resources in the areas of land of the dominion. But when the dominion handed over the natural resources to the provinces, the Indians' rights were forgotten. The provincial governments do not recognize responsibility toward the Indians; that is a federal affair. There is a division of authority. I will say this, though. There has been some promise since this committee was formed two years ago. There are signs that officers of the department are awakening. I think the acting minister, in carrying on the job for the Minister of Mines and Resources who is ill, is doing fine work, and is doing the best he can. It is not easy for an engineer to act as a wet nurse. and the job is somewhat strange to him. I hope he will carry these recommendations on to the minister who, we hope, will soon be restored to health. There is a great job to be done. The committee which brought these recommendations down did all that it could do. But the recommendations are not being acted upon. This house passed resolutions saying that they were willing to support a proposal that old age pensions should be given to Indians on the reserves. I have seen conditions among the old people on the reserves, in places like Norway House, which are a disgrace to any people. The aged, the infirm and the blind on our reserves are suffering inhuman treatment or lack of treatment. This condition must be remedied.

I hope that every hon. member of the House of Commons will read the reports of the joint committee of the House of Commons and Senate on the amendments to the Indian Act. A great deal of information has been obtained, and I want to thank a few of the newspapers across this country which have given of their space to tell the story of the Indians in Canada. A great deal is yet to be done, and I should like to have some report from the government as to whether or not they intend to set up this claims commission, and whether their plans are to give greater opportunity to the Indians to go out and make use of their capacities and abilities to further enrich Canada.

Mr. BROWN: I would not want to detract from the speech of the hon. member, because I think I would agree with most of it, but he said that treaties made with the Indians in times past have been broken. Will he not agree that, while that may have been so in some particulars, those treaties have been added to and replaced to a great extent, with the result that the Indian has been getting much more than was provided in the treaties?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: In some instances and under some treaties there have been some advantages; but I would say none of the advantages given the Indian in this way would recompense him for the loss he has suffered by being relegated to a position of inferiority. I suppose most of the treaties have been fulfilled to some extent, and many of them have been changed, but the thing the Indian does not like is the fact that he is placed in a position where he has no voice in regard to the changing of those conditions. Claims are settled without the Indian being consulted. Things are done with his lands, his reserves, without the Indian being asked. I referred to the fact that many of his rights were forgotten entirely when the natural resources of Canada were handed over to the provinces. At that time proper provision was not made for what he thought were his inherent rights under the treaties which he, as a poor savage, sighed with the sophisticated people who had everything on their side, including the fact that the treaties were in their language. Certainly the Indians of today have shown great willingness to come to an agreement with the government, and they are willing to help.

Mr. BROWN: Since you have stated there should be an Indian on the proposed claims commission, with which I heartily agree, in view of the fact that we have not been able to get the Indians at our committee meetings to agree among themselves as to who should represent them, could you tell us how we should go about getting them to agree on an Indian to represent them on the claims commission?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Yes, gladly. If some little effort had been made by the government and others to get the Indians of Canada organized I am quite sure their good judgment would bring out fine men. If in a few months most of the provinces can gather together and organize the Indians to choose representatives—

Mr. BROWN: Then would you tell me—

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Just wait till I finish.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. All questions must be addressed to the Chair. I do not think it helps matters when hon. members discuss these matters between themselves.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I quite agree, Mr. Chairman. I was just about to say that in those areas where the Indians were assisted in getting together and organizing they were able to choose satisfactory representatives to appear before the committee. I am quite sure that when all the Indians of Canada become organized so that they can speak with one voice, they will choose good men. Their ability to tell their story and the way they told it showed what the Indians of this country can do.

Mr. HARKNESS: I could probably stand here and talk for two or three hours on the wrongs and troubles of the Indians of Canada, but I had rather hoped that, in view of the deliberations of the joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Indian Act, we would have very little, if any, discussion this session on the estimates of the Indian department. Holding that view, I did not prepare, or anticipate making, any long speech on the Indian question. However I should like to say it seems to me that the joint committee now considering this matter is carrying out its work in a just, reasonable and impartial manner. As I say, I could speak for hours on the way I think the Indians have been ill-treated, but I believe, instead of getting into arguments, instead of discussing particular cases, instead of debating the general question of how the Indians have been treated, we should wait until the committee has finished its deliberations.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HARKNESS: I hear some hon. members on the government side saying "hear, hear", and apart from any other consideration, probably they are well advised in doing so, in view of the fact that the present government has been in power for some twenty odd years out of the last twenty-five. As a matter of fact, the Indian problem has been on our hands since confederation, and every government that has been in power in this country must bear a certain amount of responsibility for the fact that our Indians have not been well and reasonably treated. Under no circumstances should the Indian question get down to a party level, or the level of what this government has done, what that government has done, or what the other government has done. We should consider it on the basis of what will be best for the Indians and for Canada. Since the entire question is being fairly exhaustively considered at the present time by the joint committee, and since I believe it is anticipated their deliberations will continue next session, personally I would be in favour of passing the estimates of the Indian department at the present time and waiting for the results of the deliberations of the committee before embarking upon a debate which would more or less crystallize the views of the various groups in this parliament as far as the Indians are concerned.

Mr. MacNICOL: I had not intended saying anything on this matter, because the committee has not yet formulated its recommendations or revised the Indian Act, and I consider it premature to deal with what may be proposed to be done. However I am happy that the department is increasing the amount of these votes, particularly in the supplementaries. It is the first occasion for some time that this has been done, and I am glad to say the present Minister of Mines and Resources, the hon. member for Marquette, who is away because of illness, has been very sympathetic to the matter of improving the lot of the Indians. I say humbly that I was one who, more than ten years ago, or perhaps fifteen years ago—and I do not know anyone else who did—after making many surveys of Indian reservations myself, suggested that we set up a royal commission to investigate the whole problem of Indian administration. However, that did not take place. Indeed, nothing happened along that line until the present minister took office, at which time an attempt was made to improve the lot of the Indians by setting up the Indian Act committee.

I am not going to say anything about the work of the committee, because in my judgment it would be premature to do so at the present time. However I am pleased to see an increase in the estimates for this purpose, and I am hopeful that next year we shall see results, and that at the next session the act may be revised and a full programme set out for the benefit of the Indians. At that time I shall have something further to say about Indian affairs.

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): May I associate myself with what has been said by the hon. member for Yorkton. The past history of our treatment of Indians does not make good reading. I believe we may accept the fact that today we are making efforts to do something better for them.

As one who has spoken on the same subject in the house before, and as one who has spent some years on Indian reserves, I should not like the impression to go out from the committee that all who have had anything to do with Indians in the past have sought to exploit them or to cause their downfall. Rather I would pay tribute to many hundreds of fine men and women of all Christian denominations who have spent many of the best years of their lives in seeking to improve the lives of the Canadian Indians. I feel that much has been accomplished by these people, and that, as a result of the fine work done on many of those reserves, we have cause to look forward to the future with great hope.

May I also express my appreciation of the work done by the joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons in regard to this matter of revising the Indian Act. I am sorry I was not privileged to be a member of the committee, but I have followed its work with interest. Like many thousands of others, I am waiting for the official report of the committee to see what improvements will be made in the Indian Act and what sort of future lies ahead of the Indian people.

Reference has been made to the outstanding ability shown by delegations from the east and the west before the committee. That exhibition of ability can be duplicated throughout the Indian population. Many of our Indians today are every bit as worthy of trust as are many of our white population, if we would only give the Indians the opportunity.

I should like to say something further about the development of native handicrafts, which perhaps might more properly be discussed under a later item. That is one phase of Indian life which should be fully developed. The Indians of Canada have developed some excellent handicrafts, and they should be perpetuated. It would be a great mistake to allow those handicrafts to die out. The time is ripe to give the younger people on the reserves training in the handicrafts of their fathers and mothers, so that these exhibitions of native skill may not be lost.

I hope that the work of the committee, which is being brought more closely to the attention of the people of Canada, may result in a new and better day for our Canadian Indians.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: How many teachers does the department employ in residential and day schools of Indians in Canada?

Mr. HOWE: The department employs more than 300 teachers in day schools. The churches employ the teachers in the residential schools, of which I believe there are about eighty. I cannot say how many teachers are employed per school, but I should think that would depend upon the size of the school.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: There has been some question as to whether the teachers are fully qualified and have certificates from the provinces in which they are employed. How many of these are qualified teachers, and how many hold Canadian qualifications? I understand that some have qualifications from the United Kingdom, and some from the United States. I was promised a break-down in committee, but I did not receive it.

Mr. HOWE: Some of the teachers are not fully qualified, but the department is striving to raise the standard. All we can do is to report progress and continue efforts in that direction.

Item agreed to.

Immigration branch—

185. Administration of the Immigration Act and the Chinese Immigration Act, $277,423.

Mr. MacINNIS: I should like to speak briefly about contracts entered into by employers with persons from displaced persons camps. Some time ago I placed a question on the order paper. It was later passed as an order for return, and I received the return yesterday. I find that a large number of companies have made application for persons from displaced persons camps. The return before me shows applications from thirty-eight different companies. The Canadian lumber industry has made applications on behalf of fifteen companies.

I wish to refer particularly to a contract set out in another return tabled this morning. This form of contract is that of the Great Lakes Paper Company with the individual displaced persons who will be taken to Canada. I regret very much that in industries where there are labour organizations which have agreements with employers, no effort has been made to get the employers and trade unions together with respect to these contracts. I am satisfied that the method followed will not result either in good relationships between the persons brought in and the company, or in good relationships with other employees of the company.

The agreement I have before me is between the Great Lakes Paper Company Limited of Fort William, which in the agreement is named as the employer—and then there is a place for the name of the individual employee. The first section in the agreement reads:

1. The employer agrees to employ the employee in lumbering, pulpwood or logging work for a period of ten months to run from the date the employee begins work on the operations of the employer.

I do not believe that an agreement should be made for as short a period as ten months. If you are only going to make an agreement for ten months you may just as well bring these people here and let them find their own employment. An employee who has worked for only ten months will not have earned any benefits under the Unemployment Insurance Act, and if his employment terminates at that time he will not be eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits. A contract should not be made for less than two years, and any employer who cannot guarantee work for two years should not apply for people of this kind.

Mr. HOWE: In the case of the Dionne labour my hon. friend's leader said that a contract for two years represented slavery. It is hard to satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. MacINNIS: It is not hard to satisfy either my leader or myself. When the leader of our party was referring to the Dionne case he was referring ot the terms of the contract, not to the period of the contract.

Mr. McILRAITH: To the time.

Mr. MacINNIS: That was the objection there. I am objecting to contracts in any event, because bringing contract labour to this country is contrary to our laws, but if we are to have contract labour the period of employment should be longer than ten months. The second section reads:

2. The employer agrees to pay wages to the employee during the currency of this agreement at the rate and in the manner prevailing in the locality for comparable classifications of employment.

If organized labour in the industry has an agreement with the employer, then the terms in the contract providing for wages and conditions of work should be those provided by that agreement. As far as I know, the employees in all these industries are organized, but there may be some where they are not. Wherever they are organized there are agreements. The wages paid under such agreements and those paid in industries where labour is unorganized may not be the same. Under this agreement the employer is not bound to pay the wages in effect in his own industry. He agrees to pay the prevailing wages in the locality. If there is a difference between the wages paid in the industry and the rates in the locality you are going to have immediate conflict.

I regret exceedingly that the government did not insist that representatives of the workers in industries where they are organized are associated with the agreement. If we are to bring these people here they should be brought in on a basis where there will not be exploitation, or at least where the exploitation will be kept to a minimum.

I remember what happened in this country after the first world war. When labour was scarce during the war the workers in the lumber industry were able to organize and to improve their conditions of work which had been very bad. When the war ended, employers took advantage of the situation that developed. Even though their camps were

not operating, when they found that workers were being taken from all parts of Canada to the harvest fields in the west they made application to the labour exchanges for workers for their lumber camps. Of course there were no workers available, and then they asked permission to bring in workers from Europe. Workers came in from Europe and, not knowing the conditions in the industry, they were used to destroy conditions that had been built up with a great deal of effort.

I do not want the country to go through the same process again, because it does not make for good labour relations. It does not make for peace in the industry, and it does not make for good relations as between unorganized and organized workers in the same industry. I should like the Acting Minister of Mines and Resources and the Minister of Labour, who, I believe, has been consulted in this matter, to get together and, wherever possible, insist that there be some contact between the organized workers in the industry and the employers, should any arrangements of this kind be made in the future.

Item agreed to.

Immigration branch—

187. Field and inspectional service abroad, $351,595.

Mr. FULTON: This matter has been mentioned several times, so that I shall not speak about it tonight, but I should like the minister to give a specific answer to this question: When will it be possible to investigate cases of people who are now classified as enemy aliens in order to determine whether they are really enemy aliens? I referred to a case of this kind this afternoon. This man used to reside in Roumania and his family was put in a concentration camp where some of them were killed. He is now a Canadian and wants to bring them to this country, but they are classified as enemy aliens. Obviously they were not, because it was thought necessary by the enemy to put them in this camp. When I asked an explanation of the department all they could say is that they have not found it possible to establish an inspectional staff. When can these people hope to be able to enter Canada?

Mr. HOWE: The department is continually faced with the problem of getting in touch with these persons. The rule is that if the person in question was opposed to the enemy government he is admissible, provided that he can get to a place where the department can function. Nothing can be done as far as real enemy aliens are concerned until they cease to be enemy aliens. I presume that, after the peace treaties are signed and ratifications are exchanged, the government will no longer regard them as enemy aliens. In the meantime it is necessary for a man of an enemy country to prove that he was opposed to an enemy government in order to be admissible at this time.

Mr. FULTON: Is any procedure laid down governing these cases?

Mr. HOWE: Each case is judged on its merits. The investigation is in the hands of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who have their contacts in these countries. If it can be shown in an individual case that a family was killed off because of resistance to an enemy power, the man would be admitted. The onus of proof is on the man to show that he was not an enemy alien. If he had lived in an enemy country the presumption would be that he was an enemy alien. If he can prove otherwise he is admissible.

Mr. FULTON: In Switzerland or in a country where there are no inspectional facilities at the moment, are people free to leave that country and go elsewhere where there are inspectional facilities and be examined there?

Mr. HOWE: It depends on the laws of their own country.

Mr. FULTON: But so far as Canada is concerned?

Mr. HOWE: Yes. If they turned up in Switzerland and could be examined there, and there was the necessary proof, they would be admitted to Canada. We inspect them wherever we find them.

Mr. HLYNKA: The minister disagreed with me on one point this afternoon and I told him I could substantiate my statement. I shall not take the time of the committee to read these articles but would refer the minister to the issues of the *New Leader,* published in the United States, of December 21, 1946, containing, on page 3, an article by Martin Davidson; November 9, 1946, page 2, containing an article by Liston M. Oak; and April 19, 1947, containing another article on page 6. If the minister would care to read these articles he would find there was ground for the statement which I made.

Mr. HOWE: Many articles are written, but I have long since stopped accepting as truth every article. I should like to know more about the author and his sources of information before I would regard that as proof of my hon. friend's statement.

Mr. HLYNKA: I will let the minister read them, and then he can say whether he agrees with me or not.

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): Item 184 provides for a grant of $100,000 for additional services for the Indians in British Columbia. In what year was that grant first made?

Mr. HOWE: It was first made in 1926 or 1927.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: I grant that the subject of immigration has been thoroughly discussed today and on other occasions in the house. I simply want to say I listened with great interest to what was said this afternoon by the hon. member for Dauphin, and while I may be taking some risk because he sits opposite to me in this house I should like to say that I am in substantial agreement with the remarks he made. We should try to reconcile the moves that are made under industrial orders in council with the applications that have been made by Canadians for the entry to Canada of their relatives, and I hope that the representatives of the immigration branch will take to heart what the hon. member for Dauphin said. Some certificate or document should be placed in the hands of relatives of Canadians who reside in displaced persons camps, so that when some shipping movement is made such as was made in the past for Polish soldiers, and as will be made in the future for industrial workers, these relatives of Canadians would get some preference over others in the camps in that they are related to Canadians.

If I might have the permission of the committee, I should like to say, with respect to item 185, that I personally have the feeling that there is something inequitable in the rigidity of the present order in council which says that the child in China of a Canadian citizen must be under the age of eighteen to be admitted to Canada. I know that this subject has been debated thoroughly in the house, and I have a great deal of sympathy for the arguments that have been presented pro and con, and I feel that all arguments of humanity are against the rigidity which says you should divide a family, when, for instance, an unmarried daughter nineteen years of age is refused admission to Canada to join her father in this country and an unmarried daughter under eighteen may be admitted. I want to lodge my protest against this order fixed as it is. I think the humane attitude would be that the department should amend the order in council at least to give discretion to the officials to admit the unmarried daughter of a Canadian citizen from China to Canada.

Mr. HARKNESS: I regret to say that, owing to the abounding hospitality of the press gallery, I was not in the house when item 155 was called, and with the consent of the committee I should like to revert to that item for a few minutes to make what, I think, will be a few constructive suggestions. The vote is for the national parks bureau.

Mr. HOWE: We passed that vote hours ago. I do not think that every time a member wanders into the chamber we can go back and discuss items passed two or three hours ago. We shall never make progress in that way.

Mr. HARKNESS: I could take it up on the supplementaries.

Mr. HOWE: That would be the best way. If every man has the chance of going back we shall never get finished.

Mr. HARKNESS: If I have not consent I shall not discuss it now.

The CHAIRMAN: Did the hon. member intend to speak at length?

Mr. HARKNESS: Only very shortly.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the desire of the committee that he should proceed now?

Mr. HOWE: Very well.

Mr. HARKNESS: The prosecution of anything in the nature of a national parks policy has been altogether without imagination. I am not reflecting on this government; I am reflecting on the entire policy as it has been carried on by all governments. I do not think it is due to the permanent officials. I am sure they would be delighted to make our parks the best in the world. What I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, is that the department, either as a government enterprise or in conjunction with private individuals, many of whom would be only too anxious to cooperate, should provide in our national parks—I refer particularly to Banff, Jasper, and Waterton, which I know best—accommodation which the ordinary citizen could afford to occupy. The unfortunate fact is that our so-called national playgrounds are not within the reach of the purse of the ordinary citizen of this country. The existence at Banff, at Jasper and at lake Louise of luxury hotels is an excellent thing and is bringing a lot of United States tourist money into this country. At the same time, in these parks we should have accommodation which would be within the reach of all our citizens. I have spoken on this matter before in the

house. The solution of it is so easy that I am sorry it has not been reached before.

When I was in Yellowstone national park the year before the war broke out, in 1938, I saw there large numbers of what might be called tourist cabins, accommodation to the lowest purse, composed of slabs of trees sawn off and made into cabins, with a covered space for a man to put his car underneath and with practically nothing in them except a bed without, of course, any bedding on it. You could rent these for seventy-five cents a night. This meant that almost any individual could go to Yellowstone national park with his family and rent one or two, or whatever his requirements were, of these, and the price was within his reach. Unfortunately, in our national parks we have nothing along that line. I would seriously suggest to the acting minister that steps be taken immediately to build in our national parks something comparable with the sort of thing I have described, which existed as long ago as 1938 in Yellowstone park in the United States, so that people of moderate means who wished to spend their holiday in these parks would be able to get accommodation within their reach.

The greatest weakness in our national parks is that there does not exist in them accommodation at a reasonable and cheap rate, so that our own people could go there and enjoy the beauties and the pleasures of these playgrounds. Personally I feel very strongly about this. I think our parks are the best in the world. I do not think any country has anything which can even approach Banff, Jasper and Waterton national parks. We have an asset there, the value of which the great majority of our people do not realize. At least we should take these minimum steps to make it available to our own people.

The second thing I should like to bring out in order to develop these parks, to get a large amount of tourist traffic from our own people and from the people of the United States, a long series of riding and hiking trails should be constructed for the summer time. It would not cost much money and it would produce a great deal of added interest and traffic to the parks. So far as winter is concerned, many of these same trails could be used as ski trails. In addition, there needs to be built a considerable number of ski trails which will take advantage of the high hills and the long continued snow which lasts in a large area of these national parks until well on into May and June. That also would attract a large number of skiers. Nearly everyone will recognize that skiing is a constantly increasing popular sport, and the development of these parks as skiing grounds would mean a large increase in the winter tourist traffic to this country. At the present time our tourist traffic is almost entirely summer traffic. If we could develop in Canada skiing resorts to which people could go without having to spend too much money—and Canada has certainly some of the best skiing country in the world—we would help the entire national economy. I would ask the acting minister and this branch of the Department of Mines and Resources to give the most earnest consideration to carrying out these two suggestions, cheaper accommodation the year around in the parks, and the provision of hiking and trail riding facilities in the summer and skiing trails in the winter, which will bring people to our parks.

Item agreed to.

Lands, parks and forests branch—
National parks bureau—
769. National parks and historic sites services —further amount required, $600,000.

Mr. FULTON: Earlier this evening I was asking the minister about the road programme in the national parks. I should like to observe here that for the whole of this session I have had a resolution standing on the order paper with regard to a trans-Canada highways programme on the part of the federal government, or rather the desirability of developing such a programme. Opportunity has not been given to discuss it at this session. I felt that possibly a place would be found for it in the estimates of the Department of Transport, but the particular roads that I am interested in tie in very closely with Glacier national park and Jasper national park. The roads to these parks are the two main parts of the two main trans-Canada highways. While I realize that under the national park system we cannot expect to have a complete road built, still I think that at least that part of it running through the national parks should be brought up to a first-class highway standard. The boards of trade throughout British Columbia are particularly interested in getting the northern trans-Canada road built, one that should be an extension of the Jasper park road. Can the minister say that under this item any work is to be done on what is commonly called the Jasper Blue River road?

Mr. HOWE: No, there is nothing under that. There is a $200,000 item in the amount for completing the gap in the Banff-Winder-

mere highway, about seventy miles. That is not hard surfaced. The item is made up as follows:

Salaries and proficiency allowances ...	$14,480
Undelivered mechanical equipment ...	257,220
Banff-Windermere highway	200,000
Banff water and sewer system	37,000
Jasper, extension sewer system	19,000
Kootenay, replacement water pipeline	15,000
Banff water system for fish hatchery ..	10,000
Cape Breton, R.C.M.P. quarters	18,000
Prince Albert, Spruce River bridge ...	11,300
Riding Mountain, R.C.M.P. quarters ..	18,000
Total	$600,000

Mr. FULTON: Is any consideration being given, or any active survey under way, in regard to the extension of these roads; for instance, the portion of the Big Bend highway which runs from Glacier national park? According to the items listed by the minister, nothing is being done this year. Is the department working on anything for next year?

Mr. HOWE: I am told that plans are being prepared.

Mr. FULTON: Can the minister give us any indication what they are?

Mr. HOWE: Plans are being worked on for the Blue River highway and various other highways.

Mr. FULTON: Probably, if the interested boards of trade were to write to the department they might be able to obtain the details on that score.

Mr. HOWE: Nothing can be started at this time of the season. We are in July. I would say if they held their fire until about November, the department will be in a better position to consider these for next year's estimates.

Mr. FULTON: I will write a letter.

Item agreed to.

Surveys and engineering branch—

773. Compilation and printing of electoral maps required under the redistribution bill, $13,500.

Mr. FULTON: The bill has not yet been carried.

Mr. HOWE: That may be so, but the maps have to be prepared and we have to have the money in advance; no money, no preparation. It would be most unfortunate for us if this redistribution bill were carried and the department had no money to print the maps. We should have to hold off the election for another year, which my hon. friends would not like.

Mr. FULTON: It would be more unfortunate if the maps were printed and if the redistribution bill did not go through.

Item agreed to.

Indian affairs branch—
Welfare and training—

776. Welfare of Indians—further amount required, $141,500.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I should just like to raise one point. I was on a visit up in my own constituency in the Kispiox valley outside of Hazelton, and it was pointed out to me that there is a mile of road on the Indian reserve in such shape that the Indians could not get either in or out. Has any amount been allocated for the fixing of that road?

Mr. HOWE: What is the name?

Mr. ARCHIBALD: In the Kispiox valley. I am not certain whether it is the Kispiox reserve.

Mr. HOWE: I do not think the reserve is called that.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I am sorry that I have not the name of the reserve in mind.

Item agreed to.

Indian affairs branch—

780. To provide for payment to the Indian trust fund, Gibson band, Parry Sound Indian agency, Ontario, for the amount of cash stolen from Indian agent, $1,214.

Mr. FRASER: Is the department in the insurance business? I notice that this is to take care of an amount of cash stolen from the Indian agent.

Mr. HOWE: The department is custodian of the band's funds. If an agent of the department is robbed, my hon. friend would not suggest that the Indians should stand the loss, would he?

Mr. FRASER: No, but I would think he would be bonded.

Mr. HOWE: He did not steal it; he was robbed. He could be bonded against dishonesty, but he would not be bonded against theft from his person.

Mr. FRASER: That is right, too.

Item agreed to.

Indian affairs branch—

781. To reimburse the James Smith band account (No. 293), Duck Lake Indian agency, Saskatchewan, for sums paid as salaries to farming instructors, which should have been charged to parliamentary appropriations, $9,612.99.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I should like to understand item 781 a little bit better.

Mr. HOWE: Back in 1921 I am told that the department used funds of the band to pay farming instructors, whereas it was the practice elsewhere to pay farming instructors from government funds.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): What is the band?

Mr. HOWE: The Indian tribe. The Indian tribes have funds. This is a festering grievance which has been going on for twenty-five years.

Mr. HACKETT: Are we paying interest on the grievance?

Mr. HOWE: I could not say.

Mr. HACKETT: Why should this have been charged to a parliamentary appropriation?

Mr. HOWE: Justice ruled that the department had no right to spend the funds of the tribe for that purpose. The only other place you can get funds that I know of is from parliamentary appropriations.

Item agreed to.

Immigration branch—

782. Administration of the Immigration Act and the Chinese Immigration Act—further amount required, $34,730.

Mr. FULTON: I am going to ask a question which is common to many of these items. It simply states "further amount required" for administration. When we turn up the details on page 31 of the estimates we find that simply two items are shown, permanent salaries and temporary assistance. Why is a further amount required? Is that something which was not foreseen, or have increased numbers of personnel been taken on? If so, why was that not foreseen?

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend will recall that, whereas these estimates were made up last February, since then the Chinese Immigration Act has been repealed and the department has had to deal with the wives of Chinese residents of this country. That called for more staff and, therefore, more expenditure.

Mr. FULTON: Has the minister the details as to the number of extra staff?

Mr. HOWE: Yes. Permanent salaries, $13,920; temporary salaries, $20,810. It calls for a head clerk, Mr. E. A. Butler; another head clerk, Miss E. A. O'Connor; four principal clerks, appointments pending. That accounts for the $13,920. Then the temporaries are: three administrative officers, grade 2, administrative officer, grade 2; six clerks, grade 4; two stenographers, grade 3. None of the appointments have been made.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF RECONSTRUCTION AND SUPPLY

349. Dominion fuel board—administration and investigations, $38,004.

Mr. FRASER: I think the minister should make a statement in regard to the fuel situation at the present time. They are taking on fuel oil now, are they?

Mr. HOWE: No. We have made provision for a dominion coal board, which has not yet been appointed. This is the dominion fuel board, which has been carrying on since 1921.

Mr. FRASER: They are not taking on fuel oil?

Mr. HOWE: They will be absorbed by the dominion coal board when it is appointed, and the dominion coal board will be responsible for both coal and fuel oil.

Mr. HACKETT: To what extent were the functions of this board taken over by some agency set up during the war?

Mr. HOWE: The dominion fuel board formerly functioned in the Department of Mines and Resources. Early in the war, I think in 1940, a coal administrator was appointed by the wartime prices and trade board, in the person of Mr. James Stewart of Halifax. He acquired his staff in part by taking over the staff of the dominion fuel board, who were seconded from the Department of Mines and Resources to the wartime prices and trade board. A year later it was found that the problems with which the coal administrator was dealing had much more to do with supply than with distribution. At that time the work was transferred to the Department of Munitions and Supply and the coal administrator was replaced by a coal controller, while the dominion fuel board continued to function as an element of coal control. The fuel board is still functioning in the Department of Reconstruction and Supply. I presume it will be merged with the coal board, which ultimately will be administered by the Department of Mines and Resources.

Mr. HACKETT: Is the fuel controller still in office?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. HACKETT: Who has replaced him?

Mr. HOWE: Fuel control was abolished on December 31, 1946.

Mr. HACKETT: I wanted to have just a word in regard to fuel, coal and oil, because there is some uncertainty as to our supplies for the winter and people are being advised to purchase their fuel as early as possible. Would the minister say who is in charge at the moment?

Mr. HOWE: Well, Mr. Chairman, private enterprise is running free—

Mr. HACKETT: That is good.

Mr. HOWE: —just as it did before the war. In other words, if private enterprise brings in enough fuel and distributes it well, everyone will be protected. If not, there is no agency of government this year to protect the public, as there has been in previous years.

Mr. HACKETT: Then what is this $4,500,000 for?

Mr. HOWE: That is the provision for subventions. As my hon. friend knows, a subvention policy for moving coal has been in force since 1921. This amount of $4,500,000 is the vote that has been standard for several years, though last year the expenditures amounted to only about $1,500,000. It depends upon the amount of coal mined and the distance it has to be transported.

Mr. HACKETT: That applies to coal mined in the west as well as the east?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): What was the amount actually expended last year?

Mr. HOWE: The expenditure was $1,550,000.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Do I correctly understand that that was the amount expended out of $4,500,000 in the estimates?

Mr. HOWE: Yes. The sum of $4,500,000 has been the vote in normal times, and it was carried during the war as a standard provision. Throughout the war, however, use of the coal in the locality in which it was mined cut down the requirements, with the result that during those years the subvention vote was not completely used. As my hon. friend knows, the subvention is to pay transportation costs on coal.

Mr. MacINNIS: If I understood the minister aright a moment ago, in replying to a question asked by the hon. member for Stanstead he said that in the matter of coal and oil for fuel, private enterprise was running free, and that the public did not have any protection unless private enterprise protected it, or something to that effect. Some time ago in the house the minister made a statement warning the country of the danger of a fuel shortage next winter, and saying there was a guarantee of only sufficient fuel for those who now had contracts with oil suppliers. Since that time I have noticed that certain firms have been advertising the installation of oil burners. Perhaps all the people of Canada who wanted to instal oil burners did not hear the minister's statement in the house or read of it in the newspapers. Was anything done to see that oil burners were not installed in homes when there was no hope of getting fuel oil for next winter?

Mr. HOWE: Every fuel dealer in the country was circularized by the department. The statement I made in the house was distributed as widely as we could distribute it. I am sure no reputable oil company was a party to selling oil burners if there was not a supply of oil. Some oil burners were imported from outside the country and sold in Canada, in spite of all the warnings we could give. It is quite beyond the power of the government to protect people who will not be protected. We could only tell them the story, and then, if they insisted on buying, there was nothing we could do about the matter.

Mr. MacINNIS: I was referring particularly to advertisements appearing in the Ottawa newspapers since that statement was made. I do not know whether these were reputable firms, but the advertisements were there.

Mr. HOWE: It is possible that a dealer with a firm contract had reserve oil he could supply. That is not beyond the bounds of possibility; but certainly the government did all it could to warn the people of the danger they were running.

Mr. HARKNESS: I should like to ask one down-to-earth question on this item. Are the nine individuals I see listed as employees of the dominion fuel board to be taken over as employees of the dominion coal board when it assumes its obligations; and, if so, what is to be their position under the civil service regulations?

Mr. HOWE: They are protected under the legislation. As to whether or not they will be taken over, I will give the stock answer, that government policy will be made known in due course. I do not think that is a proper question.

Mr. HARKNESS: I do not think this stock answer that government policy will be made known in due course is a very good answer.

As a matter of fact, I have become sick of hearing it. Rather than give that answer, I think the minister would have much more success in getting his estimates through and in satisfying the committee if he would give a reasonably definite answer.

Mr. HOWE: I am doing all right.

Item agreed to.

National research council—

351. Salaries and other expenses of the national research council, $6,043,002.

Mr. GREEN: Last year we made some important amendments to the act which sets up the national research council. What is the position at the present time? For example, can the minister say whether or not any crown companies have been set up by the research council, and, if so, what those companies are? As I remember it, authority was given the research council to set up these crown companies. Has that authority been used?

Mr. HOWE: No crown company has been established. We are working on the legislation for the crown company to own and commercialize patents owned or discovered by the government. On account of the officers of the research council being busy in other directions the work is not as far advanced as we should like. But the answer to my hon. friend is that no corporations have been established.

Mr. GREEN: It is the intention to set up a crown company to handle patents owned by the dominion?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Does the minister not think it would be wise to bring in a statute making provision for such a company, rather than having it a subsidiary of the national research council? I should think a company which is to commercialize patents—and that is the word the minister used—would be entering a new sphere for Canada, and that would merit some consideration in the house.

Mr. HOWE: This is not a new sphere. The research council does commercialize patents today. It has considerable income from patents which have been patented by the national research council itself. I believe it amounts to $25,000 a year. There are in the patent office today some 3,000 German patents which should be exploited. Some of them are valuable, and some are not. But they are simply lying in the patent office. Unless someone comes in, works his way through them and finds out what is valuable and what is not, they are not likely to be of value. In addition, patents are taken out by universities in the United States. It is customary for universities to turn patents in to be exploited by the corporation which exploits patents in that country. Another reason for the corporation is that it is the custom of the United States government to exploit American patents in the United States, but to turn their exploratory efforts in other countries to government agents in those countries, provided that there are such agencies.

I see every reason for having an agency of this kind. Indeed, I think we have been late in setting up our machinery. I can see no possible harm in it. If we are to exploit government-owned patents we might as well exploit them efficiently, rather than in a casual way.

Mr. GREEN: That is true.

Mr. HACKETT: In the making of rubber have there been patents?

Mr. HOWE: Rubber is in a somewhat peculiar position. All the patents on rubber are pooled by the manufacturers in Canada and the United States. In the early days of the war it was necessary to effect the art of making rubber quickly; and by agreement under the sponsorship of the United States government everyone who held patents bearing on the manufacture of rubber put those patents in the pool. Canada was admitted to the pool, and the provision is that we must expend a certain amount each year in investigation and research, and turn in any patents we have to the pool.

Mr. HACKETT: What happens to the revenue?

Mr. HOWE: The patents are held for the industry itself. There is no charge. If you are a member of the pool you have the right to use all the patents. If, as a member of the pool, you discover a patent, by agreement that patent is turned into the pool, without recompense.

Mr. HACKETT: Were the patents to which the minister has referred, which might be held by the corporation which is to be or has been set up, the fruits of the efforts of the national research council?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): When the minister spoke about some 3,000 German patents lying in the patent office, and that unless somebody came along and looked them over we would not know what value they had—and I believe I have stated correctly what he said—I was wondering whether there was not some concerted plan to

deal with them. The impression I gained was that it was being left in abeyance at the present time.

Mr. HOWE: The plan to deal with them is to form a corporation with a competent staff to merchandise the valuable patents. They are simply there in the patent office, and if my hon. friend wishes to go there, search through these patents and exploit them, it would be possible. But in the hands of a competent staff certain patents could be offered to manufacturers who could probably use them to advantage, and the revenue would derive to the crown.

Mr. HACKETT: I should think the revenue would not go to the crown. Would it not go to that fund in respect of those who have claims against alien enemies?

Mr. HOWE: Possibly. But there is no doubt that these are practically all I.G. Farben patents, and I doubt very much if—

Mr. HACKETT: That is alien enemy property.

Mr. HOWE: Yes. And I doubt very much if the I. G. Farben Company will be returned to Germany.

Mr. ADAMSON: What about the Bayer patents?

Mr. HOWE: They are owned by the custodian of enemy alien property.

Mr. ADAMSON: He still has ownership of them?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: I understand that this crown company will check up on all the German-owned patents registered in the patent office, and then it will issue licences to private firms for the use of those patents; is that correct?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. HACKETT: I thought the minister said they would sell them.

Mr. GREEN: Sell them, or issue a licence.

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): It seems to me that there is not quite the same expedition in dealing with this matter to which we have been accustomed in the actions of the minister, especially during the war. The minister has talked as if it were something which should be done but which for a considerable number of months he has waited to do.

Mr. HOWE: A year ago I was full of enthusiasm; but, after listening to opinions from the opposition, I decided that possibly it would be a bad thing, so that I have been turning it over in my mind.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Oh, you cannot flatter us like that.

Mr. HOWE: But I have come to the conclusion it is all right.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I should like a serious answer to my question.

An hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. GREEN: No, it is not carried yet. We have further questions to ask.

Mr. HACKETT: While hon. members are thinking over their questions, may I ask one? Do I understand the minister to say that the corporation will endeavour to investigate these German patents and to realize upon them, and that the proceeds will go to the custodian of alien enemy property for division among those who have claims against alien enemy countries?

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HACKETT: Just a minute. We would like an answer.

Mr. HOWE: This would be an agency to exploit crown property. For example, in my time a valuable patent was worked out in the Department of Mines and Resources, one which returns, I believe, an income of something like $100,000 a year. It is being administered by the Department of Mines and Resources. The purpose would be that valuable patents of that kind would be dealt with by people skilled in the management of patents. Almost every country in the world except Canada has an organization of this kind. The United States agency has a tremendous income from patents discovered by the United States government.

Mr. HACKETT: I understand the answer by the minister with regard to patents which may be registered by Canadians, or other than alien enemies. But my question had to do with those 3,000 patents owned by Germans. I understood the minister to say that this corporation would investigate patents and bring them to sale. I asked him if it was the intention of the company, when these patents have been sold, to turn the funds over to the custodian of alien enemy property.

Mr. HOWE: The corporation would administer the patent and would charge for its services. The funds that came due would be

turned over to the custodian of alien enemy property to be administered according to the law, just as funds paid to a university would be handed over and then returned to the university.

Mr. WINTERS: I should like to say a word in support of the plea made earlier this session by the hon. member for Levis for higher salaries for engineer personnel of national research council. Generally speaking, these engineers are the equivalent of engineers to be found in industry, and possibly their general average ability is higher because the acceptance standards for employment are much higher. Salaries paid to engineers in industry have increased considerably, and in many cases the only thing that prevents engineers in the national research council from going to the United States or to other employment is a well developed sense of loyalty which most of us find it impossible to understand. I shall say no more at this stage other than to urge the minister to do everything he can to increase the salaries of engineer personnel at the national research council.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): I notice that this item is for well over $6,000,000. When discoveries are made in the research council and patents obtained—picrite would be an example—just what is done? Can the minister state whether the sale of the Welland plant included world rights or only Canadian rights to picrite?

Mr. HOWE: Picrite was not discovered in Canada; the formula came out of England. The continuous process for making it was developed here and was adopted by other countries. I do not know that anything was patentable in connection with picrite, but it was not the practice in war time to patent discoveries of that kind.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): Was there any correspondence with the British government in connection with turning over the rights to the American Cyanamid Company?

Mr. HOWE: There was nothing to turn over; the process for making picrite is well known.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): The minister's facetious answer to my question still makes me want a serious answer. He said that he had been full of enthusiasm about this thing a year ago, but that the arguments made on this side of the house had chilled him. Of course we appreciate that very much, but we do not take it seriously. Quite seriously, what I should like to know is this. The minister was keen on this a year ago, and for some reason which he has not yet given us he no longer believes in it. What is the reason it has not been gone ahead with?

Mr. HOWE: I wished to give no such impression. We had a lot of things to consider. The Chalk river plant came in and required the time of the senior staff. One or two staff appointments which we expected to be able to make did not develop, or at least we had to use the staff in another direction.

Mr. HACKETT: I may be dense, but I have not yet been able to understand if it is the function of the minister to sell German patents and then make over the proceeds to the custodian of alien enemy property.

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Will this crown company also handle inventions of employees of the national research council?

Mr. HOWE: Yes, all of them.

Mr. GREEN: I notice that $3,425,000, or over half the item, is for term appointments and temporary assistance. Can the minister explain how?

Mr. HOWE: Practically all scientific personnel are term appointments and would be classed as temporaries. A scientist usually does not start in the civil service and work his way up; it is not desirable that he should. If he intends to be a great scientist he should not stay too long in one place.

Mr. GREEN: Does that not put the scientist who is a civil servant in a bad position? There are many scientists in different departments who are permanent civil servants and who have excellent standing as scientists. I suggest that the minister's remark was unfair to them.

Mr. HOWE: It was not unfair to them at all. They have chosen to be civil servants; they have chosen to stay in one job for a long time or at least in one line of endeavour. Most young scientists, and I think the wiser young scientists, prefer to gather experience for a few years by changing occupations. I think that produces a better all-round scientist.

Mr. GREEN: There was some doubt last year as to how the plant at Chalk river would be operated. Will it be operated by the atomic energy control board, by the national research council or through some joint arrangement?

Mr. HOWE: It is being operated by the national research council for the atomic energy board. The atomic energy board have the

responsibility for the plant, but by arrangement they have turned over its operation to the national research council.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): In the details on pages 213 and 214 of the estimates there is a list of a staff of 101, the cost being $378,437. Then there is an item, term appointment and temporary assistance, $3,425,713. I suggest that we ought to have some general indication as to the nature of the work being carried on which is costing over $3,000,000 for salaries and wages. I am not asking for a lot of meticulous detail, but I suggest that the minister should give us some idea where that $3,425,713 is going?

Mr. HOWE: Only yesterday I tabled the annual report of the national research council, which specifies that work in great detail.

Item agreed to.

National research council—

352. Expanded research on the utilization of farm crops, $401,400.

Mr. CHARLTON: While we are increasing expenditures practically all the way across the board, it seems to me that this is a poor time to decrease this item.

Mr. HOWE: This is a complete revote. The appropriation was to build a scientific laboratory in Saskatoon. The vote last year was $587,000, and $185,600 was spent. There is now a revote of $401,400. In other words, they were not able to spend the money last year, and the rest of it is being provided this year.

Mr. CHARLTON: Is this department carrying on any research work in chemurgy outside of this one particular building?

Mr. HOWE: This was just a laboratory building.

Mr. CHARLTON: They are not carrying on any work at all?

Mr. HOWE: The national research council will use the building and staff it out of their ordinary vote. This item is simply to build the building in western Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON: The salaries of 101 employees amount to $378,437, which works out at an average that is out of line with other departments.

Mr. HOWE: Usually the criticism is the other way, that the research council does not pay salaries commensurate with those paid the rest of the service.

Mr. CHARLTON: I say that they are very much out of line with those of other departments.

Mr. HOWE: Too low or too high?

Mr. CHARLTON: I am not criticizing that they are too high. I simply say that the salaries are very much higher than the average paid in other departments.

Mr. HOWE: As a matter of fact, the salaries of the research council staff are not higher than for comparable positions in other departments.

Mr. CHARLTON: The average salary is $3,746 for 101 employees.

Mr. HOWE: What is the classification of those employed?

Mr. CHARLTON: That is the average salary.

Mr. HOWE: Including scientific workers.

Mr. CHARLTON: There are scientific workers in agriculture, and yet the average for that department would be around $2,000.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): Perhaps the minister was in the same doubt that I was whether the hon. member wanted to see the research council employees paid higher or lower salaries. Usually my hon. friends to my right are decrying government expenditures. I am not clear whether the hon. member thinks these employees are underpaid or not.

Being a farmer from the west end recognizing that in the west, particularly in the prairie provinces, we have a very unstable economy owing to fluctuations in prices and production, I should like to say a word on this item. It is to provide, in part, for a research building at Saskatoon for research on the utilization of farm crops. I am tremendously interested in the chemurgic use of agricultural products. I have recommended in this house on various occasions that it is essential that we plan for the ever-normal granary in the west and that when we have large stocks of wheat and feed grain on hand in times of so-called over production and surpluses, we should plan for the utilization of these surplus products for various chemurgic purposes. I would impress upon the minister that we should have both research and real planning, so that when we have these large volumes of wheat and other grains on the prairies our farmers will not once again have depressed prices but that, through planning, surplus products such as flax seed may be processed to make linseed oil and our wheat be processed for glyco and for turning out feed products. That would help to stabilize our economy. I think we should be spending even more money on this kind of thing, the chemurgic uses of wheat and other farm products.

Item agreed to.

VICTORIA

National research council—

353. Housing research and industrial chemistry building—preliminary explorations, plans and specifications, $100,000.

Mr. TIMMINS: Would the minister explain this item, which seems to be a new one? I was under the impression that housing research had been going on in the country and that last year certain men were sent abroad to study building methods in Sweden, and I also understood that we had a department of planning in respect of low-cost housing and apartment houses to be built in conjunction with municipalities.

Mr. HOWE: This is nothing to get excited about. It is just another laboratory building for chemical engineering research and housing research. It will cost $742,000, of which $100,000 is being voted this year to get the planning and perhaps the foundations under way. The remainder may be voted next year.

Mr. TIMMINS: Why housing research?

Mr. HOWE: Housing is just a name. Call it a laboratory. Every time my hon. friend sees the word "housing" he makes a speech.

Mr. TIMMINS: Because I am interested in the people of Canada who have not the kind of housing they should have.

Mr. HOWE: There are luscious items coming on which my hon. friend can discuss housing for two hours, as he probably will. But this is for a laboratory building.

Mr. TIMMINS: I am not going to speak on it for two hours or two minutes. I am just saying that it is a little late in the day to be preparing a building for housing research.

Mr. GREEN: This item has nothing to do with what we commonly consider the housing problem?

Mr. HOWE: It is for a research laboratory. In it will be housing research and chemical engineering research.

Mr. GREEN: Several different kinds of research are to be carried on in the building?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: What type of research in connection with housing is to be carried on?

Mr. HOWE: I suppose the conductivity of housing materials, strength of materials, substitutes for materials, heating, radiant heat and various innovations in housing. The purpose of the laboratory is to test their efficiency and recommend their use or otherwise.

Mr. GREEN: Is any progress being made in finding new materials and new methods of building homes?

[Mr. E. G. McCullough.]

Mr. HOWE: The methods are in the experimental stage. Nothing revolutionary has been introduced to date either here or elsewhere.

Mr. ADAMSON: Does the government recommend the standards of the American society for testing materials, and is this to be a structural materials laboratory?

Mr. HOWE: No, we have a structural materials laboratory here. This is to be a laboratory for testing building materials, conductivity, efficiency of heating and air conditioning, and everything to do with housing.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): In Saskatchewan we have set up laboratory tests and experiments along the line of using housing substitutes rather than the orthodox housing materials. Can the minister say whether anything really constructive has been done under this item, and whether or not we as members of parliament may receive information on the results?

Mr. HOWE: I shall be glad to send my hon. friend a pamphlet that is issued by the national research council on this subject. The pamphlet is issued and broadcast to all interested parties. The department puts out a publication each week.

Mr. TIMMINS: Is it a fact that in respect of building material and building methods some officials were sent overseas either last spring or fall to study building methods in Sweden or in England? Does that tie in, in any way, with this particular item of a building for housing research?

Mr. HOWE: I know of no officials who were sent over for that purpose. There may have been officials go over; but all the literature from every country in the world pours into the national research council. For instance, there is a complete exchange of research of that type with the United States, and I am sure there is an exchange with Sweden and also with the United Kingdom.

Mr. TIMMINS: I had reference to a specific mission. I am wrong in that?

Mr. HOWE: I think so.

Mr. FLEMING: I think we are all believers in research; we should be, but we want to make sure that the research is not a duplication of anything else. Some of the type of research work the minister referred to is carried on by the Ontario research foundation. What assurance can the minister give us that there is close liaison between the type of research that is being done in the Ontario research foundation and the work referred to

here to make sure that there is no unnecessary duplication? I know something about the considerable amount of research work done on heating materials by the Ontario research foundation, and other work of the kind to which the minister referred. Can we have some assurance that there is no duplication on the part of the two research agencies?

Mr. HOWE: The national research council maintains a man in Washington solely for the purpose of avoiding duplication. The business of the man in Washington is to know exactly what is going on in research so as to advise the council whenever there is danger of overlapping or duplication. The closest possible liaison is maintained, not only between Canada and the United States, but between Canada and the United Kingdom and, I dare say, with Ontario as well.

Mr. FLEMING: What about the Ontario research foundation to which I have referred?

Mr. HOWE: There is a complete exchange of information.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): Can the minister say whether or not there is any liaison or cooperation between this research and the work being undertaken by the province of Saskatchewan?

Mr. HOWE: The national research council is the coordinating agency for all the work of the provinces. The national research council has been carrying on experimentation for many years along the lines suggested by my hon. friend. If he wishes the process for making glycol out of wheat he has only to ask the national research council for a formula on the subject and he can obtain the information. The plant built by the Saskatchewan pool at Saskatoon for manufacturing glycol from wheat and from various other processes was all developed from data in the national research council here in Ottawa. I used to receive calls from the agencies of the Saskatchewan pool to discuss the matter with them. I know they obtained their information from the national research council. The laboratory at Saskatoon will be manned by the national research council.

Item agreed to.

National research council—

354. Grant to the Royal Society of Canada, $4.500.

Mr. ADAMSON: I am not disapproving the grant to the Royal Society of Canada. They do excellent work. I know of the lectures they provide and the information service which they supply, but I should like a little further information as to the reasons for this grant and what it is being used for.

Mr. HOWE: This grant has been in the estimates of the national research council for at least the last ten years. I understand that it is by arrangement between the council and the society.

Mr. ADAMSON: I know it is an old grant, but I should like to know whether the royal society uses it for travelling expenses, lectures, or a definite work of any kind.

Mr. HOWE: I think it is just a sustaining grant which goes into the general funds.

Mr. HACKETT: Will the minister say whether this is the only grant?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. HACKETT: I think another grant is made by the government to the royal society. Possibly the minister can say this is the only one he knows of.

Mr. HOWE: This is the only one I know of.

Mr. MacINNIS: The hon. member for York West said that the society does a useful work. I shall display my ignorance and ask what work it does. Unless I get an answer, I shall remain in ignorance, which will not be good for the committee or myself.

Mr. HOWE: All I can say is that the members of the royal society are the most distinguished scientists of Canada. They publish papers. It is considered the highest honour that can come to a scientist to be appointed to the royal society. I believe it is worth while as a forum and for the recognition of scientists in general.

Mr. HACKETT: The royal society's interest extends beyond what is properly known as science. I think it goes into art, music, literature and the whole sphere of cultural life.

Mr. ADAMSON: I know it gives lectures in Toronto every so often on scientific and research effort. I should like to know what else it does.

Item agreed to.

Atomic energy control board—

355. Administration expenses, $115,000.

Mr. GREEN: I have some questions to ask on this item.

Mr. KNOWLES: I suggest that we call it eleven o'clock, which would not be too far from the truth.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Saturday, July 12, 1947

The house met at eleven o'clock.

PARLIAMENT HILL

REGULATION OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING

Hon. ALPHONSE FOURNIER (Minister of Public Works): On June 9 two hon. members of the house complained of traffic conditions on parliament hill. The hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth) put the following question:

I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works if something cannot be done to stop cars from speeding around the parliament buildings and on the roads leading to the gates of the parliament buildings.

The leader of the C.C.F. group (Mr. Coldwell) added this:

May I ask the Minister of Public Works if he will at the same time take into consideration the strengthening of the hands of the mounted police who look after the automobiles around this building.

At that time I replied that some doubt had been raised as to the authority of the mounted police to enforce these regulations, and said I would submit this question to the justice department. The question was studied by the Department of Justice and yesterday I received their opinion, which reads as follows:

With reference to the act to provide for the regulation of vehicular traffic on dominion property. I have come to the conclusion and so advise that this extends and applies to the roadways situated on parliament hill. An examination of the authorities persuades me now that the courts would be obliged to hold that these roadways have not been dedicated as public highways. Consequently it is not necessary to amend the statute.

Following this advice I may state that it is the intention of the government to enforce these regulations. We hope all hon. members and officials of the government will cooperate with the police so they may carry out their duties. We have had quite a bit of trouble in the last two or three months, but I hope this announcement that we will enforce these regulations will reestablish satisfactory conditions on the hill.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Eleventh report of standing committee on banking and commerce.—Mr. Cleaver.

Third and fourth reports of standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.— Mr. Maybank.

Third and fourth reports of standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.—Mr Maybank.

[Mr. Knowles.]

INCOME TAX ACT

GENERAL REVISION APPLICABLE TO 1948 AND SUBSEQUENT TAXATION YEARS

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 454, respecting income taxes.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in my budget speech some weeks ago I expressed the hope that I would be able to place before the house this session a revision of the income tax law.

It is, perhaps, unnecessary for me to repeat that it is not the intention of the government to press this bill for enactment at the present session. Nor, indeed, is it my wish to invite debate on the measure at this time. The purpose of introducing the bill now is to give members full opportunity to study it before next session, to explore thoroughly various aspects of the legislation, and to be in a position to give parliament the benefit of their views when the bill is presented for enactment next session.

It is hoped that this bill will receive wide circulation in the hands of the public. Various organizations throughout the country, such as the Canadian Bar Association, the Dominion Association of Chartered Accountants, and the Canadian Tax Foundation, are well equipped from the technical point of view to render a useful service to the country through an exhaustive analysis of this legislation. I can assure all interested groups that suggestions for improvement in the statute will be welcomed and given careful study by the government.

A bill of this kind is, of course, definitely non-political. I think all parties agree that we must have an income tax. We are unanimous in our desire to see the best possible law on our statute books. All agree that we should strive for simplicity and certainty. The law should lend itself to efficient administration. We are, I think, all on common ground in seeking these objectives. Once the best possible instrument has been forged, it then, of course, becomes a political matter as to how far the instrument will be used as a revenue measure and how the total burden imposed by it will be distributed among taxpayers.

It is not my intention to delay the business of the house at this time with a detailed account of how the new bill differs from the present Act. I think, however, it might be helpful if I briefly indicated the general plan of the revision, giving some of the highlights of the new measure, and pointing out certain methods used to secure greater simplicity and directness. To assist in getting a picture of the new arrangement of the law I have had

a comprehensive table of contents prepared and inserted at the beginning of the bill. Also, in addition to marginal notes opposite each section or subsection, members will find on each right-hand page references to the corresponding provisions in the present law. This will readily enable comparisons to be made between present and proposed legislation.

The bill divides the subject matter into eight parts as compared with eighteen parts in the present Act. Part 1 covers the general income tax on individuals and corporations which, of course, is the main body of the law. Part 2 imposes the taxes on non-residents, which taxes are deducted at the source on payments leaving Canada. These two parts cover the fundamental part of the taxing statute. The content of the remaining parts can easily be determined by running through the various headings.

As I have stated, part 1 deals with income tax proper, and it is set up under eight divisions. It will be seen the bill starts off directly with what is known as the charging section. It commences by stating who is liable for tax. This direct way of starting a piece of legislation of this kind may be regarded by the house as a perfectly obvious and logical way to open such a statute. However, under the present law the charging section is not reached until thirty-eight pages of other material have been presented.

Perhaps the house would bear with me if I read section 2 of the bill, because I think it offers a fair sample of the simplicity of language and the directness of the approach in the new law which have been among the main objectives in the revision.

2. (1) An income tax shall be paid as hereinafter required upon the taxable income for each taxation year of every person resident in Canada at any time in the year.

(2) Where a person who is not taxable under subsection one for a taxation year

(a) was employed in Canada in performing the duties of an office or employment at any time in the year, or

(b) carried on business in Canada at any time in the year,

an income tax shall be paid as hereinafter required upon the part of his taxable income for the year that was earned in Canada

(3) The taxable income of a taxpayer for a taxation year is his income for the year minus the deductions permitted by division III.

Division II starts in by giving general rules for computing income. I should perhaps mention here that after exhaustive study of the legislation of other countries and of the nature of the problems involved, it was decided not to attempt a specific definition of income. So far as I know, no country has achieved a satisfactory definition. Accordingly, the general scheme of the law, as will be seen by section 3 is to tax all income and to indicate the general sources of income, that is, income from businesses, property and offices or employments. Section 4 follows up this general indication by stating that income from a business or property shall be determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. We believe that by providing a general formula of this kind the best practical common sense results will be achieved. The income tax division in making assessments will interpret the legislation and the taxpayer, if he disagrees, may have his case heard by the new income tax appeal board and, if still not satisfied, take it to the exchequer court.

I should like to call particular attention to division VIII at the end of part I. The house will observe that it provides for what might be called a set of boxes for exceptional kinds of taxpayers or special provisions not of general application. In the previous law these items cluttered up the main body of the law. A separate division for these unusual cases or situations greatly simplifies the part of the statute which is of general interest to the ordinary taxpayer.

Special attention has been given in this revision to the question of ministerial discretion. The house may recall that the income tax legislation of last year provided for an advisory board to review cases where ministerial discretion had been exercised under forty-three designated provisions in the law. The house may be interested to know that of these forty-three ministerial discretions only two remain in the new bill. Furthermore, these remaining two do not affect the amount of any tax payable. One requires the concurrence of the minister upon the change of a fiscal period of a taxpayer, and the other gives the minister power to determine who shall be the taxpayer where multiple trusts are set up in favour of the same beneficiary.

In cases where some degree of flexibility is felt necessary we provide that rules shall be determined by regulations fixed by order in council, which will be subject to review by the courts and will not involve the objectionable principle of ministerial discretion, as is the case in the existing law.

Possibly the house would be interested in the method adopted in eliminating discretions. This has been done by converting the discretion into a rule of law dependent on a question of fact. An example will make this clear. For instance, subsection 2 of section 6 in the present law states that

the minister may disallow any expense which he in his discretion may determine to be in excess of what is reasonable or normal for the business carried on by the taxpayer...

The corresponding provision in the bill provides that

Where a disbursement or expense or a part thereof is otherwise deductible, only such part thereof as is reasonable in the circumstances may be deducted in computing income.

In practice the department in making an assessment may disallow a certain portion of an item of expense as being unreasonable in the circumstances. If the taxpayer is dissatisfied with the assessment on the basis used by the department he can appeal the assessment and the new income tax appeal board will pass judgment on the case, that is, the court will decide whether the department has acted reasonably. The government is prepared to give this system a thorough trial. It may be found, however, that certain discretions may have to be reinstated if experience shows that the subject matter is not appropriate to judicial determination.

In view of the extent to which ministerial discretions have been removed from the law, it will now be unnecessary to proceed with the appointment of the income tax advisory board provided for in last year's legislation. I shall recommend, therefore, at the next session of parliament that the authority for this board and for appeals from ministerial discretion be repealed *ab initio*.

I trust the house will pardon me if upon this occasion I express a certain pride in the work that has been accomplished in this revision of our income tax law. I should not, however, like to give the house the impression that I think this bill is by any means perfect. As a matter of fact I remain open-minded on some of the changes in the new bill. It is probable that further study will require further changes. I should also like to make it clear that because of pressure on my time some important questions have not been finally settled. I quite realize, for example, that the various penalty provisions need careful examination. Some of these outstanding items will be dealt with later when the legislation is introduced for enactment in the 1948 session of parliament. In the meantime further consideration is being given to them. It would be my thought that when the bill is introduced in 1948 to make it retroactive to January 1st of that year.

An attempt has been made by the translators to have the translation into French follow closely with the original drafting in English. I find, however, that the numerous last-minute changes in the draft have not yet fully been dealt with by the translators, with the result that a few days may elapse before the French text of the bill is available. I am sorry about this, but I am assured that the copies in French will be available for circulation shortly.

[Mr. Abbott.]

I should not like to close this statement without saying a few words about the officials who to a great extent are responsible for the work embodied in this bill. Over the past year senior officials of the departments of justice, finance and national revenue have, in addition to their regular work, devoted an incredible amount of time and effort to this revision. It has meant a great deal of night work and sacrifice of leisure. Unless a person has had some experience in attempting to revise an exceedingly complex statute of this kind he can have no idea of the difficulties involved in rewriting such a law. I have personally taken a great interest in the work, and speaking from my close association with the officials in this matter I wanted publicity to express appreciation to them for their excellent work.

Mr. J. M. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Mr. Speaker, for obvious reasons I shall make only brief comments on two things. I think we are all glad to know that this long overdue measure is now—not before us, but in sight of being before us for action. I do not propose to say anything more except that in the first budget speech I heard in this house, which was nearly two years ago, the Minister of Finance referred to this measure and said it was overdue. It was certainly overdue and I regret the time that has elapsed since without any general revision of the act. However, that is past.

Just a comment on what the minister has said. If this bill is successful, as the minister indicated, in introducing simplicity of language and directness of approach, then certainly the minister is entitled to the pride which he says he has in it. I was glad that he referred to his openmindedness, although with legal caution he qualified that by saying that he could not be expected to be open-minded on all questions.

I am sure we all agree that we owe a debt to those civil servants who have worked on this and who have produced, in its first stage at any rate, a measure which has been so long needed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

HUDSON BAY MINING AND SMELTING

WORKS DECLARED FOR THE ADVANTAGE OF TWO OR MORE PROVINCES—CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour) moved the third reading of Bill No. 452, respecting the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

RECONSTRUCTION AND SUPPLY

Atomic energy control board—

355. Administration expenses, $115,000.

Mr. GREEN: Just yesterday we received the first annual report of this board, which was authorized by a special act last session. There is a large increase over last year's figure for administration expenses which I should like the minister to explain. The minister will remember that during the debate last year there was some discussion as to whether it would be a full-time board or a part-time board, and apparently the decision has been reached that the board will act only on a part-time basis.

According to page 3 of the report the board has held only five meetings since it was set up. Meetings were held on October 16, 17 and 18, 1946; one was held on January 6, 1947, and a final meeting is shown here as having been held on March 15, 1946, but I presume that should be March 15, 1947. This board was given the most drastic powers that have ever been given to a board by any Canadian government. In addition to that, parliament was told: Hands off; the atomic energy control board must not be interfered with by a parliamentary committee; there is to be "no check at all of any kind; the board is supreme." The picture we have today is that this part-time board in effect has met only three times since it was set up, because the first three meetings were on consecutive dates. The members of that board are engaged on other duties; I believe that General McNaughton, the chairman, spends a great deal of his time at the united nations meetings, and quite properly so—

Mr. HOWE: Or on atomic energy business.

Mr. GREEN: The time has come when there should be some watchdog committee of the Senate and House of Commons with respect to atomic energy. We have been told by the minister that Canada is concerned only with the production of atomic energy for peacetime purposes, and that is another very good reason why there should be no hesitation in giving parliament some check over the matter. I do urge, as I did last year, that there should be some parliamentary check. This House of Commons, representing the people of Canada, is entitled to have a hand in the control of atomic energy developments. It is a thoroughly bad principle to give these very drastic powers to a board which is not under control of the house, particularly a part-time board which is doing this work only as a sideline. The minister said last night that the operations at Chalk River were being carried on not by this board but by the national research council. I think the time has come, Mr. Chairman, when some effective method of control should be given to parliament.

Mr. HOWE: The board was intended to be a part-time board except for the chairman, who is on full-time duty. Unfortunately his paramount duty in connection with atomic energy has been to represent Canada on the atomic energy panel of the united nations. General McNaughton has been in almost continuous session on that panel. He has been chairman of it from time to time and has been a very active member.

One reason why the expenditure will be larger next year is that when General McNaughton was appointed chairman he was on the payroll of external affairs, and that is still the situation. His salary was not charged to the atomic energy board during the past fiscal year.

The members of the board, while they have not met together formally, have been very active on atomic energy work. Dean Mackenzie spends a good portion of his time at Chalk River and is engaged in matters having to do with the work of the board. My own deputy minister, who is also a member of the board, has visited Chalk River frequently and has devoted a great deal of his time to the board. The same applies to the other members. Mr. Bateman has been very active on the raw materials procurement side. To form a judgment of the board on the number of meetings it has held in its initial stages would be fallacious. Another factor to be taken into account is that one of the principal duties of the board is to deal with products and by-products of the plant at Chalk River. It takes some months to recover those by-products, and therefore the problem of disposing of them has not become an active problem as yet, although it will so become before the end of this calendar year.

The board has carried out the duties given to it by parliament and has carefully protected the raw materials which are produced in this country. There again that task has been simple because only one company is producing the raw materials and that company is government-owned. I have no doubt however that production by private interests will appear and the production of raw materials will require control by the board. I suggest that everything is under control. My

hon. friend has said that since they are producing the products for peace-time uses only, there should be no secrecy.

Mr. GREEN: I did not say that.

Mr. HOWE: He suggested control by a parliamentary committee or something of the sort. I would point out that the material is the same material whether it is used for purposes of peace or war purposes. The fact that we now use it for peace-time purposes would not prevent this government or anybody else from using it for war purposes. It is just as explosive as the material that other people make for war purposes. Therefore the same secrecy provisions must be maintained; in fact, they have been tightened over the past year. In taking that precaution we are following the procedure of all governments manufacturing or dealing with this commodity.

Mr. GREEN: The minister is not following the procedure in the United States so far as parliamentary control is concerned, because there they do have a watchdog committee of the Senate and House of Representatives. The minister said last year that he thought such a committee in Canada would be feasible eventually, but he was not prepared to recommend it last year. Has the time not come when such a committee could be set up?

Mr. HOWE: I think not. Atomic energy is such an explosive subject at the moment—it is under discussion at Lake Success and in the newspapers—that my thought is that the best contribution Canada can make for the next year is to avoid any discussion of atomic energy. I think that is the wise course to take. I read the proceedings of the Senate committee and so far as Canada is concerned there would be no objection to giving the same information to a committee about the Canadian project as was given about the United States project, but I think no good purpose would be served by doing so. Therefore I suggest that the matter be allowed to stand as it is for another year, and that, at the next session I shall be glad to review the position and discuss the establishment of a committee of the house or the Senate to meet in camera and examine the officials of the atomic energy board.

Mr. GREEN: I would point out to the minister that my thought is not that a committee should be told secrets that nobody else is allowed to get, but rather that there should be a body of parliamentarians who are studying the implications of this new power, atomic energy. I think it is agreed on all sides that atomic energy is going to make vast changes in our whole economy, yet here we are in the Senate and House of Commons with no one but the minister understanding anything about the development of atomic energy. Canada is in the forefront, one of the three leaders in the development of atomic energy, and yet we are not taking any steps to build up an informed opinion among the people who are responsible for leading the nation. I think that is a very unsound position for this government to take. I would not ask that such a committee be told secrets that should be carefully kept—not at all. But I do suggest that there would be great value in having somebody here study the whole question, and I would ask the minister to give serious consideration to arranging that such a committee or some similar body be set up at the next session.

Mr. HOWE: I shall be glad to keep that suggestion in mind and will do so at the first opportune moment, Canada is one of the two nations of the world which are producing this material. The paramount consideration at the moment is that the secrecy provision be preserved, and I am sure my hon. friend will agree with that position.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): The hon. member for Vancouver South has made it very clear that he agrees with that. He was very specific indeed, but so far as I am concerned the minister has not satisfied me that this indefinite delay in setting up a discreet and limited committee, if you like, which the hon. member for Vancouver South suggested, is justified. Nothing that the minister has said is an answer to that request. I hope that he will take it in mind very seriously, because at the present time what is being said to us in this house in effect is that we are a lot of children who cannot be persuaded to behave like grown men. That is the position in which we are. We recognize, and my hon. friend has made it clear, the position that the minister is in. We respect that and we want to protect it. We do not want him to tell us things we should not know. My hon. friend has made that clear, but there is surely a middle ground between that and this house and the other house being in effect told that they might as well not ask any questions but be good little boys. I hope the minister will take that seriously under review. I can see no reason for the delay.

There is one other point I should like to mention. This item covers $115,000 for administration expenses. The minister will correct me if I am wrong, but there are no details. Is that right?

Mr. HOWE: I think that is right, yes.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Why should we not have more details? No secrets are connected with this item. We know the salaries that are being paid to most important civil servants. Why do we have to take it sight unseen, as they say in the street? I am dealing with what the minister said a moment ago, that he would not give details. If I am wrong the minister will correct me.

Mr. McILRAITH: Turn to page 214.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I still think my hon. friend has not answered the question. The explanation on page 214 says, "Temporary assistance, $75,000." That means that we are not to have any knowledge as to what is being paid to other people. I cannot see at all that that is a secret which goes to the root of security. It is not clear to me why we should be asked to pass these omnibus items and know nothing about payments which are being made to people merely because they are not on the permanent civil service list.

Mr. HOWE: There is no objection to giving the salaries of the personnel. The salaries of the staff last year, outside of salaries to the members, because none were paid last year, are as follows. The salaries of government staff $8,936.21 for the period from October 12 to March 31, which is the period that the board functioned; temporary salaries $1,250, making a total of $10,186.21. There is an item of $25.73 for special temporary assistance; travelling expenses $1,325.54; printing and stationery $685.90.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I am not asking the minister to give all these details; I am just asking for the main items of salaries, if he would care to give them. I do not want to waste the time of the committee.

Mr. HOWE: I am sorry; I cannot give the salaries because I have not the details at hand. I can send for them if the hon. member is interested. There is no objection to giving this; but in reply to the remarks that have been made I might point out that General McNaughton, the chairman of the board, appeared before the external affairs committee of the House of Commons. He was examined there and gave all the information that in the opinion of the government could be given publicly. My hon. friend will appreciate that. There is no desire to withhold information that can properly be given; but in talking of the process it is very difficult to be able to sort out information that can be given and information that cannot be given. One slip in information that cannot be given brings instant criticism from the others who share this process with us. I am simply asking for another year to consider the position as to what machinery can be set up as a means of communication between the board and parliament.

Mr. GREEN: The minister would not suggest for a moment that the fact that General McNaughton appeared before the external affairs committee and made a statement which had to do primarily with the international implications is an answer to my criticism that there should be some committee of parliament studying this question. I am on the external affairs committee, and this is only one of the sidelines. Incidentally, they do not pretend to be specialists on atomic energy.

Mr. HOWE: I am simply suggesting the fact that General McNaughton did appear before the committee is an indication that there is no desire on the part of the government to withhold from parliament any information that can properly be given.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): The whole problem of atomic energy is of great concern to every parliamentarian and to the Canadian people generally. I recognize that at this late hour in the session we do not desire a full-dress debate on the subject. I remember that in the first session of this parliament the whole post-war problem of what we were going to do with atomic energy was thrown in our laps. In all deference to the lack of knowledge which hon. members have in that regard, I might say that I agree with the hon. member who has just spoken when he says that something should be done so that as parliamentarians we can deal intelligently with this subject.

I express regret that the parliamentary and scientific committee which we endeavoured to set up this year when we had before us Professor Bernal, the famed British scientist, has been a great disappointment to me.

I do not agree with the minister to the extent that we should say little about this problem until next year. This is a matter which today is receiving world-wide attention. Surely as one of the nations which are in the know-how we should be doing something more definite about atomic control and development, and not merely along the lines which we followed during the war, because of necessity at that time we were doing this work as part of our war effort. At this time we should

develop atomic energy along peace lines, because I believe there is no single thing which can revolutionize the economies of the world and bring about peace and good will more than atomic energy. At the same time if these fears, which are growing up between the nations today, are allowed to develop, we shall run into difficulties. The minister should do all in his power to cooperate with his colleagues in the government and with those in the international spheres to try to bring about a world development of atomic energy so that this great nuclear power may become a beneficial thing to mankind. We in this country have perhaps one of the main world sources of uranium and plutonium, two of the main ingredients of atomic energy. When we read the reports of these scientists responsible for atomic energy development we are excited by the possibilities of its use for industrial purposes and also for curative purposes in the field of medicine. While keeping atomic energy under government control so that nothing shall be done to curtail its development, we should do everything possible to develop it on an international basis and in such a way as to dispel some of the fears which are abroad today and bring world peace.

Mr. BARRETT: What policy is being carried out in regard to the control of the raw material? Are new fields being prospected, and what form of control is exercised?

Mr. HOWE: Any discovery of raw material must be reported to the crown. It cannot be staked privately at the moment. I have stated to the house that I considered that would not be the permanent policy of Canada, but until international negotiations are advanced to a further point the provision against staking by private interests is continued. Eventually, however, I think the control of radioactive materials will start from the time they are actually mined. They will pass into the hands of the atomic energy control board at that time, and all raw materials from that stage on to the finished product will be handled by the atomic energy control board.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Apparently the minister is not in a position to give us much in the way of details in connection with the development of atomic energy, and the reasons he has given sound fairly reasonable at this time. I believe, however, he could tell us something about the policy which is being proposed with respect to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. A moment ago he said something to the effect that it was not the contemplated policy of the government to maintain control over the staking of claims or the development of new sources of supply. It was a very hazy statement he made, but I took it to mean that eventually the government proposes to let private enterprise in on the development of atomic energy. It would appear to me that we should have a definite policy very soon, because this is going to be one of the big developments in this country. It can create a new industrial revolution. A new form of power such as that contained in atomic energy can play a major part in the progress of the country, and I fear that if private interests are permitted to come into control of the supply of this material, these same interests, who have other industries in their control using the orthodox forms of energy, will not be inclined to develop atomic energy to its fullest extent. That is only natural because they will want to protect their original investment in the ordinary type of industry. This question therefore poses a problem to parliament. Are we going to do everything possible to see to it that atomic energy is given the fullest opportunity to be developed to its limit for the general use of the country, under public enterprise, or are we going to allow the sources of supply and their development to slip into private hands, as other sources of supply have passed into the hands of private enterprise in the past, with the result that the country is hog-tied and hamstrung by private interests who will not allow their orthodox style of production to be interfered with? It is a matter of history. Although this is not the time to bring out the details, we know that private interests in the past have diverted certain processes from production merely because they wished to protect their own investments. That has not been in the interests of the public. Here is one opportunity, surely, for the government to take a step forward for the benefit of the public by developing this form of energy for the general use of the nation through the initiative of public enterprise. I hope the minister will indicate what the policy of the government is in that connection. Will he tell us whether the government will be prepared to maintain public enterprise in this field and to extend it, or whether they are contemplating handing atomic energy over to private enterprise?

Mr. HOWE: The government is proceeding to develop uses for plutonium. Studies are being made of methods of controlling the release of energy in a manner that will permit it to be used in industry. These studies are in their initial stages, but by the next session of parliament we shall be able to give a report

on the advance of the art in that direction. My hon. friend will appreciate that, after this material is produced, methods have to be found for releasing the energy gradually so that it can be used. Theoretically enough of the material could be put in a fountain pen to drive a battleship across the ocean for three years, but the actual mechanics for releasing that energy require a good deal of development. That is work that is being carried on today.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I am not going to press for details. I know that the practical side has to be developed. I would like to know, however, whether the patents of any new invention as a result of atomic energy which is developed by the national research council under the control of the atomic energy control board will be held by the government or by the research council on behalf of the government—

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: —or whether any of them are being disposed of to private interests at this time.

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. GREEN: There is one statement in the report of the atomic energy control board which I do not quite understand. It appears under the heading "Encouragement to Prospecting". It states:

> It was not found practicable to make regulations for the encouragement of prospecting, owing largely to uncertainty as to the international situation, but the position is being kept under continuous observation, in cooperation with the Department of Mines and Resources and Eldorado.

That of course is the crown company handling the mines in the northwest territories. Why should it be impossible to encourage prospecting for these necessary minerals? That seems to be of the utmost importance and I do not understand why the board should find it impossible. Furthermore, there is no mention here of cooperation with the provincial departments of mines. They are, at least as far as British Columbia is concerned, and I believe the same is true of Ontario, the bodies which are handling mining. The provincial departments do that. The dominion work in connection with mining is very limited.

Mr. HOWE: It is limited to the northwest territories, but that area contains all the radioactive materials ever discovered.

Mr. GREEN: The people who really know mining are the provincial departments. Will the minister explain that statement I have quoted from the report?

Mr. HOWE: It was explained when the emergency legislation was being discussed. The united nations have not decided whether the control of atomic energy should begin in the ground or not. In the days when Eldorado was formed, control was taken of material in the ground. In other words, the provinces were asked to join with the federal government in enacting legislation to provide that discoveries of radioactive materials should not be patented. That regulation is still in effect. Our inclination was to remove it, but General McNaughton, who represents Canada on the atomic energy commission, felt that any change in the regulations at this time would be unfortunate, that changes should not be made until the policy of the united nations had been determined. Therefore since 1943 no change has been made for that reason.

Mr. GREEN: Does that not mean we are losing precious time in the search for these vital metals? From this report it is quite evident that steps could be taken to encourage prospecting, but those steps are not being taken because we are waiting for the committee of the united nations to reach agreement. If that committee does not make more progress in reaching an agreement in future than it has made in the past we may have to wait quite a long time yet before our board encourages prospecting, and surely Canada should not be losing that time.

Mr. HOWE: The government itself, that is Eldorado, has twenty parties in the field today prospecting for radioactive materials. The Department of Mines and Resources has a few parties also doing the same thing. There is nothing to prevent any prospector from searching for radioactive materials if he wishes. If he makes a discovery, Eldorado will be very glad to take it over and compensate him for it. I do not think there is any great handicap to prospecting. Personally I would prefer that there be no restriction on patenting claims for radioactive materials, but as I say, the regulations provide otherwise and we have not changed them, following the advice of General McNaughton.

Mr. GREEN: It is perfectly obvious from the report of the board that they believe something should be done to encourage prospecting.

Mr. HOWE: It does not say that.

Mr. GREEN: The report itself is worded in that way: "It was not found practicable to make regulations for the encouragement of prospecting." Obviously the board does know that steps could be taken to encourage prospecting; and I suggest to the minister that this position be given further consideration.

Mr. HOWE: I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. GREEN: The minister has not said anything in regard to cooperation with the provincial departments of mines.

Mr. HOWE: There has been complete cooperation. They have carried out every request this government has made.

Mr. GREEN: Are any of those parties prospecting in the provinces, or are they all in the northwest territories?

Mr. HOWE: In the northwest territories.

Mr. GREEN: So there are no prospecting parties, either under Eldorado or under the dominion Department of Mines and Resources, working in any of the provinces?

Mr. HOWE: I would not say that. I think the Department of Mines and Resources has prospecting parties out in several provinces; but the prospecting parties directly searching for radioactive materials are all in the Northwest territories, if for no other reason than the fact that no discovery of radioactive materials has ever been made outside the Northwest territories.

Mr. GREEN: And is not likely to be unless they start looking.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): In regard to certain discoveries as a result of which nuclear power could be used for specific industrial purposes I would like to ask the minister how that would be assimilated into Canadian industry. Here we have public research, and let us suppose we find how to use some of this nuclear power in industry. To whom would that privilege be given, and just how would it be assimilated into our Canadian economy? As the hon. member for Dauphin has very well pointed out, there is a problem in that connection when it is realized that such revolutionary uses of nuclear power may upset our economy. I can very well see that the whole progress of atomic research may be retarded unless we have a definite plan to develop it, because you will have the problem of technological unemployment due to bringing such a revolutionary idea as nuclear energy into industry, and you will also have the present system under which that would be a very difficult thing to assimilate. I should like the minister to answer that question.

Mr. HOWE: That is a question that will not arise for five or six years. There is nothing revolutionary in a government building a source of energy. Governments in this country own more sources of energy than private interests own. The government can either establish a power plant of its own or sell the rights in the materials to someone else. That is a matter for future governments to determine, however, and I think it would be a waste of time to speculate on it at this moment, when the art is in its infancy.

Mr. IRVINE: That is right; the C.C.F. will determine it.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: In any project such as this, where secrecy is necessary for security reasons, and perhaps particularly in this case, the people are asking questions, and they would like to know the position as far as Canada is concerned. This year we are spending another $5,500,000 on Chalk River. What protection is there to see that the plant, the processes, the research and the results of that research are retained for the good of the Canadian people? Are all the employees at Chalk River government employees, or do you have men there on loan from the United States or other governments, or from firms in other countries? Are there any representatives at that plant from Imperial Chemical Industries or du Pont, and are the details of the processes and research being made available to any persons other than government officials in Canada?

Mr. HOWE: Everyone at Chalk River is an employee of the government. We do admit visitors from the United Kingdom and the United States, properly sponsored and coming there in the interests of pure science; but only government employees of those two countries sponsored by their governments and coming there for purposes which the government believe are desirable.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: In other words all persons given access to these details of research and so on are sponsored by the governments of other countries?

Mr. HOWE: That is right.

Mr. BARRETT: Under section 10 of the Atomic Energy Control Act the board is empowered to set up or incorporate companies. I would like to ask the minister if any companies have been set up or if it is contemplated that any will be set up.

Mr. HOWE: There would be no purpose in a crown company until the board has a product for sale, which it may have in time. Until that time comes, which will be some time in the future, there would be no purpose in having a crown company and it is not intended to establish any.

Mr. BARRETT: I suppose it is quite improper to ask the minister what is going on at Chalk River, but could he give us any idea of what progress is being made in

developing atomic energy materials purely for scientific uses, and what is being done to see that they are not used for war purposes?

Mr. HOWE: All the materials made there are under the control of the government. It is difficult to say more than that. We are making materials, and all the materials are being retained at Chalk River for experimental purposes. That is all I can say.

Item agreed to.

Atomic energy control board—
357. Chalk River project—capital and operating expenses, $5,573,000.

Mr. JAQUES: In reference to this atomic energy control board, does that relate to the international control of atomic energy or merely to the control of the development of atomic energy in Canada?

Mr. HOWE: Yes, in Canada.

Mr. JAQUES: It has nothing to do with international control?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I do not recall item 356 having been called. Apparently we are calling the odd numbers today; we must have had the even numbers yesterday. Has No. 356 been called?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has been carried; we are on 357.

Mr. GREEN: We did not hear item 356 being called.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If my hon. friend continues to hold conversations with those behind him and an item is called and carried without his hearing it, I cannot be responsible for that. If my hon. friend wants to go back to 356 we shall be glad to do so.

Mr. GREEN: If it were not so near the end of the session, Mr. Chairman, I might have a good deal to say in reply to that remark. Any discussions I have been carrying on with my associates have been in regard to these items; and if the chairman did not mumble so much we might hear what is going on.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: This is a new item dealing with research and investigation with respect to atomic energy. We realize that $150,000 is a mere drop in the bucket when compared with the amount of research taking place. Is this for some special project?

Mr. HOWE: The three universities indicated have facilities for research ancillary to the work at Chalk River. A cyclotron has been established at McGill university to be used for splitting atoms. At the university of Saskatchewan is a betatron, and at the university of British Columbia a generator and linear accelerator. These have been installed for work in connection with atomic energy, and for that reason these three universities are receiving assistance from the atomic energy control board to let them carry out research which is of value to the work at Chalk River.

Mr. GREEN: In the last fiscal year the expenditures for Chalk River are shown in the report as amounting to $7,171,067.26, and this year the vote is for $5,573,000. Can the minister give us any idea as to how much this project is going to cost each year. Will the expenditure be smaller or will it be increased, and is there any revenue coming in? Is there anything to offset these expenditures?

Mr. HOWE: Not at the present time. The operating cost at Chalk River for the current fiscal year is estimated at $3,400,000. That will be a continuing cost which, in time, we hope will be offset largely by revenue. At the present time however we are not in a position to dispose of any materials which would bring in revenue. So far as capital cost is concerned, the total investment is slightly over $20 million. Provision is made in the estimate for $5,573,000 which will largely complete the capital expenditure anticipated.

Mr. GREEN: Does this $5,573,000 include operating costs?

Mr. HOWE: The $5,573,000 includes operating costs and capital. The balance of money required is $2,173,000.

Mr. GREEN: And that completes the capital expenditure, on the Chalk River project?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Are any of the materials now being produced at Chalk River being exported from Canada, or are they all being held at that point?

Mr. HOWE: They are all being held at Chalk River.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): What is that material; is it just a stock pile?

Mr. HOWE: Plutonium, and certain isotropes which are by-products of the process.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—Reconstruction and supply—
568. Departmental administration, $1,989,208.

Mr. MERRITT: I take it that the minister or Wartime Housing has not yet arrived at a contract with the city of Vancouver for

the building of further houses, and that the minister has not changed his mind with respect to the Bremerton houses, that he does not propose to bring them in.

Mr. HOWE: This is the vote for departmental administration. Vote No. 574 deals with Wartime Housing Limited.

Mr. MERRITT: My remarks will be general, and will be directed to Wartime Housing Limited, emergency shelter, the moving of buildings, and national housing. I thought this would be the convenient point to discuss all these matters.

Mr. HOWE: As you wish.

Mr. MERRITT: I believe I am correct in stating that no agreement has yet been entered into with the city of Vancouver for the building of further houses by Wartime Housing Limited.

Mr. HOWE: No agreement has been entered into because for months I have found it absolutely impossible to make any agreement with the city of Vancouver. Plans are under way for a very considerable project in that city in the field of low-cost housing. It is not completed, but it has advanced very close to consummation. Certain representatives of the citizens rehabilitation committee are now in the city. They are engaged in developing the project. It is somewhat difficult to discuss the reasons for its not being completed, but I can say we hope to have a thousand low-cost houses under construction there before many weeks go by—but not under agreement with the city of Vancouver.

Mr. MERRITT: Having discussed this matter with the minister both privately and in the house on other occasions I should like him to understand that I know his views. I am not accusing him of bad faith in the matter, but I am suggesting that the conclusion to which he has come in respect of wartime housing is wrong.

I believe I am correct when I say that the Bremerton houses are not going to be brought in by the government as emergency shelter, and I should like to deal with that matter for a few moments. I shall be brief, because the minister understands the situation, and it is not necessary to give him details. There are 1,600 houses in Bremerton which could be moved to Vancouver after being obtained from the United States housing authority, the present owner. The estimated landed cost per house on the site and ready for occupation is estimated at $2,100 of which $300 or $400 is reserved for contingencies and allowances for customs duties and items of that kind.

These are four-roomed houses of temporary construction, certainly—not suitable for permanent occupancy—but which come complete, including a certain amount of interior fixtures including such items as stoves and refrigerators. They can be had for somewhere around $2,000—and my best information is that it would be $300 less than that, or $1,700. This project was originated by some young men in Vancouver. It was pressed by them on the city council and on the minister. They came down here to get in touch with certain insurance companies in the hope of financing the project. The minister was kind to those young men, offering them an emergency shelter grant on each house, and I believe gave them his blessing. In the end however they were unable to get the balance of the funds they needed from the insurance companies.

As I understand it, the reason the minister would not accept these houses as emergency shelter was that they were a little too good to be placed in that class. They had a possible life of about ten years, and did not fall within his specifications as to what emergency shelter should be. The reason why the insurance companies turned down the project—I am not complaining about this because it is their business—was that the houses were not a good commercial risk because their life was limited to ten years. They felt that they could not lend their money on that sort of thing. Therefore, we have these 1,600 houses falling between two stools. On the one hand, it is said they are a little bit too good for us—

Mr. HOWE: I wish my hon. friend would not put words in my mouth. I never said the houses were too good; I always said they were not good enough. I said if anyone wanted to use them for emergency housing we would make a contribution, but I never said they were too good for emergency housing. Nothing could be too good. They might cost too much, but they would not be too good.

Mr. MERRITT: I did not intend to suggest that the minister used those words, but the effect of what he said was that $2,000 was too much for one unit of emergency shelter. I am only going by what I understood he said, and he can correct me if I am wrong. The project has failed somewhere between the two methods of getting these houses into Vancouver, between the emergency shelter method and the method of private financing. The one agency would not come up far enough and the other agency would not go down, and the result is that we are not getting these houses.

The housing of veterans who are unable to obtain homes and who have had to double

up with their relatives in unsuitable quarters is a social responsibility of this government. The minister recognized that when he said, as reported on page 3595 of *Hansard:*

> The federal government has recognized a responsibility for providing housing to take care of the dislocation in population arising through the war.

Veterans who have had no houses since they came back from overseas are people whose living has been dislocated through the war. The insurance companies very properly say that this social responsibility is up to the government, that it is not up to them. In this unusual situation, which no one would consider except for the housing emergency, they say that they do not intend to take what is called the end position. They say that they have no responsibility for the social end of things. They are quite right in that.

Under all the circumstances of housing in Vancouver I say to the minister that there is a responsibility upon him and upon the government to bring in these houses as emergency shelter, or to provide an adequate number of houses by some other means so that we will not miss the 1,600 houses which could be brought in from Bremerton. Here we have a cut-and-dried project. As he knows he can get most enthusiastic management. The proper person to be in the end position is the government, if there is going to be any end position in this matter. These houses are the cheapest four-roomed houses that can be obtained and they can be obtained most quickly. It may be that the amount of money that would have to be paid for emergency shelter is more than the department has been accustomed to paying, but there is at least a good chance that the money will be got back in the same way that the sponsors of this scheme expected to get it back if they could have raised the money from private sources. I simply want to leave that matter with the minister.

I turn now to wartime housing. In this connection I know the minister feels that the city council has been most uncooperative. I do not hold any brief for the city council. As I understand it, the building of a large number of houses by Wartime Housing in Vancouver this year was prevented by the fact that the city demanded that they be paid an adequate sum for the lots instead of the one dollar which is the usual Wartime Housing payment. The city said that they could not hand them over for one dollar each because their sinking fund would not permit it and they did not want to put the extra cost upon the taxpayers of the city. They held to that position throughout.

On the other hand the government contended that they could not negotiate a different type of contract with Vancouver than had been negotiated with other cities because that would not be fair to the other cities, and they stood on that position. Both sides have stood their ground with the result that the houses have not been built and it looks now as though they will not be built. Vancouver members who have discussed this matter with the minister and the city council have suggested that as the two parties cannot come together, and as the houses are needed, the city and the dominion should agree on terms satisfactory to both and under which the dominion would not pay more than $1 for the lot and the city would get what it feels it should get for the lots. As far as I know no progress has been made since that suggestion was offered.

The minister says that he does not want to have one type of contract with one city and another type with another city. That is all very well, but I find in the Montreal *Gazette* of Friday, July 4, a report of a scheme similar to the one that Vancouver members proposed which has apparently been entered into between Wartime Housing and Rosemount councillors. One paragraph of this report reads:

> The objections of Rosemount councillors have been met by calling for the new houses to be of brick veneer finish, with full basements and pipeless furnaces, although the modifications of the standard Wartime Housing structure will increase rents four to six dollars a month.

That is the suggestion that was made to the minister by the Vancouver members, that he should meet the objections of the Vancouver city council by building the houses and if necessary charging the additional amount to the veterans. By the way, this additional amount as I understand it would not be more than $2 per month instead of from $4 to $6 per month in the case of the Montreal project. The minister has said that his idea is to keep the rentals of wartime housing down low, and I agree thoroughly with him in that. I do not think the addition of $2 per month to the rent of one of these wartime houses in order that the city may get what it feels it should have will raise the rent of any one of these houses over $30 a month, and that is the cheapest rent you can get anywhere. I am sure that a large number of veterans in Vancouver would be prepared to go into that scheme. The minister has broken precedent in Montreal with respect to this matter and I cannot but feel that he could break it for Vancouver just as well. The houses are needed and their building must not be delayed just because two public authorities cannot get together. I am not over-critical of the minister or the city council. I believe

that both of them think they are right, but the idea that the inability of two public authorities to agree can stop much needed housing for veterans is one to which I cannot subscribe.

The minister has stated in this house that the dominion has the responsibility for the housing of those dislocated by the war, and no one has been dislocated by the war so much as the veteran.

Why do I feel so strongly on this subject as it relates to the city of Vancouver? The fact is that we have there a very large number of homeless veterans. The February figures, supplied to me by a source in which I have confidence, show that 4,700 veterans were on the waiting list for wartime housing in that month, and of these 2,500 were married men with families with overseas service in the face of the enemy, all of whom had enlisted in Vancouver, so it is in that city where they can most rightfully expect to be housed.

The minister knows that the old Vancouver hotel and the Dunsmuir are sheltering some 400 families and he knows the overcrowding and doubling up that is going on in Vancouver as in other cities.

Just to bring it down to an individual basis I have a copy here of the Vancouver *Province* of Thursday, June 26, which incidentally shows two pictures of a housing survey team looking into housing conditions in Vancouver, and which I shall be glad to show to the minister if he is interested. I want to read some of the things which this survey team found only in June of this year:

> One tenement examined by the women was in "imminent danger of collapse," she said. Six families including nine children are living in it.
>
> On the same lot they found three brothers and their mother living in a basement suite "where no daylight could get at them." The brothers are all working and could afford better accommodation, but could find none.
>
> The survey found a veteran and his family living in an alley in a house with all upstairs windows broken and the siding falling off.

Those illustrations give some idea of the conditions with which the minister is very familiar and about which he is much concerned, so I shall not labour that.

The Vancouver Housing Association, which is taking a most active interest in housing in Vancouver, recently informed me that there is a shortage in Vancouver of 25,000 houses. They said if I wanted to be conservative I should say 20,000, so I will say 10,000, and that figure warrants the building of wartime houses at once.

The minister knows that the greatest need of veterans housing is in the lower rental group. So much is that so at the present time in Vancouver that I say again if he does not bring in Wartime Housing or the Bremerton houses he must do something else, because we cannot go on longer without the housing.

Turning now to a more general approach to the subject, I wish to read two short extracts from newspapers which have caused me considerable alarm. The first is from the Ottawa *Citizen* of June 24, under the heading: "Home building lagging", and Mr. D. V. Mansur, the president of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, is quoted as follows:

> He indicated that in the opinion of the government, these figures were lagging sadly from the hoped-for number which Reconstruction Minister Howe included in his 80,000 target for the whole dominion this year.

Referring to the question of materials he said:

> "Even if home building were to stop completely," he said, "labour would be fully employed on commercial and industrials construction, so great is the volume of that type of building. The private dwelling situation doesn't look good at all."

The report goes on:

> No adequate solution of the complex problem is in sight, he admitted. The only solution lies in getting new homes, and this solution won't be reached for a long time to come.

That simply means that with the stopping of Wartime Housing and the stopping of Housing Enterprises and the stopping of the Veterans Land Act housing scheme, the government is left with only integrated housing as its means of stimulating house building. Integrated housing is a very good scheme, and I think the minister should have all credit for introducing it, but only a very limited number can take advantage of it. The number of houses that can be built under the integrated housing scheme at the present time apparently is not sufficient to take care of the need.

I have another clipping from the *Financial Post* of a very recent issue, some time in June. I shall read only the title of this article: "Ottawa hopes housing prices to solve itself. May stand by expecting lower cost trend within few months." I do not think this parliament can prorogue without the minister being told that the government should not sit tight and use that way out of this difficulty. In view of the physical need of housing of so many veterans, that course simply cannot be contemplated. The government must do more than sit tight. It must act, and if it will not act in the way I have suggested in regard to Vancouver, it should act in some other way.

I know it is not my duty to tell the minister how to run his department. It is perhaps sufficient for my simply to point out

the shortcomings of the department and leave the minister to find his own way. Nevertheless I shall make one concrete suggestion to him as to how he might help these homeless veterans. The suggestion I am going to make will naturally be a rough one. It might be refined by his officials or by the minister himself; but I would certainly urge it upon him and ask him to take it into consideration. I am going to suggest to him that he do not try any longer to solve the whole housing problem all at once. I am going to suggest to him that he work out a veterans housing scheme, and if he houses the veterans, particularly those who have been homeless since they returned from overseas, he will be doing something for those who are in the greatest need and are the most deserving. At the same time by creating more housing for that class he will loosen up the accommodation for all classes.

Mr. HOWE: May I interrupt and say that my hon. friend has evidently not been following the situation closely. Every house that the government has built under wartime housing, under integrated housing, under the Veterans Land Act or under any other government sponsored scheme, has been for veterans and for no one else. The government takes no responsibility for solving the entire housing problem for this country. It is perfectly ridiculous to suggest that it is a government responsibility. Every city has its own housing responsibility, as has every province. The government is responsible for the returned men, and its responsibility stops at that point.

Mr. MERRITT: I am perfectly aware that the government has given priority—

Mr. HOWE: Why not say so?

Mr. MERRITT: —to veterans under wartime housing, under integrated housing and under all these schemes. I think that is widely enough known, so that the suggestion I am about to make could not have been taken by the minister as a suggestion that he did not give veterans preference in his various schemes. If he would just listen to me—because I am trying to be helpful—he might find some usefulness in what I say. I am impelled to say it only because of such reports as I see here which suggest that the government is throwing up its hands now and is not going ahead with any of these things.

Mr. HOWE: I am willing to answer my hon. friend, but I am not willing to answer headlines in the *Financial Post* of Toronto.

Mr. MERRITT: I have accomplished something if I have got a denial of these headlines from Toronto. Since we see no practical steps being taken and no houses going up under Wartime Housing or under Housing Enterprises Limited or under any government scheme except integrated housing, I think anyone would be pardoned, after looking at the report in the Toronto paper, for being alarmed.

Perhaps the minister will let me go on, because I am really trying to be of assistance to him. If he would rather I simply criticized and sat down I suppose that is all right with me. I should think he would be interested in any scheme which might get him out of his difficulty. If I may go on, I suggest that the minister should work out a scheme to use the veterans, particularly those who have had no accommodation since the end of the war, and there are lots of these. I want to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that even though we have had these schemes under which veterans have had preference, and rightly so, and all credit to the minister for that, there are still many veterans who have not got houses, preference or no preference. There are still many veterans who have had no assistance from the government whatever, no assistance from rent control, because rent control is no good if you have never been in a house. There is a class which has not been reached by any of the minister's schemes for which I am suggesting a veterans housing scheme.

I suggest that in the integrated scheme the minister has the basis for this kind of idea. There is nothing wrong with the integrated scheme except that it is too narrow. There are not enough builders going into it, and they are not building the number of houses which are needed to get roofs over the heads of these veterans. The reason perhaps is that the integrated scheme is what I would call a test tube scheme, a laboratory scheme. It is being tried out in only small units in various places, and it is hedged around by very tight terms and considerations which apparently do not attract builders generally. I suggest to the minister that his veterans housing scheme should be one which utilizes all builders in Canada—the private enterprisers, upon whom he says he relies to get houses built, and the veterans themselves, in order to do the work. I suggest that he expand the integrated scheme; that he prescribe an over-all cost limit and a fairly generous profit limit which will attract more builders into the scheme, and that he use the veterans themselves to make private deals with their own contractor; then if they come to an organization which might be set up with a Legion representative on it, and show that they have a contract for the building of

a house within the wider cost and profit limit which I have suggested, that they be given the priority necessary to build the house. In that way the integrated scheme could be expanded widely in every city.

Again we should consider present-day high costs. I suggest to the minister that in all cities we should have had ever since the end of the war a veterans housing scheme following the principle of the Veterans Land Act small holdings scheme. He might now consider all those veterans who have never had houses but who now still have reestablishment credits. I understand that only one-third of the reestablishment credits have been used. I suggest that he enable them to finance themselves in these times of high cost, if they will give up their reestablishment credit, by giving them benefits of the same kind as under the small holdings scheme under the Veterans Land Act. In that way he may be able to provide financing for many veterans who would like to build but have not the money.

The minister knows of the Canadian Legion suggestion that he should lend up to ninety per cent of cost instead of ninety per cent of lending value with the same over-all cost and profit restriction. The minister might well investigate that in this type of scheme.

I now want to turn to the question of providing rental housing. When the minister made his—

Mr. HOWE: If I may reply, the hon. member has been labouring a scheme that has been in operation for years. Any veteran who has $600 can build a house under provisions passed by this parliament which provide that a veteran may borrow ninety-five per cent of the first $3,000 and eighty-five per cent of the second $3,000, which means ninety per cent of the loan on a house with a lending value of $6,000, and somewhat more for a house costing less. He can arrange with the contractor to build it under the integrated scheme or he can arrange with the contractor to build it privately. On a total investment of $600 he can build a $6,000 house anywhere he likes.

Mr. MERRITT: The minister knows better than I that the number of contractors who are taking part in the integrated plan is very small compared to the number of contractors in Canada. There is something about that scheme which is not widely attracting the builders of the country. I suggest to the minister that it may be due to the fact that the scheme is a little too rigid and so is not having the practical result which one might expect from the theory underlying it. After all, I would not be here talking at all if the housing conditions in Canada, and particularly in Vancouver, were not as I have described them, and the result of all these good theories of the minister has not been to put these men in homes.

Mr. HOWE: It has built a lot of houses, though, hasn't it?

Mr. MERRITT: I am afraid I did not hear what the minister said.

Mr. HOWE: It has built a good many houses.

Mr. MERRITT: I want to give the minister all credit, because I know that this is a difficult problem, but he cannot ask me to admit that it has resulted in the building of a good many houses. The minister has given us the figures himself.

Mr. HOWE: There were 175,000 since the war ended.

Mr. MERRITT: There were 6,800 wartime houses and 6,141 units of emergency shelter completed last year; and of course there were 3,000 integrated or less than 3,000, which is about 15,000 out of 60,000 completed by all means.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Mr. HOWE: Let us not talk nonsense. This government sponsored a programme for post-war building of houses which produced about 53,000 in 1945, 62,000 in 1946 and, it is hoped, will produce 80,000 in 1947. Let us not have any juggling of the figures. That is close to 200,000 houses.

Mr. MERRITT: The minister's own senior officer has publicly pointed out the danger that we shall not reach 80,000. I do not want to get into an argument with the minister over the comparative number of houses built. I am thinking of the fact that two years after the war a very large number of veterans, who should have the highest priority in the country, have no houses, despite all schemes. I do not think it profits us to talk about 60,000 or 80,000 or 200,000. I am talking about 4,700 in Vancouver who want houses now, after all these things have been done.

It may be that what I have suggested is very like the minister's integrated scheme; indeed, I said it was. I said it was only an expansion of that scheme. I am suggesting to the minister that he should expand it.

Now I wish to speak for a moment about the rental side of the problem. In February of this year the minister, as reported at page 211 of *Hansard*, speaking of that problem, stated in part:

> Because rental construction was disappointingly low in 1946, we believe that steps should be taken to remedy this deficiency.

Then he set out certain steps which he proposed to take, such as double depreciation, a longer term of amortization and priorities for those who built rental housing. I do not think the minister's scheme has produced much more rental construction. He can correct me if I am wrong in that, but I do not think it has had the effect which he desired, and which I believe the house hoped for as much as he did, At page 212 of *Hansard* of the same day he said:

> We believe that these steps will substantially increase the supply of new rental housing units. Should we be wrong, other steps must be taken, because we cannot allow a continuation of the proportionately low level of new construction in this field.

He was speaking of the rental field. I know that the minister considers it not to be his duty to subsidize rental housing. He said so quite clearly. I suggest to him, however, that so far as veterans are concerned we have a special problem. It might very well be singled out from the general situation in regard to low rent housing. In these particularly difficult times, right after the war, I submit that he should give special consideration to that particular class no matter what his general views may be.

The minister knows that in this low monthly rental field the houses are not going up. I suggest to him that he make use of the same technique as he adopted in the war when he needed ships. He built the ships, retained ownership in the crown, and operated them through private ship operators. When the war was over and the need for these ships for war purposes had disappeared, he was able to sell the ships to private operators at a price which, in his opinion and in the opinion of these operators, would enable them to keep the ships at sea in peace-time trade and so make possible the maintenance of the merchant marine. I do not see why that same idea could not be followed in the matter of veterans rental housing. If as a result of that plan the government suffered loss, that loss could be capitalized and considered as a war expenditure, precisely in the same way as with wartime ship building.

I see it is one o'clock and therefore I will say nothing further now. I assure the minister, however, that while I am most critical of him I am critical not for what he has done but for the results which he has failed to achieve—everything that I have said has been said in a sincere desire to help him in what is Canada's major problem.

Progress reported.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at two o'clock.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR CREDITING TO C.B.C. GROSS AMOUNT OF MONEYS RECEIVED FROM LICENCE FEES

Hon. J. J. McCANN (Minister of National Revenue and Minister of National War Services) moved the second reading of Bill No. 453, to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936.

He said: Mr. Speaker, since the passing of the Canadian Broadcasting Act in 1936 and the setting up of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation the affairs of the corporation, including its policies, its operation and its financial statement have been under review by a special committee in successive years. That custom was followed this year, so I submit that anyone who is interested in the affairs of the corporation or in radio broadcasting has had a splendid opportunity to follow the debates that have taken place. Having followed them, such person must be informed with reference to the matters which have been under discussion. Therefore I do not feel that I should take much time today in any attempt to review the situation in reference to the broadcasting corporation. This bill is an amendment to the Canadian Broadcasting Act. It is not a very long measure, and has to do principally with the amendment of one section.

Under the Canadian Broadcasting Act the proceeds of radio licence fees go to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. At present costs of administration and collection are deducted. The special committee on radio broadcasting last year recommended that the full amount of the fees paid go to the C.B.C. The broadcasting committee this session has reiterated this recommendation. In a report presented to the house last Friday, the committee said:

> Your committee has reviewed the financial position of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation very carefully this year and is impressed with the need of the corporation for a larger income, and the committee believes that the whole of the licence fee received from holders of receiving sets should be paid over to the corporation by the Department of Transport. A like report was made last year and your committee regrets that same was not implemented. Your committee recommends that appropriate legislation be passed at this session to give effect to this recommendation.

I submit that the committee had a good opportunity to consider the financial aspects of a national radio system after hearing full explanations from officials of the C.B.C.

It is seldom realized how great are the basic costs of operating a national radio system in Canada. The operation of a nationwide system in this country is basically more expensive per head than it is in any other country that has a nationwide system. This is due to the fact first of all that Canada has a very big area with a relatively small population. No matter how it is done it costs money to cover a given area with a radio programme; thus costs per head in Canada of getting programmes to listeners are very high. For example, one single station in New York can cover a population as great as that of all Canada. To reach the same number of people in this country we need thirty or more stations and thousands of miles of expensive wire lines in regular daily operation. Thus the basic cost per head of reaching listeners is many times greater in Canada than in the United States.

The area of Great Britain is only a fraction of the area of the inhabited part of Canada. But to provide services, the British Broadcasting Corporation has the revenue from the £1 licence fee of over ten million people. On its home services this year the B.B.C. has over $40,000,000 to spend. The C.B.C., with its vast and expensive area to cover, had some $5,800,000 from all sources. In Australia the licence fee is also £1. In New Zealand the rate is 25 shillings, and in South Africa an average of 28 shillings. Neither Great Britain nor Australia faces the need of providing broadcasting service in two languages. In Canada this increases our basic cost by a very considerable proportion. It means duplicate facilities in part of the country, extra administration costs, and large extra programme costs.

In the face of the high cost factors set by the nature of Canada and the composition of our nation, the C.B.C. has been operating a national radio system with a licence fee of $2.50 compared with higher fees in other countries. Actually it has been receiving only about an average of $2.15 per licence. The national system also receives some assistance in programming and some additional revenue from commercial sources. But the financial basis of a national radio system in Canada is, and probably will continue to be, direct contributions from the public. Comparisons with other radio systems show that the revenues of the C.B.C. are small in relation to the size of the job it has to do in Canada. During recent years its expenditures have necessarily increased to meet needs of the listening public. Broadcasting facilities and network service have extended to cover wider areas. This involves extra operating costs which continue year by year.

[Mr. McCann.]

At the same time the corporation has been faced by sharply rising costs in nearly every phase of its activities. In the last few years prices and costs in almost every field have gone up in Canada. In the radio business this rise has been particularly acute. For example, a comparison between the performers' fee costs of a group of typical programmes in 1940 and for the same programmes at today's rates shows an increase of sixty per cent. Expenditure items of the C.B.C. have risen; at the same time the main income item of the licence fee has remained at the same level. No organization can remain in the situation where costs rise steeply while its income remains about the same, and still continue to give good service.

For the year 1945-46 the corporation had an operating deficit of $78,000. Last year costs again increased considerably, but by careful management and economies, which had to include a reduction in employment given to Canadian artists, the corporation succeeded in keeping its operating deficit at $70,000. In this it was assisted by a rise in commercial revenues and in the total number of licence fees paid. No great help, however, can be expected from these sources in the future. The number of families owning radio sets cannot grow much larger than it is today unless we have within a short time a considerable increase in population. Efforts by the corporation to increase its commercial revenues too greatly would seriously reduce the quality of the service given by the national system.

Deficits of the corporation are met out of its own limited reserves saved from surpluses in earlier years. I might point out here that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has been financed entirely by the people of Canada through moneys they have paid in licence fees, and fees by commercial revenue. It is true that loans have been made to the corporation. In every instance those loans have been repaid. The corporation had power to borrow, and at the present time has a loan for increased capital expenditure. In due course we hope that that loan too will be paid. When I say that every loan has been paid, I mean that that is the condition up to last year.

On the basis of its present operations, the corporation would face a deficit of at least $265,000 this year. Therefore if the proposed extra revenue were not provided, the corporation would have drastically to reduce more of its services and its use of Canadian artists and writers.

Giving the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation the full amount of licence fees paid will provide extra revenue to meet at least some of

the increases in its costs. If this were not done it would mean inevitably serious deterioration in the extent and quality of the service provided by the national system. It would mean that the corporation could not maintain present broadcasting produced by Canadians for Canadians. It would certainly mean that necessary improvements could not be made.

I think that this house agrees that our national broadcasting system is providing an important and valuable service for the Canadian people from coast to coast. It is one means of bringing together Canadians in whatever part of the country they live, and it makes an important contribution to our national life.

This bill, carrying out the recommendations of two parliamentary committees, will enable the national radio system to continue its present service to the Canadian public.

Mr. DONALD M. FLEMING (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 453 appears small in compass, but actually the issue presented to the house for decision has wrapped up in it far-reaching questions of policy in connection with radio broadcasting in Canada. I am sorry the present debate comes so late in the session, when there is so much pressure upon all members, but it must serve the purpose of reviewing those questions of policy. I for one welcome the opportunity for debate presented by the bill, first because of the importance of the subject, and second because otherwise no opportunity will be afforded for discussion of the final report of the special committee on radio broadcasting.

I should like to make one observation about the practice followed in the house by the present administration since 1935, with reference to the reports of the special committee on radio broadcasting which has sat in most years since that time. In 1932 and in 1934 debates ensued on motions for concurrence in the reports of that committee. But from 1935—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Hon members will understand that it is the duty of the Speaker to confine debate to the principle of the bill before the house. Unless hon. members have the unanimous consent of the house to discuss matters other than those contained in the bill, it will be my duty to keep the debate within proper bounds. It is a rule of the house, and it is my duty to confine the debate to the principle of the bill.

Mr. FLEMING: I do not think Your Honour was in the chair last night when the resolution preceding the introduction of the bill was before the house. By agreement among all parties it was understood that there should be no debate on the resolution preceding the bill, but that on second reading full opportunity would be given to discuss not only the bill but the two reports of the committee on radio broadcasting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member unanimous consent?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. MacINNIS: In view of the agreement reached last night I do not think the hon. member would be proceeding on the basis of unanimous consent. The same privilege will have to be given to all hon. members. It is my impression that what the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) has said with respect to the arrangement made last night is correct. We should agree to that now.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is right, yes.

Mr. McCANN: Perhaps I took greater liberty than I am entitled to take, but I did give the assurance to hon. members opposite, so far as it was within my power to do so, that when second reading was called we would raise no objection to a general discussion involving not only the amendment to the act but also the reports of the committee and other matters connected with radio. If that meets with Your Honour's approval, we have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand the same latitude is to be given to all hon. members?

Mr. McCANN: Exactly.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That was the understanding last night.

Mr. FLEMING: I was referring to the fact that in the many years since 1935 that the committee on radio broadcasting has sat, there has never been a motion for concurrence in a report. It is only therefore on an occasion of this kind, when a bill is presented, that one is afforded an opportunity to discuss this important question of radio broadcasting in Canada.

We are frequently reminded in the radio committee and in the house by spokesmen for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that their responsibility is to parliament. If the responsibility is to parliament, and that is the statutory position, then certainly it is desirable that the reports from the committee from year to year should be debated in the house on motions for concurrence, if for no other purpose than to let the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation know whether the recommendations in the reports presented from year to year really represent the view of parliament.

If a motion for concurrence were made in the house it would serve as a guide to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. If there

is to be true parliamentary control of that corporation, then obviously there should be some vehicle provided for an effective expression of views, not only in this one house of parliament, but in both houses. This is particularly true because, in the light of the experience I have had on that committee in the past two sessions of parliament, I can say it has been dominated by a working majority of Liberal and C.C.F. members who are, at least in this instance, apparently on completely common ground.

Another important reason in my estimation why the reports of this committee should be fully debated in the house is that it would afford an opportunity to see whether the expressions of the Liberal-C.C.F. majority in the committee actually represented the views of this House of Commons. In the closing stages of the session last year, during the debate on a bill which was similar to the one now before the house but included other matters as well, an opportunity was afforded, as now, to discuss the report of the committee. I would remind hon. members that the discussion which followed then had a different flavour and tone from that which prevailed in the committee.

As the minister pointed out when introducing the bill, in effect the house is being asked to approve a proposal that the consolidated revenue fund of Canada should bear the entire cost of collecting fees imposed on private stations and owners of receiving sets. On the basis of last year's figures the amount involved is $544,673.17 per annum. To a government dominated by the mental approach indicated by one senior member of the cabinet who said in the house in 1945 when speaking on his estimates, "what's a million dollars?" this amount probably does not look like a large sum. However, on further examination I think the house will see that there is more involved in this matter than simply the question of giving the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation a sum annually in excess of half a million dollars.

Just in passing I should like to mention several factors bearing on this present proposal. First, the amount is annual and it may increase. The minister thinks that there will not be any substantial increase in the number of licensees of receiving sets. He may be right, but I am inclined to think that there is going to be an increase; therefore the cost of administration and collection is likely to rise. This bill proposes that the cost of administration and collection shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund, which would give the C.B.C. the gross rather than merely the net revenue from these fees.

These costs of administration and collection are too high. In the past eight years they have never been less than 11·92 per cent of the total fees collected. They have risen to as high as 12·5 per cent and last year they were 12·36 per cent of the total. That is much too high. In addition, the enforcement apparently is not the same in all parts of the country. As was admitted by one minister last Tuesday, apparently the enforcement is much more strict in Ontario than it is in other provinces.

There is a much more serious aspect to this matter. The public wants to know what it costs to maintain the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It has known that hitherto because every licencee of a private receiving set has had an annual reminder of that cost every time he paid his licence fee. He knew what he had to pay for the benefits of the enterprises of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. He will continue to pay $2.50 per year, but that $2.50 will no longer represent the total cost of maintaining the operations of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. There will be provided by parliament from the consolidated revenue fund—I take it that it will be done by a statutory item—a sum in excess of half a million dollars per annum. I do not think that is sound in principle. I do not think additional revenue should be provided and then the impression left with the people—I do not think it is intentional, but it is inevitable—that the $2.50 is providing everything necessary to maintain the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I know why the government does not propose to increase the licence fees by an amount sufficient to provide what is being provided by this bill. The minister has indicated that the additional payment to C.B.C. will equal 35 cents for each receiving set licence. Why does not the government increase the receiving licence fee to $2.85 or $3.00? I will tell you why. It would be a most unpopular move; there would be an outcry across the country. Yet this bill is indirectly increasing it. It may not be intentional, but this method has the effect of hiding part of the cost of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation from the public. It is an unsound method. The cost should not be hidden in this way.

What is this additional money going to be used for? After all, that is the crux of the whole matter. The minister has indicated that the costs of operation are rising. That is quite true. He has referred also to deficits. These are manifest from the evidence heard

by the committee. In the fiscal year ended March 31, 1946, the C.B.C. statement showed an operating deficit, before providing allowances for depreciation and obsolescence, of $78,425.73. An officially audited statement for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1947, is not yet available but the estimate of the officials of the C.B.C. is that the operating deficit, without including allowances for depreciation and obsolescence, will aggregate about $70,000, approximately the same as last year. The minister stated this afternoon that there is an actual operating deficit for the year 1945-46 of $265,000, and we had a repetition of that last year.

Mr. McCANN: No. I said the anticipated deficit for this year, 1947-48, was $265,000.

Mr. FLEMING: The figures are practically the same on the basis of actual operating deficit without allowances for depreciation and obsolescence, and I do not think there is any reason to expect that there would be any great difference between the two years in the actual deficit including proper allowances for depreciation and obsolescence.

For what purpose is this additional money being provided? Is it simply a matter of improving the service to the Canadian people? That depends upon what you mean by service. In my submission this additional amount is not chiefly for the improvement of programmes and for the employment of more Canadian talent, a worthy and laudable object. It is tied in with a policy of expansion by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It is the same policy which was discussed during the debate in the closing stages of the session last year.

This policy of expansion does not confine itself to the occupation by the C.B.C. of channels not hitherto occupied. It is a policy of expansion which takes on a most aggravated form in the assumption by this corporation of three of the major wavelengths now in the hands of private stations, stations which represent in terms of actual operation the closest thing we have in Canada today to competition in radio as between the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and others. Parliament must ask itself at this juncture whether it approves this policy of expansion.

It is not enough to say that parliament last year in the closing stages of the session provided in a supplementary appropriation another loan of $2,000,000 for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that there was presented to this house a bill which among other things provided that there should be opened up to C.B.C. loans aggregating $10,000,000 over a period, and in the first fiscal year $2,000,000 of that sum was to be available by way of loan to C.B.C. The whole basis of it was to enable the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to embark on an extensive policy of expansion, expansion in the form of providing an additional network. It was not simply a matter of improving the programmes of one national network. This programme of expansion contemplated the creation of a second national network, namely, the dominion network and the taking over of CFCN as part of the trans-Canada network; the dominion network was to take over the wave length of CFRB and transfer it to CJBC and make that the foundation for the second dominion network. Parliament did not pass that bill. It never was given second reading, and I submit that in passing the supplementary appropriation this house did not give approval to a programme of expansion in the form of a second national network as proposed in the bill. I submit that parliament has a duty at this stage to review this whole question of expansion, expansion at the expense of the wave lengths now enjoyed by some privately-owned stations which are among the leaders in giving service to the public.

Since that time the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has proceeded with very great haste in its steps to take over these wave lengths and crowd these three stations out into inferior wave lengths because the equal of the three they have enjoyed are now no longer available. They were available some years ago if C.B.C. had made know its intentions then, but it did not. The time limit provided by international agreement on this continent for the increase of power on class 1-A channels to 50,000 watts, has been extended by a *modus vivendi* arrangement. Nevertheless C.B.C. is proceeding with all possible speed to take over and occupy these wave lengths. That was done with government concurrence. It had to be. The government did approve. It had to approve before these three stations could be displaced from wave lengths which they had occupied for some years and on which they had given the Canadian listening public very good service.

Therefore I submit to this house that this whole question resolves itself now into this. Is the house prepared to give blanket approval to a policy of expansion which has as its foundation the taking over of these wave lengths held by the privately-owned stations? The report of the radio committee says:

> The area of competition between C.B.C. and the privately-owned stations is small.

That is the expression in the report, in the *Votes and Proceedings*, at page 737. The area of competition is small. The report says elsewhere:

The functions of the two types of radio service are different.

—that is, C.B.C. on the one hand and the privately-owned stations on the other, and there are about 100 of these stations in Canada. The report also says that these two types of radio service should be complementary to one another. In that respect I submit that the finding of the radio committee is not a correct and factual finding. Actually there is a very considerable area of competition as between C.B.C. on the one hand and the privately-owned stations on the other. That is the whole basis of the complaint which the privately-owned stations have made, through their association, against the continuation of a system under which the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is not only competitor, not only litigant, but also judge and policeman over them. If the situation were as simple as the radio commission has so naively described it, and there were no element of competition between the C.B.C. on the one hand and the privately-owned station on the other, the case for an independent regulatory tribunal would be somewhat different. But there is no escape from the fact that there is a substantial element of competition between the C.B.C. on the one hand and the privately-owned stations on the other.

The chairman of the board of C.B.C. said at a recent meeting that the evidence he would be prepared to give this year would be confirmatory of the evidence he gave to last year's committee on the matter of competition. To last year's committee he said that the C.B.C. was in competition with the privately-owned stations for listener interest—that was admitted—and in competition with them for commercial revenue. Those are important indicia of competition. I well remember putting a question to the chairman of the board of C.B.C. I want to make clear that the chairman of the board of C.B.C. is a gentleman for whom I have the highest respect. He is very efficient, and I think is gifted with a high sense of public service. He agreed that the place where competition was the keenest was where C.B.C. comes into competition with the large privately-owned stations of the kind I have referred to, the kind which enjoy the three wave lengths which are being taken over by C.B.C. with the government's full approval in what is nothing else but what I would call legalized robbery.

Here is the position. There is an area of competition. The C.B.C. was given by the Broadcasting Act the widest kind of powers to regulate all broadcasting in Canada. It is very difficult to conceive of powers couched in wider language than those contained in sections 8 and 22 of the Canadian Broadcasting Act. It gives C.B.C. control of all the private stations. It is a most sweeping power. Not only that, but the full licensing authority for all radio stations in Canada is vested by the Radio Act in the Minister of Transport, whose functions—which we were considering the other night—are exercised by the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply. He acts in pursuance of section 24 of the Canadian Broadcasting Act on the recommendation of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It was stated in evidence that he has never gone counter to the recommendations of C.B.C. in this matter. To all intents and purposes with the approval of the government the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation not only has full and complete regulatory powers in respect of all radio broadcasting in Canada but it shares with the Minister of Transport complete authority in respect of the issuing of licences.

In that situation I submit that the only fair and proper way in which parliament ought to make provision for legislative control over broadcasting in Canada, including licensing, is by vesting authority in the public interest in an independent regulatory tribunal. Independent—why do I say that? It must be independent of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I have said already that that body, even in the area in which it is in close competition with private stations, is their judge. They have no right to appeal from its judgment. It is the one and final judge. Is that not a fine situation? Here is one competitor coming before its chief competitor as a litigant, and the latter competitor has not only his interests involved as a litigant but he is judge, jury and sheriff, and in the case of these three wave lengths, executioner as well. I submit that that is an absolutely unhealthy situation. It is very unhealthy for the C.B.C.

I must confess my difficulty in understanding the attitude taken by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, voiced in the committee recently by the chairman of the board, I think with the full approval of the board of governors, that when the Canadian Association of Broadcasters comes before the parliamentary committee and asks that an independent regulatory tribunal be set up in the public interest it flies to arms and says: We are being attacked. I do not approve of that attitude. I do not think that because the C.B.C. is given these functions it should regard itself as

inviolate, or that it should be regarded as an act of impertinence on the part of those with whom it is in competition, in a substantial area of competition, to come to the only place that they can come and say they think the system is wrong and it ought to be changed. Surely we have not yet come to the place in this country where persons who have a grievance cannot come to a parliamentary committee and plead for a change in the system under which they are being judged by their competitors.

When we are told that these people did not set forth individual complaints, I ask, Mr. Speaker, if we need any more individual complaints than the record of the legalized robbery by the C.B.C. of these three wave lengths. For my part I do not need any more proof of the necessity of some tribunal standing apart from the C.B.C. to judge as between the C.B.C. and the private stations in these matters where their interests are in headlong conflict. The kind of tribunal that is needed, Mr. Speaker, is a tribunal which, in the field of regulation of broadcasting in Canada and with respect to licensing of stations for the purpose of broadcasting in Canada, would exercise powers and functions similar to those exercised in the field of transportation in Canada by the board of transport commissioners. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, parliament countenancing a proposal that the functions of the board of transport commissioners in respect of the regulation of rail transport in Canada should be handed over to the Canadian National Railways? Would you think of submitting the Canadian Pacific Railway to regulation by its competitor the Canadian National Railways? It is not enough to say that in the railway field the competition is complete, and that in the broadcasting field the competition is not so complete. That is an answer in degree only, and apparently we differ very greatly on the extent of the degree. For my part I say that the principle involved is precisely the same.

I will give another example. The air transport board, in a manner somewhat similar to the board of transport commissioners in its field, regulates civil aviation in Canada. It has had to judge as between Trans-Canada Air Lines and Canadian Pacific Air Lines, and will no doubt have to do it on occasions in the future. Would this house countenance a proposal that these regulatory functions in respect of civil aviation in Canada should be handed over to Trans-Canada Air Lines to be judge over its competitor? Of course no sensible hon. member would propose any such thing. Then why in the field of radio broadcasting do we—in the face of the case that has been made out for an independent regulatory tribunal appointed with full parliamentary approval, holding tenure, possessing powers, exercising functions, and generally operating in the same fashion in its field as the board of transport commissioners in the railway field—why do we hesitate now to take action to correct the situation that is now permitted to exist here? I say, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when this house must boldly say that we believe in public control of all radio broadcasting, and that we are going to say that, as between the various agencies through which broadcasting is done in Canada, there will be fair play. The only way in which that can be assured is through an independent tribunal appointed under parliamentary authority and operating in the public interest.

I want to deal as quickly as I can with several individual matters. Reference will be found in the report of the radio committee to the matter of a ceiling. The ceiling on the strength of private stations in Canada is set by C.B.C., and as things now stand no private station has any chance of being allowed to increase its power to the point where C.B.C. is likely to experience too much competition from that station. There are only a couple of stations, being those holding these wave lengths to which I have referred, which enjoy any power in advance of the ceiling set by the C.B.C. for all privately owned stations in Canada, which is 5,000 watts. The result is that, depending on which of two alternative interpretations of the Havana treaty, section 6, is correct, we may have been losing some of the prior rights we had in respect of channels which were assigned to us from the class 2 channels under that treaty.

The radio committee has brought forward a proposal now which is sensible though belated, indicating that it does think the ceiling may well be raised. I submit that should have been done long ago. It would have been in the public interest. Greater power for these stations would mean better broadcasting, better reception at the receiving end, and generally better service to the Canadian people. The final decision on this question of ceiling should not be left in the hands of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Then there is the matter of television and facsimile. Facsimile is not mentioned in the report, although we heard much evidence on it. There should have been something in the report on facsimile. Nobody may have a licence unless the C.B.C. board recommends it. The C.B.C. has refused heretofore to

recommend the issuance of any licence for television and facsimile. Why? The reason is the paternalistic attitude taken by the C.B.C. They say that this country is not ready for facsimile and television; that it would be premature for somebody to spend money on it. They think it is premature for the C.B.C. to spend money on it, but they will not let private interests spend their own money to develop facsimile and television. Can you imagine a situation like that, Mr. Speaker? I call that the final proof of the dangers of the monopolistic control over radio broadcasting by C.B.C. What we are going to wake up one day in this country and find is that television in the United States is an established fact and in commercial use. In Canada C.B.C. will then begin to consider whether it should permit anybody to have such a licence.

This report—again it is a belated recommendation; again in strict fact it is a censure of the policy followed by the government and the broadcasting corporation—recommends that consideration be given to the granting of licences for television, provided—and this is a proper proviso—the licencee will really develop these licences and spend money and work on the development of television. That is sensible. Nobody should have a licence simply to be allowed to sit on his rights; but there are people who have been applying for these licences and have indicated they are prepared to spend money on them. But the almighty C.B.C., with the almighty minister who is the fountain of licences says: No; we are going to exercise paternalistic control over you and we are not going to allow you to have a licence. We are not going to let you spend your money to develop television in Canada.

The same thing applies to facsimile. The possibilities of the development of facsimile in Canada as elsewhere are simply revolutionary, Mr. Speaker, and if we are just going to sit by we are leaving the newspapers of this country exposed to the danger,—I do not say the certainty—of being found at a great disadvantage when facsimile becomes a proven fact. If the C.B.C. then exercises the ruling powers that it enjoys under section 8 of the Canadian Broadcasting Act to publish news, the newspapers may be completely at the mercy of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

I wish to deal with one further matter in the report. There is a criticism in this report which represents the views of the Liberal-C.C.F. alliance on the committee. I think an attempt is made in several paragraphs to smear the private stations. When we are told that they are making a lot of money, I would remind the house that these stations were not given any opportunity to indicate, nor were they asked any questions about, their profits. We simply find quoted verbatim in the report a statement given by C.B.C. We are not told what that represents in terms of the past operating records of these stations. We are not told anything about their experience in the pioneer days. These stations were not given an opportunity to be heard on this point, but an attempt is made here to smear them.

The private stations are also criticized inferentially in this report for even daring to publicize, over their own stations and in the press, the brief which they were submitting to the committee. Think of that! Apparently we have come to the pass in this parliament where a committee, dominated by the government-C.C.F. alliance, can criticize people because they try to make their views known across Canada even though they are expressing those views at the same time before a parliamentary committee. That is one faint example of the dangers that exist today in our radio set-up of throttling and muzzling free expression of public opinion in Canada.

When this report undertakes to criticize the privately-owned stations for not using more live Canadian talent, I would make this observation. I for one want to make it perfectly clear that in my opinion the private stations and the C.B.C. alike are not using enough live Canadian talent, and if the private stations are not doing so, it is an indictment of the C.B.C. for its failure to exercise wisely its regulatory powers over those stations. I do not think enough has been done to encourage the greater use of Canadian live talent over these stations, and I will tell you one reason for that. It is the insecurity of tenure enjoyed by the private stations. They have a licence which is clearly stated to be for twelve months only; it expires on March 31 of each year. They have therefore no legal assurance of continuance beyond that date. This committee has wisely reported in favour of some extension of that tenure, because if these stations are given some assurance of tenure, encouragement will be given them to expend more of their revenues in the development and use of Canadian talent.

I believe this report is right in its recommendation that the present refusal of the C.B.C. to grant licences to newspapers ought to be withdrawn. There is no reason why newspapers as such should not be permitted to hold radio licences pending good behaviour

like any other licensee. The fact is that a number of newspapers have licences, and if you deny the same right to other newspapers you are putting those that now possess licences in a favoured position, and that is indefensible discrimination.

The same thing applies to multiple ownership. I say that, other things being equal, we should try to spread licences around. Where other things are absolutely equal, where you have competing applications, the licence should be granted to the applicant who has not already a licence, but there should be no rule against the ownership of more than one station. That is arbitrary and it favours those who already enjoy the ownership of more than one station. Again, that is indefensible discrimination.

There are omissions from this report. It is clear, from what I have said, what kind of omissions they are.

I wish to conclude these remarks by pointing out the dangers of the present situation. Anyone who will sit down and calmly examine the possibility that exists, through the monopoly of licensing, not necessarily under the present management but under any other management, of throttling the free expression of public opinion, will realize that these dangers are so great that the time has come when this house must see that the structure of radio broadcasting in Canada is recast, that the regulating and licensing are confided to a body publicly appointed, operating in the public interest, which will function with due regard for the interests of all, instead of being dominated by the C.B.C. We must avoid monopoly and make a more realistic approach to the whole problem, and I say that if the house passes this bill, having regard to what we know now about the plans of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for expansion, we are extending powers which it is too dangerous in this or any other country, to confide, to one agency.

Mr. ALISTAIR STEWART (Winnipeg North): We have listened once again to the annual hymn of hate of the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming), and it was not quite so good as it was last year, perhaps because there was so much duplication of material in it. I would suggest to the Tory party that they get another needle or another record, or at least that they get some live talent on their programmes. I think they could do with it. The member for Eglinton has talked repeatedly of the C.C.F.-Liberal majority. I can assure him that Canada under these circumstances is much better off with a C.C.F.-Liberal majority than under the rather insanitary Tory-Social Credit minority.

One of the things I have noticed about the member for Eglinton is his habit of saying nothing with an air of great profundity. For instance, he tells us that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is the judge, jury, sheriff and executioner as well, and he tells us that is not a healthy situation. I have never known execution to be at all healthy, but that is a matter which the hon. member for Eglinton can decide for himself. However, if he is guilty of these profundities he is equally guilty of enunciating error with a zeal worthy of a better cause. For instance, he asks us this question: Is the house prepared to give approval to this policy of taking over channels owned by private radio? There are no channels owned by private radio. They belong to the people of Canada and the people have complete control at any time over these channels.

In another burst of oratorical fervour he asks us to watch that freedom of expression is not throttled and muzzled by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in Canada. It is possible I have had more radio experience than my hon. friend. During the last twelve years I have made as many as 800 or 900 broadcasts on the C.B.C. and private stations, and my practical experience is that liberty is in no danger whatsoever from the C.B.C. But liberty would be in danger if the C.A.B.—the Canadian Association of Broadcasters—were running things in this country.

What is asked for in this bill is in effect that another half million dollars of revenue be given the C.B.C. The corporation needs it. It has had a deficit, and if it cannot get more revenue there is only one thing to be done and that is to cut certain sustaining programmes. If the C.B.C. gets its revenue, not only will it be able to maintain its service to the people of Canada but it will be able to improve that service. The alternative is to cut certain programmes and they will be sustaining programmes, the type of programmes that appeal to a minority in the country, but a minority which must not be lost sight of.

There is "Stage 47." On occasion I have heard some bad performances, but on the whole I think the presentations "Stage 47" and "Stage 46" and those of previous years have been a credit to radio in Canada, and I should be sorry to see them dispensed with. We have the weekly book reviews, the forums, chamber concerts and so on, and all these things must be paid for. A substantial minority of people in Canada want to hear these things, as I have said, and if the C.B.C. cannot get the revenue we just will not hear them. We have symphony concerts from Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver, and I hope that next year we may have such con-

certs from Winnipeg. Unless the C.B.C. steps in, however, there will be no orchestra at all in Winnipeg. As a matter of fact there are very few symphony orchestras which do not require to be subsidized in some way. I remember that in 1938 three of us in that western city were talking about the possibility of building a symphony orchestra in Winnipeg. One of the three was the western director for the C.B.C., Mr. Claringbull; another was Mr. Geoffrey Waddington, the well known musician and conductor, and I was the third. Through the cooperation and help given by the C.B.C. eventually we were able to build up in Winnipeg an orchestra of some fifty-five men and women, who became sufficiently good as performers to be heard not only over the Canadian network but also over the Mutual network in the United States. That would have been impossible without the aid of the C.B.C. I think the orchestra got about $400 a programme, and even at that it meant the players averaged over a period of ten weeks only about $10 per performance, which is inadequate pay for the performances they gave.

So if the C.B.C. is going to avoid running into deficits, some of the most cultural and useful programmes in Canada will have to be dispensed with. The minister has told us that much of the service given by the C.B.C. is provided by the licence fee of $2.50 paid by the citizens of Canada. He has also told us that we are reaching the saturation point in the number of licences that can be issued. The rise in fee revenue apparently has been checked in the last three years; but while that has become stationary every other phase of cost has climbed steeply. There is administrative, operational and programme cost; and, as the minister said, the fees of artists have increased by almost sixty per cent in some cases since 1940. Unfortunately the salaries of those who work for the C.B.C. have not risen in proportion to the cost of living. It is not right that these public servants should be discriminated against because sufficient revenue is not available for them, because the inevitable result will be the loss, not only to the corporation but to Canada, of many of our most able young men and women.

I do not think there can be any question that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is the greatest instrument we have in Canada for the advancement of culture. I do not suggest that there is yet any such thing as a Canadian culture. We are still falling between the two influences, the British and the American, and it is time we started to build our own. In this the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation can be of great assistance. The type of culture we are importing from south of the line just now unfortunately is mainly that of the comic strip. Without wishing to give offence I think I can suggest that Li'l Abner is much better known than most cabinet ministers, and in certain cases perhaps held in higher esteem. It is obvious that if we are going to produce a Canadian culture we must be prepared to pay for it, and one of the tasks of the C.B.C. is to develop and expand this particular form of service to all the people of Canada. That is a policy of expansion; and the C.B.C. should be continually expanding if the type of service we envisage is to be given. We have to give coverage to the most sparsely populated areas in our country, and that is expensive. It means that in Canada the cost per head for coverage is probably higher than in any other country. We have a great area with a small population; therefore it is obviously expensive to provide the service we expect our people to get. I stress that word "service" because it is the duty of the C.B.C. to give service to the people of Canada.

On the other hand the primary duty of the members of the Canadian association of broadcasters, as private stations, is to make profits. After they make profits then the service may come. According to figures I have last year private radio made a little over $2,000,000, and this on a capital of some $8,250,000, or a return of about 25 per cent. The licence fees charged private radio were slightly under $40,000, obviously a quite inadequate sum. But if the Canadian association of broadcasters are going to insist that the private stations are there to serve the people, then I think those private stations should be satisfied with a return on capital of ten per cent at the most, and let the balance revert to the treasury of the nationally owned broadcasting company so that still greater service may be given the people. If the government does not agree with that idea then I suggest that the licence fees ought to be stepped up appreciably.

I want to make clear once again what was said last year and in previous years. We in the C.C.F. are not in favour of a state monopoly of radio. We want to see private community stations run for the benefit of the community, and as long as they do that they are playing their part. Some community stations are run very capably and efficiently; with others the position is just the reverse. One of the efficient stations I think of is CKRC in my own city of Winnipeg. Although the station is owned by the Sifton interests the management is enlightened. In

few cases where the public interest is at stake and one approaches the management and asks for free time to explain the situation is that time not given. At election time, whether municipal, provincial or federal, the management will get the parties together and say, "There is a certain amount of time available. No matter how much money you have you cannot buy more time. Divide it up among yourselves," and each is given fair play. The management of that station, I repeat, is broadminded and fairminded. Unfortunately these conditions do not exist throughout the entire private industry.

There can be little doubt in the minds of impartial observers, I think, that the Canadian Association of Broadcasters would very much like to slit the throat of the C.B.C. from ear to ear. They may not have avowed that intention, but it is implicit in many of the things they have said. Heaven help Canada if private radio takes over control, if ever it does; naturally I hope it does not. The first thing the C.A.B. would do would be to concentrate on the audiences in urban areas, because there you have your most compact audiences; and the people in the rural areas would not get the services they get now. There would be the very minimum of service where small profits were to be made. Today the C.B.C. carries programmes which I have no doubt are worthless commercially, worthless from the point of view of earning money, but of tremendous value from the standpoint of cultural and political unity. I can hardly think that private radio would give us programmes of the same type.

In their campaign against the C.B.C. this year the Canadian Association of Broadcasters bought full-page advertisements in about seventy Canadian newspapers, in an attempt to discredit the government owned radio organization. I do not know how many thousands or tens of thousands of dollars the C.A.B. paid for those advertisements, but advertising on such a national scale is rather an expensive hobby. Furthermore the committee was given the results of a survey which purported to show that national radio was in disfavour in quite a number of provinces throughout Canada. When inquiries were made it was disclosed that those responsible for perhaps the financial arrangements behind this survey were Imperial Oil, Aluminum Limited, Canadian Industries Limited, Canadian General Electric and Northern Electric. I think it is reasonable to believe that the results of that survey might be somewhat suspect, in view of the sponsors.

Mr. FULTON: Does the hon. member know the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation used the same survey themselves?

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I do not know it; I am talking about one particular survey which still is somewhat suspect.

The suggestion has been made that there is nothing very far wrong in newspapers owning radio stations. I disagree with that. In the first place, on more than one occasion newspapers have distorted facts. For instance, when the Montreal *Gazette* came to print the story about the survey it omitted two provinces which showed that they were in favour of national radio. I do know the newspapers in my own home town somewhat better. There is the Winnipeg *Tribune,* a newspaper which is without either bowels or brains, but on occasions has some heart. Then there is the Winnipeg *Free Press,* owned by the Sifton interests, a paper which if it can posssibly go out of its way to distort, will do so. I cannot feel at all happy at the prospect of such papers owning and controlling radio stations. I think it is imperative for the sake of freedom in Canada that the air be kept in the hands of the people of Canada. So long as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation protects the interests of the people of Canada, just so long are we prepared to vote for measures such as this one.

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, rising this afternoon to take part in the debate may I say first that this year for the first time it was my pleasure to be a member of the radio committee. I must say I found the deliberations of that committee most interesting, but I had many complaints to make before it, and I did not support the final report when it came before the committee.

I believe hon. members may accept the frank view that every member who speaks in this debate is speaking because of the experience he has had in respect of radio in his own district or province. That is no indictment against any principle or any trust he may have; but by the natural course of events every hon. member coming from any section of Canada is interested either in his local radio station or conditions in radio in the province from whence he came. So this afternoon I wish to make it clear that my remarks emanate from the experience I have had, coming from British Columbia. Today most members have the experience of speaking over the radio. That does not pertain to any one member, because all of us take whatever advantage we can from the use of the radio, and I believe all appreciate that opportunity.

I believe it can be said, too, that we can be thankful we are not in a country where listening in over the air is either prohibited or forced upon us. The public have a well-established right—and properly so—whereby if they do not like a programme, by a slight twist of the wrist they can tune it out.

When Mr. Dunton, the chairman of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, was before the committee, I asked him if he placed any confidence or any reliance in the Elliott-Haynes survey, and he admitted that it was about as fair a report as one could get. I do not care what any member says or what views he holds with respect to radio; the fact is that we have now before us and we had before the committee evidence that, according to the Elliott-Haynes report, in most provinces the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation have a smaller number of listeners on the air than the private stations.

An hon. MEMBER: Where?

Mr. REID: British Columbia. I would not refer to these figures this afternoon were it not for the fact that I asked Mr. Dunton when he was before the committee if the Elliott-Haynes report was a reliable one, and he said it was. As a matter of fact it is the only report we have with respect to radio listeners over the various stations in Canada.

The last report given before the committee showed that in September 1944, forty-four per cent of the people were in favour of private radio and thirty-six per cent in favour of government radio. The latest report, that of February 1947, reveals that the number of listeners preferring private radio had increased from forty-four per cent to 57·8 per cent, while those listening in on C.B.C. stations had decreased from thirty-six per cent in 1944 to 24·1 per cent in February 1947.

Any hon. member may get up and argue all day about the C.B.C. being a better system of radio. But in the final analysis the people of Canada are the best judges as to which system is the best. And until we get a better report, then the Elliott-Haynes or one which will contradict the one I have before me, then I say we must take it that so far as most provinces are concerned, most of the radio minded people are listening to private radio stations rather than to the C.B.C.

I say that is a total answer—and you can argue all day about the merits or demerits of the present situation. I am speaking for and about the Canadian people. I am speaking on the official poll taken, taken throughout Canada, not among members of the C.C.F., the Social Credit or Progressive Conservative parties, but from the Canadian people themselves. Until it is refuted, in my opinion that record is the record of radio listeners in Canada. I have an open mind as to whether we should have a board similar to the board of transport commissioners to control radio. I must confess that at first blush there appears to be a good deal of merit in having another board to which both the C.B.C. and private radio stations would have to go, and under whose control they would come. I am not going to offer a definite opinion at the present time because, as I say, my mind is open in the matter.

However I have in mind other boards we have set up in the past. I think particularly of the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada, and I am wondering if the people of Canada are receiving the protection which was intended when that board was first established. When it was set up a long time ago, the view of the then government, and of the people generally I believe, was that some such board was required to protect the interests of the Canadian people. Over the course of the years however the viewpoint and outlook of that board has changed considerably until today I can say without fear of successful contradiction that the board of transport commissioners are looking after the interests of the railways and not those of the people of Canada generally.

Can one imagine a member of parliament rising up in debate and asking for reduced freight rates? Let him do so, and he will receive the answer I have received for the past eighteen years: "That is not a matter for parliament to decide; it is one for the board to decide." I am afraid if a board were set up for radio, in the course of a few years the public might awaken to the fact that it had an autocratic board sitting in some building in Ottawa, a board over which parliament had no control.

As I say, my mind is open in the matter. But I believe the time has come when there should be a thorough review of the entire radio situation. I believe I would go so far as to say another commission similar to the Aird commission should be established, and I will state why. When the Aird commission was set up, compared with what it is today, radio was in its infancy. Some twenty years have gone by since that commission made its report. By the way, I am wondering how many members have read the Aird report. I know many did at the time it was published, and perhaps some have since; but I make the plea that every member of the House of Commons get a copy of the Aird report and read it again. What will they find? They will find, as I have, that many of the recom-

mendations made in that report have been thrown in the discard and have never been acted upon. When the Aird commission set out to examine into radio they went to many countries, among them Great Britain. If they went to Great Britain today I venture to say that they would not find as many people in favour of the B.B.C. as were in favour of it in 1928. Those are the reports I receive from Great Britain at the present time. When they visited the United States they went to only one point and they had not much to say about United States radio.

This afternoon I want to draw attention to some of the recommendations that were made and I am going to complain because some of those recommendations have not been carried out. One recommendation was that there should be seven 50,000 watt stations throughout Canada, and British Columbia was mentioned as one place where such a station should be located. What do I find on looking over the list? I find that all we have in British Columbia is a 5,000 watt station. It is well known that you must have a powerful station to get into the interior over the mountains. There is one of these 50,000 watt stations in Watrous, Saskatchewan, one in Montreal, and one in Sackville. As I say, there is a 5,000 watt station in Vancouver and another one in Toronto. I claim that we have been ignored so far as the recommendations of that commission are concerned.

Let us look at other recommendations. When the Aird commission investigated radio in this country they envisioned every provincial government taking a vital part and being tied in with radio. Here is one recommendation the commission made:

> That a provincial radio broadcasting director should be appointed for each province to have full control of the programmes broadcast by the station or stations located within the boundaries of the province for which he is responsible.

That commission had considerable respect for the private stations of that day. In order to keep the record clear I will read the next recommendation:

> That high-power stations should be erected across Canada to give good reception over the entire settled area of the country during daylight; that the nucleus of the system should possibly be seven 50,000 watt stations; that supplementary stations of lower power should be erected in local areas, not effectively covered by the main stations, if found necessary and as experience indicates.

Then they envisioned national unity and education, not the education spoken of here but scholastic education. Before dealing with that particular recommendation I should like to read the main three recommendations, because they are the foundation of my address this afternoon. They are:

> (a) the establishment of one or more groups of stations operated by private enterprise in receipt of a subsidy from the government;
>
> (b) the establishment and operation of stations by a government-owned and financed company;
>
> (c) the establishment and operation of stations by provincial governments.

It was recommended, first, that there should be a national company; second, that provincial radio directors should be appointed in the provinces, and, third, that a provincial advisory council should be set up. In addition it was recommended that seven 50,000 watt stations should be estabilshed across the country. But there is another recommendation that has never been carried out. It was recommended that the great northland of this country should be provided with radio. If anyone will look at the map presented to the committee by the C.B.C. he will find that there are not many radio stations in the far north. Yet the Aird commission envisaged radio being provided for the remote districts of Canada and for all our people. The C.B.C. was established in 1936, but little has been done about the recommendation up to the present time.

At one of the sittings of the committee I asked for details of the expenditures in the various provinces, but no one could find out what they were. British Columbia has not been provided with a 50,000 watt station and yet that province pays more by way of radio licence fees than the three maritime provinces and the Yukon together. Last year British Columbia paid $385,514 for radio licence fees, while the maritimes and the Yukon paid $345,538. In other words, British Columbia listeners paid $36,676 more than the listeners in the maritimes and the Yukon. Yet our people are receiving, I was going to say nothing, but they are receiving very little from the C.B.C. Most people in British Columbia are listening either to United States stations or to the local private stations. I quoted to the committee figures obtained by Elliott-Haynes Limited, one of these companies which takes radio tests throughout the country. These showed that so far as British Columbia was concerned more people were listening to private stations and to United States stations than to the C.B.C.

Why is this? There is no high pressure group making these people listen to those stations. A simple turn of the knob will get you the station you want. Some one this afternoon spoke about encouraging fine music. I would like to know who is responsible for

some of these soap box plays we hear, these weepy plays that go on by the hour where you can hear women tearfully weeping all the time. There is always tearfully weeping all the time. Some of them go on by the hour. Is that considered to be educating the people?

Mr. GRAYDON: Are those on the air?

Mr. REID: Yes. Where do you think they would be?

Mr. GRAYDON: I was wondering how the hon. member got to know about them. Did he listen to them?

Mr. REID: I am out for education. I do not take things secondhand. I listened to them and I know that on one Sunday one went on for a whole hour, the weepiest play I have ever heard on a Sunday evening. When you protest to C.B.C. about these plays they tell you that they are receiving many favourable letters. They may receive letters, but just look at what they did when this committee inquiry was on. I accused them at the time, and I say so again. They were able to get a lot of their highly paid patrons to write articles all over the country on behalf of the C.B.C.

The private stations were accused this afternoon of carrying on a high pressure campaign, and I do not think that should have been in the report. However, nothing was said about the high pressure campaign put on by the C.B.C. through their well known commentators. They are not paid directly to put on a campaign like that, but they did it just the same. They wrote articles from one end of the country to the other. These men are receiving remuneration, and if you do not call that a high pressure campaign I would like to know what it is. Let us be fair. This thing is not all one sided. These men do not want to be cut off the C.B.C. list. They are all getting some money on the side from the C.B.C. and they are out to support C.B.C I would like to know who chooses these soap operas. I asked about a man by the name of Sinatra, but I am not going to go into that now.

I am rising to oppose this bill. Because of what I heard in the committee I cannot help but oppose it until this whole radio system is thoroughly investigated—not by a committee of the House of Commons; oh, no; not after what we witnessed in the committee this year. I know I will probably be looked upon possibly as a black sheep because of the independent stand I am taking. I am not apologizing for that, but I say that until we have a thorough independent inquiry I hardly think it is fair to tax the people of Canada who do not have a radio $544,673.

Someone mentioned the difference between the government and parliament, and I am glad he did that, because all members on this side at least, and cabinet ministers in particular know full well that the public blame the government for collecting the licence fees. There is hardly a member of parliament, on this side at least, who if he is honest will not tell you that he has received criticism of the collecting of the licence fee and that it is aimed directly at the government. It is all very well to say that C.B.C. is under the control of parliament, but the government is linked up with the collecting of the licence fees. The collecting of the licence fees, in the mind of the public, is done by the government, because the Department of Transport is a department of the government, and therefore any grievance is laid at the door of the government, as well as enforcement and prosecutions. The government is held to blame for all that. None of us will say that we would like prosecutions to take place on the eve of an election. We might as well be frank, and I am bringing this point up to show that the government has some responsibility in this matter.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It is a good job that there is one honest Liberal I know of.

Mr. REID: Well, thanks.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. member for Bow River would not know what an honest Liberal is. He has not the intelligence to discriminate.

Mr. HACKETT: One is enough to save the city.

Mr. REID: I am sorry this short debate is not going over the air. To come back to what I was saying before I was interrupted, there are in Canada something like 4,000,000 families, out of a population of approximately 12,000,000, who could have a radio licence. The radio licence fees collected this year, however, amounted only to $1,807,824. Roughly speaking, about fifty per cent of the householders have a radio licence. It has been a surprise to me that in proportion to our population we have far fewer homes in Canada with a radio licence than most other countries. Be that as it may, I think it is most unfair to tax the people who have no radios this $544,673. I am going to oppose that.

I propose that the whole matter of radio be investigated by an independent commission of some kind and in the light of present modern inventions. Take the question of facsimile newspapers, for instance, which came before the radio committee. The Aird commission on radio had no idea that facsimile newspapers would ever come into being.

Again in regard to some other modern developments I do not think that C.B.C. is taking the proper attitude. Take television. I know that we have a marvellous heritage here. I know that some control will have to be exercised to prevent multiple ownership from becoming too great and becoming, shall I say, the entire boss of what goes over the air in this country. But parliament can impose proper safeguards. C.B.C. claims that it has not the funds to develop television. But private interests are ready to go ahead with it. I would not be so afraid of giving them the right to develop facsimile provided that we have proper regulations. We should not let C.B.C. sit there with a charter for television without supplying a television service, and simply holding the charter as a monopoly. I know that we must be careful not to allow private radio companies to control an entire chain from one end of this country to the other. I am against that kind of control or monopoly.

I am opposed therefore to increasing the amount of money to be given to C.B.C. by this scheme of turning over to them the whole of the licence fee. One other matter before I finish. If there were in Ottawa some private radio stations which were really alive to what the people want, I am sure that the people of Canada would be enjoying from time to time a programme from this city which only a few around here ever hear, and that is the programme from the carillon in the tower. Sometimes you can hear the bells from Big Ben in London over B.B.C., but here in Ottawa unless you are within hearing distance of the tower in the House of Commons, you cannot enjoy the carillon programmes. If the C.B.C. had been alert to giving real service they would have allowed the entire country to hear that programme from the tower at least once a week, and in that way the rest of Canada who contribute hundreds of thousands of dollars to C.B.C. could enjoy the carillon programme.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: They might hear your bagpipes instead.

Mr. REID: That would still be better than Sinatra. I am willing to bet that they would get more letters of commendation about the bagpipes than they would about Sinatra. Having given my views, Mr. Speaker, I simply say in conclusion that I am opposed to this bill.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the opportunity is presented to us to discuss the radio situation in Canada. I take a conscientious interest in my work and I would have been sadly disappointed had the radio committee's report been presented to parliament with no opportunity whatsoever for our discussing it.

Might I remind the house that while the radio committee's report was made to parliament, it was not unanimous; and furthermore, the report will not be concurred in by this house. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation take great delight in referring to the recommendations of previous parliamentary committees. The psychological effect of that lends the impression that parliament has approved of such-and-such and the corporation is acting in accordance with the wishes of parliament. But that is not so. What the corporation is acting upon when it says that it is doing so and so because of the recommendations of a radio committee of parliament is this: it is acting upon the recommendation of a few government members, some of whom will admit that they are not exceptionally well qualified in radio matters.

The setting up of a separate regulatory body seems to be the main theme of the presentation by the independent stations throughout Canada. The report itself lays stress, through the use of a little phrase, on something which I think is receiving too much prominence. The report says:

They—

Referring to the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, representing some ninety odd stations in Canada:

They were insistent that any such organization—

Referring to a separate regulatory body.

—must be set up by the parliament of Canada as a whole—

I am not finding fault with that, because a body would not be set up except by an act of parliament; but they continue, and this is what I take exception to:

—and appointments to it should be by parliament of Canada as a whole and any review of its actions must be by parliament as a whole.

I think that is put in there for the purpose of discrediting the recommendations of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters. I do not believe that the independent stations are necessarily pressing for individual appointment to such a board as having the necessity of receiving approval by this parliament. Their main theme is—and it is just as reasonable as anything could ever be—that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation by its very nature should not be in a position where it can regulate and control its competitors. That is the main theme, and therefore an independent body responsible to parliament should be set up.

I was happy to hear the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) say that his mind was still open on the subject of an independent body. He did emphasize that he would not be in favour of an independent body that could rule the roost and not be responsible to parliament. Let me say to him that nobody has ever suggested such a body as that, not even the independent stations. We believe that any regulatory body should be responsible to parliament. That is only common sense. If the hon. member's mind continues to be open I for one am quite satisfied that he will eventually recommend the same thing that most of us are recommending, namely, that a separate regulatory body responsible to parliament should act as referee in matters of regulation between the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—which, after all, is, we can say what we like, a government owned institution—and the private stations in Canada.

Mention is made of the fact that the Canadian daily newspapers' association supported that view. No comment is made. It is simply said that they supported that view. The Canadian daily newspapers' association is composed of 110 separate daily newspapers in Canada. That is worthy of consideration. They are supporting an independent body. The Canadian daily newspapers association is not vitally interested in radio as part of the general set-up of newspapers. What they are mainly interested in is that radio itself is a medium of disseminating information, education and news, and any institution with that great power should not be able to control its competitors. That is the main theme of all those who are supporting an independent body.

In the report I find a paragraph which begins like this:

> Your committee has given very careful consideration to the proposals for a separate regulating board.

I want the house to notice these words:

> Your committee has given very careful consideration . . .

Mr. Speaker, that is just a laugh; that is a huge laugh. The committee did not give any consideration, let alone any careful consideration, to the setting up of an independent board. Someone might well ask, "Were you not on the committee?" Certainly I was on the committee, and I want to say this. I was also on the steering committee and I was a very busy man. I say that when we met there was no weighing of the evidence of those who presented their case for an independent body and that of those who presented any opposition to it. There is very good reason why there was no weighing of the evidence. No evidence was presented in support of opposition to an independent body. When the committee gathered together in executive council to formulate a report I happened to be a very busy man. I had another committee meeting approximately at the same time. I came down to the house in the morning in a big hurry and I had not even shaved. That does not make any difference as far as coming down to the house is concerned. But as time went on I did not even have time to have anything to eat at noon. That does not make any difference either. But when at about 4.30 o'clock I went into the committee which was supposed to weigh all the evidence there was hardly a quorum there. Therefore I said to the chairman, "Well, this is one time when I shall be very valuable to you. I will stay at least until you get a quorum." He looked at me and I could see what he was looking at, because I was looking like an African Santa Claus. I had not had time yet either to shave or eat. I stayed until the quorum came. Then I said, "What is the agenda?" The agenda was read through and the separate regulatory body was at the end of the agenda. I said, "Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I can snatch five minutes to go down and get a sandwich and a cup of coffee." The chairman said, "Yes, I think you can." I rushed down and had a sandwich and a cup of coffee, and when I came back to the committee half of the members had gone and the other half were picking up their papers ready to leave. I said, "Mr. Chairman, is it all over?" He said, "Yes, we have the whole thing fixed up." I said, "What did you do about this independent board?" He said, "Oh, they sat on it; they quashed it completely; they would not have anything to do with it." I said, "Well, I am surprised. I thought the intelligence of this committee was higher than that." What I am putting over to the house now is that that is how carefully they weighed and considered the evidence which was presented for an independent board.

Mr. McCANN: May I ask a question?

Mr. HANSELL: Yes, because I shall be asking the minister some questions.

Mr. McCANN: The hon. member was there when the final draft of the report was drawn up and he did not raise a single objection. Is that not right?

Mr. HANSELL: No. The thing had all happened while I was down trying to revive my vitality.

Mr. McCANN: The hon. member was there the next day and he did not raise one objection. He had not a word to say.

Mr. HANSELL: Did not raise any objection?

Mr. McCANN: When the final draft was presented to the committee.

Mr. HANSELL: I did not raise any objection?

Mr Mc.CANN: Not a word.

Mr. HANSELL: There was nothing—

Mr. McCANN: The hon. member is now trying to tell a different story of what happened before.

Mr. HANSELL: What I am trying to tell is the truth.

Mr. McCANN: Well, you have missed a part.

Mr. HANSELL: I have not missed a part of it at all. Will any man rise here and say that he is in any doubt as to my position? Will the minister himself above anyone else, question my attitude toward the setting-up of an independent board. I was in the committee. Of course I was, and when the time came, when the entire committee was there, I was ready to emphasize the need of an independent board. That is why I made certain it was at the last of the agenda.

Mr. MITCHELL: Does not silence mean consent?

Mr. HANSELL: Not when you are not there. The point I make is that this is the careful way in which they went into the weighing of the evidence. Evidence is not weighed between the views of one and the views of another. People make up their minds, and I will go farther than that. My belief is that sometimes people's minds are made up for them before there is an opportunity of weighing evidence.

Now here is something in this report that I would bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker. I am going to say, before I quote it, that this part is false and I objected to it at the time. It appears in the same paragraph:

> Your committee has given very careful consideration to the proposals for a separate regulating board and has also received numerous arguments from other bodies such as trade unions, agricultural organizations, cooperative societies, and the like, in opposition to those proposals, to which also the committee has given careful consideration.

What is the truth of that paragraph? In the first place, the way the paragraph reads is that numerous arguments were received. Anyone reading it would think these organizations came before the committee. They did not come before the committee. They submitted letters to the committee. The letters were read and appear as an appendix to the evidence. They can be read in report No. 11. But what I want to say is this, that this opposition which seemed to come from these trade unions, agricultural organizations and cooperative societies, is not in fact the truth, and I will challenge the minister or anyone in the committee to read these letters and find more than one place where these organizations stated that they oppose a separate regulatory body. What they do say is that they are satisfied with the present radio policy and some of them are pulling for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. That is all right; that is their privilege. But to say that their arguments against a regulatory body were carefully considered is more than foolish nonsense. It is false.

While that is put in there, no mention is made of the other letters that were received supporting the Canadian Association of Broadcasters in their desire for a separate regulatory body. No mention is made of those, and there were letters from other organizations to that effect.

There is another matter along this line. It is a strange thing that no arguments are used as to why a separate regulatory body should not be set up. There are those who say it is not needed. There are those who say they are satisfied with things as they are. But no arguments are ever advanced as to why a separate board should not be set up. When we ask in what way the effectiveness of broadcasting by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation would be lessened, no arguments are presented. When we say, "Well, if there is an independent body, tell us how that would affect in any way the efficiency of the broadcasting of the C.B.C.?" No arguments are presented. A separate body does not mean that radio will be any less effective. It only means that there will be a referee and that one competitor cannot control the other.

I listened to the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart), who gushed forth in vitriolic vein, with some considerable push, a multiplicity of puny arguments. He vigorously defends state monopoly of radio, and the reason is that it serves the socialist purpose. It is significant that in his speech he did not present one argument why a separate regulatory body should not be set up. I am not surprised, because there are no arguments. I am very happy that he has had an opportunity to do so much radio broadcasting. I believe he said he had broadcast about 900 times. One thing is certain, that radio has been especially good to him, and if he can say that some of

his broadcasts were given over C.B.C., all I can say is that C.B.C. has been a little kinder to him than it has been to most of us.

I am convinced of this, Mr. Speaker. After sitting on the radio committee for a good many years, I am convinced that we shall never get a separate regulatory body until there is a change in government. That is the conclusion I have reached. We can say all we want about non-interference by the government. I am not going to charge them with any interference. It is certain, however, that radio policy in Canada today is government radio policy. and we shall not have any independent board or referee until there is a change in government.

I am not going to elaborate this point, but in the report a whole paragraph is devoted to a campaign which was carried on by the independent stations during the time the committee was meeting. Well, in the steering committee I objected to that paragraph being included. I agree that perhaps it was a special spurt on the part of the independent stations to inform the public; and why not? Anybody has that right in Canada; it is still a free country. No one will say that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has not done similar things in days gone by. I do not know how many newspaper advertisements it has published, but I will say that tons of literature have gone out in support of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Nothing is said of that. I am not objecting to it; it is something that is to be expected. Furthermore—and I am saying this complementary to what the hon. member for New Westminster said—how about last year, when circular letters were sent out by the farm forum to all their farm forum groups? I know the argument will be that the C.B.C. did not do that. Well, I am going to tell you there is quite an affinity between the farm forum organization and the C.B.C. They sent out circular letters with resolutions the same word for word, sending them through the mails or placing them on the desks of the secretaries of all these farm forums with a request that they send them in to the radio committee, whether or not they knew very much about radio. That was quite a high pressure campaign, and perhaps more effective than any newspaper campaign.

With respect to revenues, the committee reports that the independent stations are making some considerable profits. I am not going to say they are not profit-making institutions. In our system of private enterprise what business institution is not a profit-making institution? They would not stay in business very long if they were not. But when we talk about private enterprise and profit, let us remember it is not only a profit system we are living under; it is a profit and loss system. Radio stations can lose money, too. I am not saying many of them are losing money now, and I am glad they are not. I do not begrudge anyone a profit if it is not exorbitant and stolen from somebody else. I will challenge anyone to prove how the consumers of products or the Canadian people are suffering any loss from their own pocket-books through the profit that independent stations may be making from their commercial and advertising business.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Who pays for it?

Mr. HANSELL: My hon. friend raises the same question as he raised last year: "Who pays for it?" The people who buy the goods.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: We have to eat soap with our breakfast.

Mr. HANSELL: I will say this, that by reason of the advertising done by radio a product can be sold in such quantities that in all probability the public pays less for it.

An hon. MEMBER: Ho. ho.

Mr. HANSELL: Anyone who says "Ho, ho" to that statement reveals his ignorance. I would advise these men, including the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart), to be a little careful how they speak of the great and mighty profits that independent stations are making, because if they are not careful they are going to overdo it. Somebody is going to ask them how it is, then, if radio is such a profitable business, that the C.B.C. goes into the red. They have to be careful not to ride that horse too hard. I want to be fair. I know the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is required to meet huge expense; I am not denying that. I know they spend a great deal of money on programmes. I know they spend a lot of money in the search for talent. I know all about that, and I do not begrudge them a cent that is used properly. Let that be understood. Nevertheless I say that the argument goes both ways. If radio is such a profitable business, what is the position of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, having a tremendous advantage to start with, having four or five million dollars handed to them from the Canadian taxpayers, not having to pay any taxes as the independent stations must pay? So I say that those who argue against the profits being made by independent stations should be very careful.

There is another little matter I should like to bring before the committee, because it

affects a radio station within radio distance of my own constituency, and I think one has a right to speak in the interests of his own people. It has to do with the matter of free expression. Some evidence was brought out by the chairman of the board of governors of the C.B.C. to the effect that sometimes independent stations were not paying enough attention to free speech on the air. The station involved in the argument was the voice of the prairies station, CFCN, in Calgary. An extract was read from a letter in proof—and I want you to mark this, Mr. Speaker—of the suggestion that some independent stations were not paying enough attention to free speech on the air. This is what was quoted from the letter, and I think I will read the comment as well:

> The following, for instance, is from a letter received from station CFCN, Calgary. This station is a prominent member of the C.A.B., the most powerful private station west of Winnipeg, and its representatives before the committee last year spoke hotly about freedom of the air for the people of Alberta. The letter said:
>
> "As C.B.C. regulations require a station to sell time to all groups, if they sell to any (distribute time fairly), we have discontinued selling time between elections for political broadcasts, because about the only people who would spend money fifty-two weeks in the year belonged to some 'ism' or other."

I say that was unfair. It did not give the entire picture. The witness went on to say:

> This is hard to reconcile with statements in the C.A.B. brief about freedom of the air . . .

What was the case; what was the letter? I do not have the full file; no doubt the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has it all. I got in touch with the station and I said, "What is this all about?" They sent me the letter from which this was quoted. What had happened? I shall show first of all, that only that part of the letter which suited the argument of the C.B.C. was quoted. I shall begin by reading the first paragraph, to show that it is a friendly letter addressed to Mr. Dan E. Cameron of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation at Winnipeg. It starts out, "Dear Dan"—so it is friendly, you see—

> We acknowledge yours of May 14th with regard to the origination of "Terry Levis" talk on Tuesday May 20th from CFCN.

Then, later on, the paragraph from which the quotation is made reads this way:

> Had we accepted the revenue tender to us by various representatives of communism, socialism and other various "isms," at $40 per quarter-hour (money subscribed by their sucker following, if the broadcast is sufficiently bombastic), we could have taken a good many hundred dollars, but as C.B.C. regulations require a station to sell time to all groups, if they sell to any (distribute time fairly), we have discontinued selling time between elections for political broadcasts because about the only people who would spend money 52 weeks in the year belonged to some "ism" or other.

What was the reason for it? As a matter of fact, on one occasion I consulted this station, because I had been asked by my group if I would see the manager of CFCN for the purpose of purchasing time on the air for our Social Credit group. What did the manager say? He said, "We can sell you time but, as a matter of fact, we have just finished an election, and we think that perhaps the people are a little bit tired of political broadcasts." He persuaded me that that was not the right time to make political broadcasts.

What happened in this instance to which Mr. Dunton referred? No Progressive Conservative organization was asking to buy time; no Social Credit organization was asking to buy time; no Liberal organization was asking to buy time; but the communists and those of socialist views were pressing for time on the air. The station could have sold it at $40 a clip for fifty-two weeks in the year. In order to maintain a perfect balance, the radio stations said, "Well, for a time at least we will cut out all political broadcasts."

That is reasonable, but it is not the way it appears in the evidence. In the evidence it would appear as though this radio station were refusing to present all sides of the case. The very thing they were trying to do was, if possible, to present all sides of the case; and if they could not get all sides of the case they would not broadcast any.

That is the policy of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. At page 404 of the proceedings of the committee I find that the hon. member for Saskatoon City (Mr. Knight), a well respected member of that committee, asked about freedom of speech on the air, and he was asking particularly if labour unions had had an opportunity of going on the air. The chairman of the board of governors answered in this fashion:

> In our general policy regarding opinion broadcasting on our own networks we try, as our white paper says, to give a chance for different viewpoints to be expressed.

That is all the station in Calgary was doing. The paragraph is snitched from its context and used in an attempt to prove that private radio does not believe in free speech. That is unfortunate.

In respect of talent we have heard the suggestion that private radio should give more time to live talent and in the seeking out and nurturing of possible Canadian artists. I have no objection to that; no one has. But let me say this: I would suggest that the

independent stations are doing just as much as is the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in finding talent. Let us remember that radio does not make talent; it discovers it. Radio cannot afford to lose audiences by putting amateurs who are not acceptable on the air to the public.

There is the question in my mind as to whether the more important function of radio is to give the people what they want, within the scope of reasonable and respectable culture, or whether its function is that of the schoolroom. I am not convinced that it is the function of radio to train radio artists. I believe it is radio's function to discover artists; the schoolrooms, the dramatic societies and organizations of that kind are the ones which make them. I do not believe there is one amateur programme put over the air by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, but many independent stations hold amateur contests. I believe, if the whole story were told, it would be found that the private stations are doing a fair job in encouraging local talent. If an artist is worth anything he is soon discovered by radio; make no mistake about that. The schoolroom, the private music teacher, the band leaders, the dramatic critics, the schools of fine arts and institutions of that sort are the ones which make the talent; radio finds it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must remind the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. HANSELL: I was going to conclude by saying that I am afraid we shall have to oppose the bill. I can say that I really thought my time had expired ten or fifteen minutes ago.

Mr. LOW: I was behind the hon. member when he was speaking and could not hear exactly what he said. Did he say the C.B.C. was red or was going in the red—or both?

Mr. HANSELL: I said it was going in the red; but I can well understand how some people could misunderstand my statement.

Mr. JOHN T. HACKETT (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to deal with only one phase of this question, but as a preface to what I shall say I should like to associate myself with what has been said by the hon. minister for Eglinton.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not yet.

Mr. HACKETT: Perhaps my words are prophetic. I will retract them for the time being and say "the hon. member for Eglinton." I should like to associate myself also with a large part of what has been said by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell). I feel that the activities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation have perhaps been more marked by attempts to expand the fields of their endeavour than to improve the quality—some of them are excellent—of the programmes which they present to the Candian public.

However I wish to deal with the terms of the bill. I think it can be admitted, without scandalizing either parliament or the Canadian public, that the government cannot administer as economically as can private enterprise. There may be reasons why administration by government is always much more costly than by private enterprise, but that is not a reason for not keeping accurate accounts of what those costs are. The bill before us is a short one. It proposes to substitute a new paragraph for paragraph (a) of subsection 1 of section 14 of the Canadian Broadcasting Act. The original subsection is in these words:

> The Minister of Finance shall deposit from time to time in the Bank of Canada or in a chartered bank to be designated by him to the credit of the corporation:—
>
> (a) the moneys received from licence fees in respect of private receiving licences and private station broadcasting licences, after deducting from the gross receipts the cost of collection and administration, such costs being determined by the minister from time to time.

It is sought to replace that subsection with the following:

> The Minister of Finance shall deposit from time to time in the Bank of Canada or in a chartered bank to be designated by him to the credit of the coporation:—
>
> (a) the gross amount of the moneys received in each year from licence fees in respect of private receiving licences and private station broadcasting licences without deducting therefrom any costs of collection or administration.

The result is that there is to be deposited to the credit of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation the amount collected without deducting the cost of effecting that collection. The explanatory note to the bill tells us that last year the cost of collecting approximately $4 million was $544,673.17. I consider that that cost is too high and altogether out of proportion to what it should be. I am certain that, did the government place the collection of this money in private hands, it could be collected for at least one-half the present cost and the collector would still make a handsome profit. It is to be remembered that a substantial proportion of these moneys are paid through the post office without even the cost of a notice.

The bill means that the science of accountancy is to be dispensed with so far as it is

applied to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. This is disturbing. Part of the actual cost of operation is no longer to be shown in the accounts of that corporation. This is not only a violation of the great science of accountancy; it is a violation of the elements of good business, of fair dealing and of keeping faith with the public. The only reason for keeping accounts is to enable all and sundry to know at all times exactly what a business is spending and exactly what it is receiving. The sole purpose of this bill is to strike from the accounts of this broadcasting corporation one of the principal costs of doing business. It is a method of subsidizing the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in a hidden and utterly improper way.

My hon. friends who sit to my left remind us quite frequently—and we have heard it today—that in their view there is some impropriety in private broadcasting companies making profits. We have heard those private enterprises criticized severely because they made profits. I ask myself whether it is more reprehensible to make profits than it is to conceal losses. I would think that the conscience which dictates disapproval of profits, whether or not they be excessive, would be highly critical of legislation which can have but one result, whatever its purpose, that of deceiving the Canadian people.

We have been told by the minister that broadcasting in this country is much more expensive than it is in other countries. He gave what I thought was a sound reason for this, the tremendous area over which word has to be carried through the ether and sparsity of our population. He went on to explain that the licence fee in Canada is but $2.50, whereas in England it is a pound or, roughly, $5, and, if my memory serves me well, twenty-five shillings in Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, or about $6. I am going to suggest to the minister that, if what he has stated is accurate, it is only right that our radio licence fee should be raised. If the sparsity of our population and the dimensions of the area in which we are attempting to carry on radio business makes the per capita cost higher in Canada than in the other lands, the natural and inevitable thing to do is to raise the cost of the licence fee. I admit that that would not be popular; but an honest man, even to satisfy the requirements of his own conscience, sometimes has to do things that are not altogether popular. If the cost of the broadcasting service in this country comes to $3 per head instead of $2.50, let us exact that $3 instead of $2.50 from the holder of a radio set. But let us not introduce into this great undertaking an element of deceit which no man would tolerate for a moment in his own business and which is bound to create dissatisfaction and distrust in regard to the broadcasting corporation. It will also engender abuses. We all know that in public undertakings costs inevitably increase; the number of people employed inevitably increases. So it goes on year after year, and the burden of taxation becomes continually heavier. It is only by carefully scrutinizing all expenditures and by knowing exactly the reasons for them that we can hope to keep them under control.

I suggest to the minister—and he is not a man without experience in business—that he would not tolerate for a moment a method of accounting similar to that which is embodied in the amendment now before us, in any private enterprise of which he was a director or over which he had any control. I submit that it is almost an affront to the Canadian public to tell it that it is incapable of understanding that the cost of a certain service is greater than that which is being charged for it and that some devious way must be found in order to make up to the corporation the loss which it has incurred. To my knowledge, excepting possibly the hidden subsidies that were resorted to as a matter of expediency during the war, there has never been anything like this offered to the Canadian public before, unless it be the statute introduced some years ago whereby several hundred millions of debt of the Canadian National Railways was legislated out of existence. That I do not think was a very happy occasion. I do not think the procedure was ever justified. I do not think it was a precedent that is worthy of being followed, especially in the early days of the development of one of the great agencies for influencing public opinion and forming character, one of the great educative and cultural agencies of the land. It should be kept as free as possible of anything which savours of impropriety or deceit.

I submit that this bill introduces into the affairs of the Broadcasting Corporation a flavour of duplicity and double-dealing that is not at all attractive, and I sincerely hope that the minister will tear up the bill and raise the licence fee to $2.75 or $3, if necessary, or bring in frankly and openly a bill in aid to make up the operating deficit of the corporation. But let us have none of the petty methods that are suggested by the bill before us.

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, I have been on the radio committee for a good many years, and I do not see any differ-

ence between this radio committee and others on which I have sat. It has always been the same way. We have always had the old steam-roller, the socialist and semi-socialist Liberals with their majority on the committee, so that there is really not much use in suggesting anything with respect to the report.

The hon. minister took the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) to task for not objecting to some of the items in the committee's report. One has only to read the report to see how unsatisfactory it is. I objected to the figures of profits being included in the report, but the committee would not stand for my objection. I do not think it is right to publish these figures on profits such as these, because it does not give any kind of picture of the whole show. I do not object to these stations making profits. I think that the more profits they make, the more talent they will have and the more advertising they can do, and the more labour that will create.

So far as any careful consideration of the proposal in the bill is concerned, I do not think there was any proper consideration given to it. When these reports are being prepared I think it should be done in open session, so that the public can come and see how the different members of the committee feel on these various questions. Then we would get some results.

The report was not unanimous, and we can easily understand that. I am free to admit that there are some parts of the report with which I agree, but I should like to say that the committee was late in being set up, and, after it was set up, it was late in being called together. Our deliberations were lengthy; a lot of witnesses had to be called, and the work of the committee was hurried toward the end, so that we did not really have time to go into some matters that we should have liked to go into. There were a great many statistics and briefs placed before us, and they came so quickly that it was almost impossible to read and become familiar with them.

I agree with the report that a standing committee of this house should be set up. The whole question of radio is far more important than the question of money involved in connection with it. There were certain things that the committee did not take into consideration at all. While I was on the committee, it seemed to me that any proposals which were ever made by the Canadian Association of Broadcasters the majority of the members of the committee tried to discredit. The report almost seems to indicate, as the hon. member for Macleod said, that organizations such as agricultural organizations, cooperative societies and trade unions were heard. One trade union appeared before us and was examined, the musicians' union. That was the only union which came before us to be questioned. From that point of view the report is not correct.

The purpose of this bill is to give the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation the whole of the $2.50 licence fee extracted from radio owners. It is proposed to give them the whole without taking away the cost of collection. In other words, the owner of a radio is to be taxed thirty cents for the privilege of paying $2.50. That is what it amounts to. Since nationally owned radio was established in 1932 there has been a radio fee. First of all a fee of $2 was collected from the owner of each radio with the exception of blind people. In 1937 the revenue was $1,750,000. In the fall of that year the fee was raised to $2.50 for ordinary sets and to $2 for battery sets. These fees were collected on account of each radio owned by every person. In 1940, in response to a political move to abolish the radio fee, it was decided to collect a fee only from each home or multiple dwelling which includes, I suppose, each person who has a radio in a boarding house or each person who has a radio in a dwelling or multiple dwelling or each person who has a radio in a hotel room. The C.B.C. now receive $3,905,841, as well as $1,900,000 from advertising. The excuse for raising the fee to $2.50 in 1938 was given by the minister of transport of that date as follows:

> It is not the desire or the intention of the corporation at any time to obtain a revenue over $500,000 from commercial sources for reasons that are obvious.

It has gone up nearly four times that amount since that time, to $1,800,000. That amount of $500,000 was considered to be in the public interest at that time for reasons that are obvious. I do not know what the obvious reasons are now.

If this bill passes, as I suppose it will, it will be to all intents and purposes, as was stated, a subsidy from the public purse to the extent of the cost of collection. There is no doubt about that. In my opinion it is only a matter of time before the C.B.C. will face another emergency and will come back and want more money. To my mind the bill is hardly an honest bill. The government should not have asked parliament to pass the bill under these circumstances. I would suggest that there are two honest ways of meeting the problem. The first one is to raise the radio licence fee to the required amount and thus put a halt to this confusion, or to put

the whole thing on a direct basis and let parliament take the full responsibility now. The public would then know the cost. Parliament should be responsible for the expenditure of the money by the C.B.C. It would be far more economical than it is at the present time, and it would certainly be less irksome to the individual licence owner.

As I have said before in the house, why should a person who has one radio pay as much as a person who has twenty? The situation is ridiculous. Why should not the person who listens be taxed? He is the person who gets the advantage. Just because a person has a radio it does not seem to me to be any reason why the radio should be licensed. As I have said before, we might just as well license refrigerators or washing machines. The owners of these machines use electricity and get service. Why should you not license them? If you are going to license at all, license the listener by taking the money out of the consolidated revenue fund.

Here is the situation. If it is right to collect a licence fee of $2.50, then it is right to raise the licence fee to $3, if necessary. Of course that would not be politically popular. Perhaps that is the answer. If it is right to raise thirty-five cents, or $554,000, at the expense of the consolidated revenue fund, it is right to raise all the money at the expense of that fund through taxes.

Let us see what the situation is. The sum of $4,406,964 was collected. The cost of collection was $547,700, or a cost of thirty-five cents a licence because there were 1,807,824 licensees. The net amount given to the C.B.C. was $3,905,841. The cost of collecting that amount of money was fourteen per cent of the amount collected. It is absurd to have a cost of collection of that amount by a government which calls itself responsible for the taxpayers' money. I understand that the cost of collecting all the revenue in Canada amounts to less than eight-tenths of one per cent. Why spend $554,000 of the taxpayers' money when the collection could be made for so much less?

In addition to that, there were 11,624 prosecutions. How absurd it is to bring 11,624 people to court to get $2.50 from each of them and the court costs as well. Some 11,624 people were prosecuted, or six-tenths of one per cent of the licences issued. Sixty-seven per cent of these were in Ontario, where only thirty-four per cent of the licences were issued, and ten per cent in Quebec, where twenty-six per cent of the licences were issued. It is obvious, on that basis, that the policing of the licences is not being done equally all over the country. That goes for the other provinces as well. I am not singling out Quebec, or anything like that. How many other people living in houses or multiple dwellings having radios have not bought their licences? I do not know, but there are over a million and one-half people in the metropolitan areas of Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg and Hamilton. How in the world can one expect to find out whether these people have paid their licence fee or not? The thing on the face of it is ridiculous.

This is a majority report of the Liberal members of the House of Commons, backed by the C.C.F. That is true. There are none so blind as those who will not see, and little progress has been made consistently with our democratic principles so far as this report is concerned. We still have the same feature that has dominated other reports; that is, continued allegiance to political questions. The report is purely political. Consideration of principles—freedom of the air, equity and justice, the use of the radio for communication—have almost been forgotten in the report. The report implies, as a matter of fact, that there was little purpose in the committee continuing the hearing, since the majority have no interest in analysing complaints or weighing the merits of the representations made.

There is one fundamental principle that has been before the committee many times before, and that is in connection with the monopoly of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It is a monopoly which has authority arbitrarily to regulate each radio outlet and each voice of the nation. What was new was the still stronger case made by the Canadian daily newspapers association, which added its voice to that of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters. Something was said in the committee to the effect that the Canadian Association of Broadcasters had no complaint, that they did not think they had a complaint, that they were in a happy position. I simply ask this question: Why, then, did they take the trouble of submitting a brief and having so many of their associations here waiting, watching and giving evidence if necessary? I will tell you why. It was because the association of broadcasters and the private stations themselves feel that the sword of Damocles hangs over their heads all the time, represented by the C.B.C. The report shows what little attention has been given to the brief in reference to the aforesaid matters. It is true that a certain amount of lip service has been given to it, but the very fact that one of the private stations had its head cut off by this totalitarian corporation—because that is what it is—

after years of toil and after years of work from the early stages of experimentation, and the progress it has made, shows that there is certainly something that needs fixing up. Their head was cut off—why? Because of the splendid audience they have built up. This shows the injustice of the present system. Whether it was legal or not, this act on the part of the dictators would not, to my way of thinking, have been allowed had an independent regulatory and licensing body been functioning. That alone, to my mind, and, I believe, to the minds of most thinking people, shows the necessity of such a body being set up.

Not only that; but time after time, in the radio committee, it has been pointed out that the arbitrary rules of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation have been a great detriment to Canada. Evidence has been given to that effect. Because of the negligence, perhaps selfishness, on the part of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; perhaps because of overpaternalism in refusing licences; because of regulations done away with only after the last session of the committee, and the decision to allow them to increase their power from one kilowatt maximum to five kilowatt maximum, which was put into force only last year; because many of the channels that should have been occupied were refused occupancy by the arbitrary decision of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; because power has been denied these stations for many years—for all these reasons, Canada has lost the full use of a great many channels which could have served the public.

May I point out that the silly thought that there are only two classes of radio broadcasting in Canada is nonsense. There are three classes. There are stations which do national chain broadcasting, the high-powered stations; there are the community stations, the lower-powered stations, from 250 to 500 or 1,000 watts; and there is the station which is far more important, which gets the greatest coverage, namely the regional station. The public of Canada have been denied more regional stations because of the arbitrary action of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in refusing to allow them to go, in some cases, up to fifty kilowatts and, in some cases, from five to ten.

In days gone by, our stations would have served the country much better if they had been allowed to go to their full power; and the C.B.C. regulations in restricting them to any power arbitrarily fixed, without regard to proper occupancy of channels, has resulted in a considerable loss to Canada. Possibly there is some opportunity for Canadian stations to increase their power even now. Unfortunately, however, that opportunity has largely disappeared. Many channels, as I said before, have been lost through arbitrary rules of the C.B.C. in not allowing licences to new stations for wave lengths in the past.

As an example of what I have said, and to support it, I will quote a few lines from what Professor Bayly said the year before last and also last year with reference to the loss of stations and power and the consequent loss of coverage to Canada. Time after time we have been told in the radio committee that we have not lost any coverage and have not lost any channels. We know that we have lost channels, and the evidence of Professor Bayly, a distinguished engineer who has received fine decorations, cannot be gainsaid. This is what he said before the radio committee in 1945 and again in 1946, at page 432:

> Everybody is interested in raising their power and to put a better signal into the area, but I point out that actual engineering figures on these areas are surprisingly small, and I think that after the war is finished and we get the completion of the occupation of the frequencies on the Havana agreement we will be perturbed as to how small our coverage is, especially at night.

Later on, he said:

> . . . the policy which has been adopted here of keeping stations down to low power instead of having them up to their minimum power under the Havana agreement has had a detrimental effect on the coverage which we can expect in the future for the people of Canada.

This situation should be corrected before we have any further trouble. There should be some tribunal which is able to judge on the merits of the case after calling witnesses, and to decide whether the propositions put before them are right or wrong. You just cannot help it when you are in the position of the C.B.C. Again Professor Bayly says:

> . . . a great many regional stations are now permitted five kilowatts, but the tendency is still there. A very good example is the one I was quoting this morning, 1010, where if the present occupants, the C.B.C., get off 1010 and another occupant comes in, they lose priority, and Canada as a whole, or that particular area of Canada, loses some of the available space on the spectrum that is available to Canada in the radio broadcasting band.

Surely that should be enough to convince anyone. The minister and those around him may laugh, but these are facts. Perhaps he should have a little greater interest in Canada and in service to the Canadian people. Perhaps I have a little more interest in it than he has; perhaps he does not know anything about it. The situation is that the C.B.C., in conjunction with the radio branch of the Department of Transport, is the lawmaker,

the law enforcer, the judge, the competitor and the policeman, as has been stated by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming). I should like to point out also that in the whole of the C.A.B. brief I cannot find one word of criticism of the C.B.C. in regard to their broadcasting activities. As a matter of fact the Canadian Association of Broadcasters went so far as to say they did not mind any competition from the C.B.C., but they did object to the principle under which the broadcasting corporation was the competitor, the lawmaker and the law enforcer, judge and policeman. I do not blame them. I think something should be done about that, and very soon.

I should now like to say a word about commercialism. The report says action should be taken to compel private stations to devote greater attention to the development of public service features, while their tendency to overcommercialism should be curbed. That is a laugh. The report further states that the private stations should use more local talent. I quite agree; but in the very nature of things, as everyone knows, a commercial station must be commercial. It cannot be overcommercial. All these stations put on some sustaining programmes, but they have to make a profit unless they are to go into the red. Perhaps then they would get government assistance, as the C.B.C. does. If they are to exist at all, certainly they must get fees from broadcasting. I do not see how a commercial radio station can be overcommercialized. The very fact that it has to seek an audience means that, of necessity, it has to put on some things which perhaps the sponsors may not want, but it has to keep an even balance. The audience is the thing that is necessary. This suggestion of overcommercialism is silly when you think of it in connection with the great C.B.C. I suppose they do no commercial work at all. From what I have read, they were supposed to have an income of only $500,000 from commercial broadcasting; that was to be the limit. They got up to $1,800,000, and at the present time forty-five per cent of their revenue comes from commercial broadcasting. They were supposed to be the people who would do the cultural work and carry the sustaining programmes, through the fees collected for licences. The report might better have been directed at the C.B.C. than at the private stations.

Then let us consider the latest programme of expansion proposed by the C.B.C. First of all, they intend to take over the wave length of CFRB. Why? For the sole purpose of having a key station. I asked why they wanted CFRB as a key station, and could not get very much of an answer except that they had to have a high-powered station. What they really wanted was a key station which had a ready-made audience of from one and a half to two million people which had been built up by that station. As the hon. member for Eglinton has said, this is nothing but legalized robbery. They wanted also to be able to command a good price for advertising in order to bolster up their second network. Not commercial? Oh, no. If it is not commercial I do not know what is. Not only that; but after taking over CFRB, in all probability they will still have to occupy 1010, or we will lose it. They have 1010 now, which is quite sufficient for their purposes, but they want the advertising there, and what they are trying to do is to bring coals to Newcastle. The people in southern and central Ontario get good service now. They would have had better service if the arbitrary dictators of the C.B.C. board had not refused this station the opportunity to go to fifty kilowatts, which would have given them a good signal to serve the people of the communities in and around Toronto, as well as more distant districts. What has actually happened is that the people of Canada have lost the coverage and the listening pleasures they might have had, as a result of that arbitrary action. An improvement could have been brought about there without any expense at all to the country, but now it will cost us this amount of money.

What is the picture as far as the C.B.C. are concerned? They are going to take over CFRB, which is to cost $300,000, when the coverage might have been obtained without any expenditure. That money was voted last year. I suggest that $300,000 might have been more profitably used to do the job the C.B.C. was set up to do; that is, to give proper coverage to all the people of Canada, instead of setting up another station in a congested area which needs another high-powered station just about as much as a cow needs a fifth foot.

The report states that the deficit of the C.B.C. last year was $70,000. It should have been given as a great deal more than that, because no depreciation has been allowed for, and at least $297,000 should have been set up for depreciation. The budget proposals of this year showed a deficit of $265,000 but you have to add depreciation to get the true deficit. Anyone with any sense at all knows you must allow depreciation of ten per cent on equipment of that kind. That would give a deficit of $492,000, so that, with this additional $544,000, the C.B.C. will just about get by.

The first job the C.B.C. was supposed to do was give coverage to all the people of Canada. That coverage should have been given

by one chain, instead of biting off more than they could chew by setting up another chain which was absolutely unnecessary to give service to the sparsely populated parts of the country that do not and cannot get service at the present time. If necessary, this money should be used to establish more stations in outlying areas. Give all the listeners service; that is what we want of the broadcasting corporation. Instead of that, they are setting up this second chain because they want the advertising revenue. In addition, they have done a little legalized robbery, as I said before, in order to get this key station. As a consequence, for some time to come there will be parts of this country that will not have the coverage they should have. This has been done for the sake of advertising, I am referring to the second claim. One realizes just how facetious the report of the committee is when it states that the private broadcasting stations are not to over commercialize to any great extent, in the face of the fact that a non-commercial business C.B.C. gets forty-five per cent of its income from commercial business, something that was never anticipated under former circumstances.

Private stations are doing more than the C.B.C. are doing by way of developing talent. It can be said that they are doing just as much, anyway. And, so far as local service is concerned, the service they are giving is just as good. I am willing to give the C.B.C. more money to do the job of work it was set up to do, namely to cover every part of the country. But I am not willing to give them money to spend in the closely congested centres of poulation where there is no need for any more service.

Then, private broadcasting stations have been refused the right to do chain broadcasts. I say they should be given that right, and should be allowed to buy their line service on a competitive basis with that of the C.B.C., although I agree the C.B.C. should have priority.

My reasons for saying that should be done are these: it would relieve the C.B.C. from some of its obligations in respect of coverage; it would do a better job for the listening public; it would increase the variety of programmes and, most important, it would give the people of Canada another voice. That is something which we must always keep in mind.

It is all very well to say that the C.B.C. is an independent corporation. While that may be true at the present time, there is a tremendous danger that it may not remain so in the future. The danger is there. We have plenty of voices in this chamber, but the point is to get these voices outside. To a great extent the C.B.C. have been fairly impartial in this respect, and I give them credit for it. The same can be said for the Canadian press. But the danger of only one voice in radio is still present, and unwarranted control of radio makes it all the more important that that danger should be removed.

Radio broadcasting is greatly different from what it was when the first commission was established; it has grown, like Topsy. To my mind, now is the time when a thorough investigation into the whole question of radio in Canada should be instituted, and I suggest that a royal commission should be set up to investigate the situation.

In my view, the C.B.C. has a definite role to play. I should not like to see it removed, and I do not criticize it for wanting to play its role—if it would only do so. But I see no reason why it should be allowed to pick off the ripe plums which have been cared for and nurtured by the private stations, just for the purpose of obtaining commercial revenue and a ready-made audience.

The C.A.B. was criticized because of the campaign it lodged recently. Some members of the committee thought it should not have taken that action. I am wondering whether this is another interference with free speech, or if those stations will be under threat of cancellation of their licences if they continue to launch campaigns in which they seek to obtain the rights which they believe they ought to have, and rights which over fifty per cent of the people of Canada think they should have.

Then, the matter of having two ministers has been discussed. The statement is made in the evidence time after time that the C.B.C. is independent of the government. I do not believe it is. If it is independent of the government, why does it need a minister? If it is independent a minister would have nothing to do with it; so why does it require a minister? I do not think it does—unless the government makes its policy. And it is my view that that is what happens. I believe the government has a finger in the pie, and I would not be at all surprised to find that it had a finger in the pie in connection with the matter of granting private licences.

Radio has two ministers. An effort is being made to have two ways of collecting money; first of all, from licence fees and, second, from the consolidated revenue fund. That would seem to be in line with the policy of having two ministers. I suppose some things will be done by the Department of Transport under the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe) and some by the Minister

of National Revenue (Mr. McCann), and that is why we have the two ministers. I say there should be only one, or that, conversely, the C.B.C. should be stripped of its regulatory powers, its licensing powers and its powers to make recommendations for licensing.

It should be simply an operating company, and should be made to look after its own knitting and do a better job of broadcasting. Possibly it should be allowed to do experimental and research work, just as the private stations would do, if they were allowed. However, up until recently they were refused that privilege.

The C.B.C. is supposed to operate for the benefit of the listening public, but I say there has been too much parentalism in connection with its operations, something which should be outside its scope altogether. It should not be in a position to say whether it is a good thing for the public to have one kind of radio set or another kind.

In the report the most important people have been overlooked. Those who should have been primarily considered are the listening public, the great masses of the people who do not belong to any organization, federation, society or chamber of commerce. Those are the people who should have been considered. The views of organizations should be respected to a certain extent, as listeners; but what would be best for the great masses of the people, those who must remain silent in this matter, has been forgotten in the report.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I can finish in a moment. In Ontario and Quebec we get all the radio entertainment we require, and if we do not like what we get we can turn our dials, and turn off those programmes.

In closing, I should like to read an excerpt from the brief presented by the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, which states my views as follows:

> To sum up; radio legislation, which has grown up haphazard, needs complete revision. The revision should be made in the light of our past experience and present knowledge; the revision should recognize the potentialities of radio and the essentiality of providing that it be free from interference and even the threat of interference, while subject to necessary regulation.
>
> In such a revision recognition should be given to the fact that there has grown up in Canada not one national system of broadcasting but two separate and competing systems and each should be accorded its proper and rightful place in which it can fully serve the people of Canada.
>
> It is desirable, in the interest of all our people, of all political parties, that so great a power should be removed from even the possibility of political control and should be given a charter under which it can expand, prosper and serve.

To conclude:

> For the reasons given we urge that the public interest requires—
>
> 1. The firm establishment of the legal right to freedom of expression on radio similar to the legal right to freedom of expression in print.
>
> 2. An independent radio licensing and regulating body appointed directly by, financed by and responsible directly to parliament with power to license and regulate all radio in Canada.

Any board of this kind would, of necessity, take evidence from the transport board and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Mr. H. G. ARCHIBALD (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I shall try to confine myself to quality rather than quantity. The C.B.C. has been referred to quite often in the debate this afternoon as a monopoly, but the opposition to the C.B.C. seems to be in a healthy financial position. There are many private concerns in this country who would like to be able to put out the balance sheets published by these private radio stations. The argument was advanced this afternoon that a separate regulatory body should be set up over and above the C.B.C. That idea was expressed first by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell), who stated that would be far better than the present set-up. He said that there was no argument which could be advanced against that.

There is in this country one institution which would compare with that idealistic body of which he was speaking. I believe this is called the railroad commission. They act like Mussolini; they compel the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National to run their trains at the same time, when it is a well known fact that the Canadian National can get across this continent much faster than the Canadian Pacific. If the C.B.C. allowed itself to get into a jack-pot like that, it would be just the same as any other greenhorn in a tinhorn gambling game.

The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett) pointed out that the government could not compete with private enterprise when it came to administering any institution. I notice that when private enterprise gets into financial difficulties it comes weeping and crawling on its hands and knees for help from the state and the government which it condemns.

We want to see the C.B.C. grow through the north country. We criticize them because we cannot get enough. The people in the urban centres contend that the C.B.C. should not operate stations in the large centres. If they were allowed to operate only in the north country, what a howl one would hear when they presented their statement from the so-

called saviours of the taxpayers. They should be permitted to get some of the cream, so that they can give more service to the remote sections of the country.

In the central part of British Columbia we cannot get enough Canadian radio programmes. There are pockets in the mountainous regions where radio reception is very poor. We would like to have more booster stations established. Boards of trade and other organizations throughout that north country have demanded more service from the C.B.C. I hate to see people who are living off the dividends they receive from gold mines away up in the north sabotaging the people who live there from getting decent radio reception. I say to the C.B.C.: Long may your chimney smoke.

Mr. NORMAN JAQUES (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I was not a member of the radio committee, but I wish to say a few words as an ordinary member of the Canadian public and as a radio listener. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming), the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid), the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) and others who have spoken in agreement with them. As I say, I wish to speak merely as a member of the Canadian radio listening public.

My opinion is and always has been that the chief purpose of radio is to amuse, to entertain and to give factual news, not to educate the public or try to educate the public or to miseducate the public. It should leave propaganda to recognized spokesmen of the various political parties or movements.

I should like to go back to 1945 when radio time was allotted to the different parties. The Social Credit party was then allotted the same amount of time on the radio as the communist party. At that time the social crediters had a dozen members in this House of Commons; there had been a Social Credit government in Alberta since 1935, and they had organizations throughout the rest of the provinces. The communist party had, I think, two members in the house, one of whom is now in prison. They had no provincial government, and they have not had any since. Yet they were given the same amount of time as the social crediters. I contend that this indicates that there is communist socialist control of radio in this country, and that that has been so from the start.

I have not the time to go into the matter fully, but I have made a few investigations of some of the propagandists or employees of the C.B.C. I would refer, first, to Richard Stanton Lambert. He was president of the writers, artists, broadcasters war council. He arrived from England in 1938 after having been on the staff of the B.B.C. He was C.B.C. supervisor of school broadcasts and chief adviser on talks to C.B.C. He was counsellor of the Toronto civil liberties league and has publicly encouraged subscriptions to the Canadian *Tribune*. In 1942 he was chairman of a meeting for Anna Louise Strong and assured the meeting that it would never do to return to the outmoded democratic society of 1939. He always supported lifting the ban on the communist party.

Then there was Raymond Arthur Davies, whose real name is Divinski. Davies is prominent in communist circles in this country which describe him as "popular leader of Young Communist League", "recruiting agent for Young Communist League". In 1938 he edited the communist paper *New Advance*. In 1939 he was a teacher at the Young Communist school in Toronto. He worked on the *Daily Clarion* and retains full party membership. In 1940 he was made secretary of the national council of the Y.M.C.A. and secretary of the Canadian Institute of Economics and Politics. Since a visit to Russia, he has written a number of articles for *Saturday Night*. He formed the writers, authors, artists, broadcasters war council. He left for Russia in October, 1943. The C.B.C. refers to him as Canadian correspondent in the Soviet Union and C.B.C. correspondent Raymond Arthur Davies. I sometimes wonder who finances these people. The Lambert-cum-Davies alliance with C.B.C. and writers, artists, broadcasters war council, plus the fact that Davies is featured as Moscow correspondent of C.B.C. only after Lambert came on the staff of C.B.C. show that Lambert is a communist actively working for the communist party. Those are facts and I can prove them to any person interested enough to look into them.

I could go on, but I think I have said enough to show the danger of propaganda by C.B.C. and by men who have no responsibility, or at least who are not openly responsible to any political movement in this country. It is all right when the leader of any recognized party or recognized movement in this country broadcasts and is introduced to the public as Mr. So-and-so, the leader of such-and-such a party or movement. That is one thing. The people know who he is and for whom he is speaking. But many of these commentators, in fact all of them, so far as we are told, have no connection with any political organization in Canada, and some people naturally think these commentators are actually speaking for the government or purely for disinterested purposes.

I might mention two men who have certainly done their level best to wean away the loyalty of the Canadian people by selling communism to them. I refer to Elmore Philpott and Matthew Halton. I happen to come from the same country that Matthew Halton does, and I know that those who know him will admit that he is a communist. Yet he is given the free run of the air over C.B.C., while social crediters as such are banned from it or appear under great handicaps.

Mr. IRVINE: That shows some wisdom anyway.

Mr. JAQUES: It does, of course, to the communist people and to their fellow travellers who make up the bulk of the C.C.F. party.

Mr. LOW: Including the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. JAQUES: After the secret session we attended last Tuesday, we had, I think, warning enough of the dangers of softening up the people of this country and of other countries to the ideologies of communism, if I understood the speaker and I listened very carefully—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I do not think the report of those proceedings has been presented to the house.

Mr. JAQUES: I did not hear you, Mr. Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is out of order to refer to the proceedings of any committee until the report of the committee has been presented to the house.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Especially a committee meeting in secret session.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I interrupt for a moment without taking any part in the debate? I wonder if I might assume the unaccustomed role of peacemaker and appeal to the house to get this measure through, because we still have plenty of work ahead of us. We have all been working very hard, and our objective is to have the business concluded by Tuesday. I wonder if my hon. friend will be kind enough and considerate enough and indulgent enough to curtail his remarks so that we can get this measure through before six o'clock. I am not at all interfering with the rights of debate. I want that clearly understood but I should like the cooperation of my hon. friend so far as he feels able to extend it.

Mr. HANSELL: You mean of the whole house.

Mr. JAQUES: I do not think I have taken up too much of the time of the house during the session. Before I sit down I wish to pay a tribute to certain aspects of the C.B.C. I should like to say how much I and, I am sure, a great many others have appreciated the opportunities which the C.B.C. have given us of listening to some really good music, symphonic music and concerts of various kinds. As I say, if they would confine themselves to amusement and entertainment and to the encouragement of the arts, and, of course, give us the news, merely factual news, and leave all propaganda alone, I think the C.B.C. would render very much more valuable services than it has rendered in the past.

(Translation):

Mr. REAL CAOUETTE (Pontiac): Mr. Speaker, I shall take a few minutes only to speak on radio as it applies to a section of my area, in the north of the province of Quebec. Our private radio stations in Rouyn, Amos and Val d'Or broadcast, at different times, the French programmes of the C.B.C. and there are instances, in the Temiscamingue and La Sarre-Makamick areas, where our citizens cannot possibly receive the programmes originating from the C.B.C. stations. This situation could certainly be remedied by increasing the power of the private stations in the north country; this would require helping the owners to secure the equipment necessary for increasing power of their transmitters so as to be in a position to cover the whole district, thereby giving a satisfactory service.

Representations have come from some of these areas for five, six and even ten years, requesting fair treatment in this connection. It is therefore a matter of urgency that a solution be found that will satisfy these people.

Now a few words only on the broadcasting periods allotted the Social Credit all through Canada and especially in the province of Quebec. Since broadcasting time is allotted the various political groups, we have had one-quarter of an hour each three or four months. Two fifteen-minute broadcasts in four months for the Union of Electors, in the province of Quebec, are decidedly not enough.

For my part, even if we are told that the blame goes to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation which allots those fifteen-minute broadcasting periods, I hold the government responsible as regards the time allotted to the Social Credit group. If, after the next general election, only two or three or even four Liberals are elected throughout Canada, I wonder if the Liberal party will be quite satisfied to have a quarter of an hour for broadcasting

every four or five months. The golden rule should never be departed from; therefore, I ask that justice be done to the Union of Electors and all other groups, and that several fifteen-minute broadcasting periods be alloted to us so that we may freely expound our principles throughout Canada. We advocate not slavery, but freedom. We want to be allowed to voice our opinions freely and sincerely over the radio and to organize in our own way our propaganda in accordance with the wishes of our French and English-speaking fellow-citizens.

(Text):

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): On this occasion, speaking on a bill of such importance, and particularly as it is the only opportunity we have had to discuss the whole question of radio broadcasting and the constitution of the C.B.C., I regret I shall be unable to finish by six o'clock. I want to say at the outset that for several reasons I am opposed to this bill, the result of which will go to increase the amount handed over to the C.B.C. by over $500,000. The first reason, is that at this time, when our tax rate is already so high and when it is so important to reduce the burden on our people, I am opposed to a measure which will increase the expenditures and will, therefore, increase taxation, without giving a corresponding service or result to the people of Canada. If this were simply a question of giving extra revenue to the C.B.C., and it could be done without increasing the direct financial burden on the people, then certainly it should not be opposed, because in the committee I think a clearly convincing case was made out for the desirability of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation getting increased revenue. But when it is done in this way, in a measure which looks on the surface as though there would be no increased burden, but when actually what is happening or would happen under this measure would be that the people themselves would have to bear the costs of collecting the licences and would have to put up over $500,000, I am opposed to it. My opposition is made stronger because, as was pointed out by an hon. member earlier this afternoon, it means that both those who have radios and those who do not pay licence fees at all will have to pay the extra taxes, since this money can only come out of the consolidated revenue fund of the country. This means that all the taxpayers, not only the radio owners, will be bearing a share of this burden.

There is an additional reason why I am opposed to this measure. I think the constitution of the body which controls radio in this country should be fully investigated and extensively changed. Therefore I am opposed to paying over $500,000 to an organization whose set-up I do not approve, in so far as my constituents are concerned at any rate. If the constitution of the C.B.C. were changed and the control of radio in Canada put on a proper footing, then the corporation would be in a much better position to come to parliament and ask for more money. To register the protest which I think should be registered on behalf of those whom I represent, I am going to oppose this bill.

The reasons why I am opposed to the present constitution of the C.B.C. and, therefore, why I am opposed to the granting of this money, have already been discussed in the speeches made earlier this afternoon; but I should like to indicate the three main weaknesses, as I see them, in the present situation. First, there is no doubt that the C.B.C. is in competition with private radio, yet under the present Radio Act and the regulations which govern radio in the country the C.B.C.—chiefly the chairman of the board of governors and the board of governors itself—is made judge and jury on any question of conflict which arises between the government-controlled network and the private stations.

May I say here, before going any farther, that my position is not that there should be an end to government control of radio in Canada. It is exactly the opposite. Government control of radio should be made effective and should be removed from the sphere of political controversy. I feel—and I shall give my reasons to substantiate that feeling—that it is not at present out of the field of political controversy, and that to continue the present set-up will only continue a situation in which the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation cannot help but be influenced by government policy quite apart from the field of radio, and reflect that political influence in its dealings with other radio broadcasting concerns. That very set-up weakens the whole structure of government control of radio.

What I should like to see is government control of radio, but on a proper basis, a basis in which the people of Canada through their parliament will enact afresh the principles which they wish to govern radio broadcasting in this country, and then to entrust the supervision and the enforcement of these laws to a body independent of the C.B.C. and of the private stations. If that were done, then the objections which are to be found at present to the giving of public moneys to the C.B.C. would be largely removed. I wanted

to make that clear before going any farther. The position we take is not that government control of radio or even a publicly owned network should be removed and the whole thing be handed back to private interests. The propaganda which has gone out recently, since the radio committeee met this session, has sought to represent that both the Canadian Association of Broadcasters and those who appear to favour this view, are trying to put an end to government control of radio and hand the whole field back to private interests. That, of course, is not the case. At no time in their brief presented to the committee or in their advertising which was inserted in the daily newspapers did the Canadian Association of Broadcasters suggest that government control of radio should end. Indeed, I would say that some of the attacks which have been made on the Canadian Association of Broadcasters' brief, and upon the members of the official opposition taking the position I have just outlined, are deliberate distortions of what are the facts. In his remarks this afternoon the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart) stated, in effect, that the Canadian Association of Broadcasters and those who agree with them were trying to put an end to government control of broadcasting and were attacking the C.B.C., trying to destroy the C.B.C. and its work. That, of course, is not in accordance with the facts. The C.A.B. never at any time attacked the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation either in the committee or in its advertising campaign. What they did attack was the regulations and the present set-up which, as they pointed out. have in them tremendous capabilities of abuse and potential danger. That was what they were attacking. They did not allege that the C.B.C. is at present abusing its power. In fact this year they were so careful to make their position clear that they did not even attack the policy of the C.B.C. in taking over the frequencies now enjoyed by the three private stations. They accepted that as a matter of C.B.C. policy. It is not quite fair to say that they were thinking of nothing but their vested interests. They see—and I certainly agree with them—a potential danger in the continuation of the method under which control of radio is exercised, and they wanted to improve that.

My second objection to the present set-up of radio in Canada is the apparent confusion in the role of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation itself. I realize that at the time when public control of broadcasting was first instituted in the country conditions were not as they are now, so that it is not proper to blame anyone for not having foreseen what would be the present state of affairs. The position we have arrived at, however, is that the C.B.C. is both a regulating and an operating body, and the one function cannot help detracting from the other. We are in the position now where there is obviously room for both a publicly owned network and privately owned stations, and I have not yet heard anyone suggest—I do not think anyone would be likely to suggest—that privately owned stations should cease to operate and that we should not have any more such stations. That being the fact, it seems to me that it is not logical, it is not in keeping with the way in which we do things in this country, to have one body both operate its own network and regulate other stations which, on occasion, come into competition with it.

My third objection is that the C.B.C. is subject at the moment to political influence; and especially in view of the situation I have described where it both regulates its competitor and operates its own network, that is an undesirable situation and one that should be ended. There are tremendous possibilities of abuse, for instance, in the fact that there are three separate departments all interested and taking their share in the control of radio. The Department of National Revenue, through its minister, in entrusted with the actual supervision of the C.B.C., and with responsibility for the actions of the board of governors. The Department of Transport, through its communications branch. has separate responsibility for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and allocation of frequencies in Canada. In turn, supervision over that branch is in part entrusted to the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply. So that when you have three ministers each with a finger in the pie you have an opportunity for misunderstanding and confusion and, moreover, you have also a multiplication of opportunities for political interference.

Mr. McCANN: You are the only one who is confused on that.

Mr. FULTON: The minister had an opportunity to explain it, but I did not hear him give any explanation. Let me give an illustration of what happened before the committee. One day an official of the communications branch of the Department of Transport presented a statement, and the next day responsibility for the statement was denied by the Minister of Reconstruction.

Mr. McCANN: That has already been debated and is on the record.

Mr. FULTON: And that made plain the confusion which exists in the set-up; and when

we asked to have the ministers called before the committee to clear up the matter, it was so engineered that we were not allowed to have the ministers come before us. One of the most important things that the committee should have considered, and would like to have considered, had it been able to have the ministers appear before it, was the elimination of this duplication or triplication in the control of broadcasting in Canada.

I have said that I believe there are opportunities for political interference with the affairs of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and I do not propose to let it end at that. I will cite instances to substantiate the statement I make. But it is six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is there not an amount of $544,673 of political patronage represented in this bill in respect of radio licences and what-not? Of course there is.

Mr. FULTON: The three ministers can answer that.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at six o'clock.

Monday, July 14, 1947

The house met at eleven o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS—FOURTH AND FINAL REPORT

Fourth and final report of special joint committee on human rights and fundamental freedoms.—Mr. Ilsley.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT—FIRST AND SECOND REPORTS

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland) presented the first and second reports of the joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the printing of parliament, and moved that the first report be concurred in.

Mr. GREEN: The report has just been tabled, and I think we must have a chance to look it over before this motion is allowed to go through.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member has not the unanimous consent of the house, the motion will have to stand until the next sitting.

[Mr. Fulton.]

TRANSPORT COMMISSIONERS

EXTENSION OF TERM OF OFFICE OF MR. COMMISSIONER STONE

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 455, to extend the term of office of a transport commissioner.

He said: Mr. Commissioner Stone reached the retiring age as a member of the Board of Transport Commissioners on June 30, 1947. Section 9, subsection 4, of the Railway Act provides that a commissioner shall not hold office after having reached the age of seventy-five years. The object of this bill is to extend the term of Mr. Commissioner Stone so there may be a representation on the board, of the labour organizations and of the maritime provinces. Mr. Commissioner Stone sat during the various hearings held by the board not only in Ottawa but elsewhere, in connection with the applications for rate increases. He is fully familiar with the evidence that has been taken, and it would be unfortunate if there were no representation of both these bodies when the decision of the board is handed down. I have had a word with the various leaders concerning this bill, and I am hopeful that they will be able to give their consent to it.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read the second time?

Mr. BRACKEN: Perhaps the minister would consent to leaving motion for second reading until the afternoon.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Very well.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. With what provinces have agreements been reached for the provincial department to handle family allowance investigation work?
2. What are the financial arrangements with each province in the carrying out of this work?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. Nova Scotia, Ontario, Manitoba, British Columbia.

Negotiations are currently under way for similar arrangements to be made with some of the remaining provinces.

In the province of New Brunswick, arrangements were made with the local children's aid societies to handle family allowance investigation work.

2. Nova Scotia—at a fixed rate of $5 for each completed report, with a guarantee of a minimum annual amount of $12,600, payable at the rate of $1,050 per month.

New Brunswick—for the payment to public and private agencies and organizations of the sum of $5 for each completed report furnished at the request of the regional director, family allowances, in that province.

Ontario—at the fixed rate of $5 for each completed report.

Manitoba—at the fixed rate of $5 for each completed report.

British Columbia—at the fixed rate of $5 for each completed report.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—LINCOLN AND WELLAND COUNTIES

Mr. LOCKHART:

1. How many persons in Lincoln county (a) on May 31, 1947; (b) on June 26, 1947, were in receipt of unemployment insurance payments, and how many job vacancies were listed in that county on each of these dates?

2. How many persons in Welland county (a) on May 31, 1947; (b) on June 26, 1947, were in receipt of unemployment insurance payments, and how many job vacancies were listed in the said county on each of the above dates?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1 and 2.

	On Benefits May 31/47	Jobs Available May 31/47	On Benefits June 26/47	Jobs Available June 26/47
St. Catharines ..	317	602	159	592
Welland	190	719	170	499
Fort Erie	96	91	67	98
Niagara Falls ...	91	378	75	434
Port Colborne ..	132	119	123	92

APPLICATIONS FOR CITIZENSHIP—PRAIRIE PROVINCES

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. How many applications for citizenship have been dealt with under the new citizenship regulations by each of the district courts in each of the provinces of Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, as of June 1, 1947?

2. How many have been refused in each of these courts?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. The information is not yet available. Under paragraph 24 of the regulations under the Canadian Citizenship Act, clerks of courts are required, half yearly, immediately after the 1st January and July in each year, to transmit to the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada a statement of all applications for decisions that applicants are qualified and fit to be granted citizenship, setting out separately the cases in which applications were approved and those in which applications were rejected. The half-yearly returns for the period January to June, 1947, have not been received as yet from all of the courts in the provinces of Alberta, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan. Many of the cases dealt with by these courts may have been applications which were filed a year or more ago under the Naturalization Act but were dealt with this year under the Canadian Citizenship Act. Under the circumstances, it would be impossible at this time to give from the records of the Canadian citizenship branch a complete and accurate report of the cases dealt with by these courts.

2. Answered by No. 1.

APPLICATIONS FOR CITIZENSHIP—INSTRUCTION BOOKLETS

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

Have instruction booklets been issued to applicants for citizenship in Canada other than to the Polish veterans?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): No manuals have been issued to any applicants for Canadian citizenship by the Secretary of State Department. The pamphlet "How to Become a Canadian Citizen" is at present in the hands of the king's printer and should be ready for issue to clerks of the court within the next few weeks. In order to meet the needs of immigrants recently arriving, including the Polish veterans, part II of this manual was translated into Polish and Dutch and mimeographed for distribution. In this mimeographed form so distributed it was called "Facts About Canada."

CONFISCATION OF MILK POWDER

Mr. MacINNIS:

1. Did the government acquire roller process milk powder under confiscation order No. 88 passed August 1, 1946? If so, from how many persons or firms?

2. What were the names of such persons or firms and what was the amount of milk powder taken in each case?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier):

1. By order No. 88 of the Dairy Products Board, 75 per cent of all roller process dry skim milk manufactured for human consumption on and after the 1st of August, 1946, in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, was requisitioned for export to the United Kingdom ministry of food. Supplies were obtained from 34 firms.

2. (a) Names and addresses of the firms which shipped roller process dry skim milk through the board are as follows:

The Borden Co., Ltd., Montreal, Que.

Malcolm Condensing Co. Ltd., St. George, Ont.

Purity Dairies Ltd., Windsor, Ont.
Les Produits Laitiers "Cartier" Ltd., Grondines, Que.
Central Dairies Ltd., Ottawa, Ont.
The Marshall Dairy Co., Jarvis, Ont.
Canada Packers Ltd., Harriston, Ont.
New Dundee Co-op. Creamery Ltd., New Dundee, Ont.
Cremerie Drummondville, Drummondville, Que.
Vermette & Fils Ltd., Danville, Que.
Villa Nova Dairy Products Co-op., Waterford, Ont.
Sawyerville Creamery, Sawyerville, Que.
Sutton Milk Products Ltd., Sutton, Que.
J. J. Joubert Ltd., Montreal, Que.
Dominion Dairies Ltd., Montreal, Que.
Cremerie South Durham, South Durham, Que.
Laiterie St-Joseph, Enrg., St-Joseph, Que.
Cow & Gate (Canada) Ltd., Gananoque, Ont.
Champlain Milk Products Co., Ltd., Stanbridge, Que.
Fordwich Creamery, Fordwich, Ont.
Bellechasse Dairy Products Ltd., La Durantaye, Que.
Caledonia Creamery Ltd., Caledonia, Ont.
Stacey Bros, Ltd., Monkton, Ont.
Cremerie St. Hyacinthe, St. Hyacinthe, Que.
United Farmers' Co-op. Ltd., Guelph, Ont.
Dalpe & Frere, Vercheres, Que.
Societe Co-op. Agric. du Canton, Granby, Que.
Ault Creamery Ltd., Winchester, Ont.
Pleasant View Dairy Ltd., Pembroke, Ont.
Lower St-Lawrence Dairy Prod. Ltd., Mont-Joli, Que.
St-Bonaventure Creamery, Co. Yamaska, St-Bonaventure, Que.
Tillsonburg Creamery, Tillsonburg, Ont.
Ste-Sophie Creamery, Co. Megantic, Ste-Sophie, Que.
The Borden Co., Ltd., Ottawa, Ont.

(b) Total amount shipped 6,231,332 pounds.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

FERTILIZER INGREDIENTS AND MIXES

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia):

1. What orders in council have been passed in reference to importation, export and price of fertilizer ingredients and/or fertilizer mixes, since 1939?
2. Have any of such orders in council been rescinded and, if so, at what date?
3. What wartime prices and trade board orders have been made concerning price, sale, distribution or mix of fertilizer or fertilizer ingredients since 1939?

[Mr. E. Bertrand.]

FOREIGN EXCHANGE

PARITY OF DOLLAR, ETC.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Could the Minister of Finance make a further statement on the gold situation, the parity of the dollar and the sterling area?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): No; it is not my intention to make any further statement.

BINDER TWINE

SUBSIDIES AND PRICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. W. BURTON (Humboldt): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance based on complaints I have received by air mail over the week-end. Will the minister give the necessary direction so that binder twine on which the subsidy has been paid by the government will be sold to the farmers at the old price?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): I had no notice of this question. I shall look into the matter.

WHEAT

1944 PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATE PAYMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I have received today your resolutions from farmers in the drought devastated areas of Saskatchewan inquiring whether the minister could not speed up the distribution of the 1944 participation certificate payments. Could not something be done to have distribution made in areas where there has been a great diminution in crop prospects?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I intend to announce some day this week that the barley payments are in the mail, and immediately afterward the 1944 participation payments will be proceeded with. I shall take note of the situation referred to by the hon. member for Lake Centre. As a matter of fact, the wheat board are anxious to see that the first cheques that are issued shall go to the drought areas or the areas where they are needed the most.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There is a real demand for them.

FURS

EXCISE AND SALES TAXES—PETITION FROM BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. CHESTER S. McLURE (Queens): I believe the Minister of Finance has an answer to the question I asked a week ago today which he did not have an opportunity of answering then.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): I have received the representations which were referred to, and they are being given the usual careful consideration in the department.

TRUST COMPANIES ACT

VARIOUS AMENDMENTS

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 417, to amend the Trust Companies Act.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—Corporations.

Mr. IRVINE: I was one of those who asked that this bill be sent to the appropriate committee for consideration. There is nothing in the bill which under the present way of doing things is particularly objectionable, but personally I oppose the idea of mortgage and insurance companies having full control of all the investment funds of Canada. However, perhaps this is not the moment to fight that.

There is only one part of the bill to which I take objection, and I want to register my protest now. It is covered by a certain section of the bill which I suppose I cannot refer to now because we are not on that section.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What section is it?

Mr. IRVINE: Section 7, subsection 2, permits companies to split their shares. I have always been opposed to that, and I cannot see any need for it with companies of this kind. It may well be, as was pointed out by someone in the committee, that this provision will not be used, but the fact that these companies are permitted to do it is something to which I want to take objection. Everyone knows that once shares are split there is an immediate tendency for the price of the shares to increase. The excuse is put forward that this is done in order that poorer people may make investment. If they do make investment under these circumstances they are buying at a higher price, and if they are ever to receive a profit on their investment, higher charges will have to be made to the public who borrow money. Moreover, this may be used as a cover-up for higher profits; I understand that that kind of practice is not uncommon. I just want to say that I am opposed to that section of the bill and to the principle which allows private corporations to manage the whole investment of Canadian funds.

Mr. CHURCH: This matter came up the other evening in connection with the amalgamation of two existing trust companies which I opposed on account of the lack of any public control of these trust companies in their methods of handling these. The time has come when the definition should be changed because these trusts and combines and restraints of trade are flourishing like a green bay tree in Canada at present. The objection I have is that the changes in definition in the act do not go far enough. Trust companies in the different provinces are being united and large splits of capital are being made for the benefit of the existing shareholders who have advance notice of what is going to be done. This has been happening very extensively in recent days. I know I have seen advertisements in the newspapers giving notice of this action by mergers of these trust companies soon to become a monopoly. They are handing out stock split up at par and sold to the public at 125. There should be further legislation to give more control of these national trust companies. The board of directors is being increased from twenty-one to thirty by this act, and when the number of directors is increased like that, the directors do not direct at all and control is under one central management. The trust company business has been a great success in this country and no doubt is a more efficient method of handling estates, but the time has come when there should be more regulation of this business in the public interest. There should be control of mergers and the issue of capital stock, which often permits the cutting of a huge melon running into millions, for the benefit of the few.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall be glad to take note of my hon. friend's observations.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 to 16 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time on division, and passed.

MILITIA PENSION ACT

PENSIONS FOR LESS THAN TWENTY YEARS' SERVICE UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a measure to amend the Militia Pension Act to provide that the governor in council may grant an annual pension to a member of the forces who has contributed to the consolidated revenue fund under Part V of the act and who has served in the forces for ten years or upwards but less than twenty years, and who is certified by a board composed of not less than three medical officers of the forces as being disabled or incapable of performing his duties as a member of the forces.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

Mr. FULTON: What scale of pension will be proposed by the bill to follow this resolution?

Mr. CLAXTON: Exactly the same scale as would have been provided under the act before it was amended. Section 47 of the Militia Pension Act provides for the payment of a pension of one-fiftieth of the average pay and allowances of the officer or soldier for the previous six years of service multiplied by the actual number of years of service. It is the intention after the bill has been distributed to proceed with second reading today, if we can get unanimous consent.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Claxton thereupon moved leave to introduce Bill No. 456, to amend the Militia Pension Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR CREDITING TO C.B.C. GROSS AMOUNT OF MONEYS RECEIVED FROM LICENCE FEES

The house resumed from Saturday, July 12, consideration of the motion of Mr. McCann for the second reading of Bill No. 453, to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936.

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, when this debate was adjourned on Saturday I had just indicated some reasons why we were opposed to the granting of this $544,000 to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. One of the reasons I gave was that I feel that the C.B.C. in its present set-up is too much subject to political interference, and I want to enlarge on that for a moment.

It is not only the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation itself but the whole sphere of radio broadcasting, the issuing of licences and the whole field of radio in Canada that I have in mind. In other words I do not merely confine my remarks or intend them to apply only to the chairman and board of governors as being subject to political influence, but I say that the complicated set-up we have of three departments all interested in radio and the various steps that must be taken between the application for a licence to broadcast and the granting of such licence, leaves room for political interference. As I said, I do not intend to let it rest there, because I do not think that would be proper. I will cite instances in support of my contention that this state of affairs exists and that it should be changed in any event, but certainly changed before we approve the granting of any further money to the corporation.

During the sittings of the radio committee it was alleged that in the choice of news commentators those favourable to government policy were favoured over those unfavourable to government policy, and that in the broadcasting of news by the C.B.C. there were occasions when political considerations were borne in mind. I want to cite an instance of that last statement.

On Tuesday, July 8, there was a very important debate in this house on the Civil Service Act. It was suggested that merchant seamen should be given a preference under that act, and other veterans' benefits. A motion was made to that effect which led to a division of the house. In the debate the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and three other ministers of the crown intervened. It was the occasion of one of the closest divisions of the session. The motion to extend these benefits to merchant seamen was rejected as a result—

Mr. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend is completely out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member should not refer to a previous debate.

Mr. FULTON: I am not going to refer to the subject matter. I merely want to remind the house that this debate took place, and of the circumstances surrounding it, because it enters into the case I am making.

On the same day the report of the radio committee was presented to the house. That report was not discussed. Concurrence was not moved; it was merely presented. The report was favourable to the C.B.C. and to

government policy. In the C.B.C. national news broadcast that night no reference was made to the discussion on the merchant seamen, but extended reference was made to the radio report. I looked up the Canadian Press news dispatches, because the C.B.C. gets its news largely from the Canadian Press, and is free to edit it, omitting such parts as it wishes. A full dispatch on the merchant seamen was sent out by the Canadian Press at 3.43 p.m. and it was marked with the code 95, which is the code they use to draw these matters especially to the attention of news editors. It cannot be said that the matter was not drawn to the attention of the C.B.C. news editors by the Canadian Press. The radio committee report was also sent out. The fact of its presentation and a summary of it were sent out, but not until 7.30 p.m. because the report was not presented until the evening sitting, so that we have the case of one debate in which ministers of the crown intervened, which would certainly have been very interesting to the people in Halifax, not referred to in the news broadcast. It would have been very interesting to them to know that the proposals to extend the benefits to merchant seamen had been rejected by a vote in this house.

Mr. EMMERSON: And that you moved it.

Mr. FULTON: I did not move it; I was not here myself. It would have been interesting to the people down there to know of this situation. No reference was made to that debate in the news broadcast, but extensive reference was made to the radio committee report, although it was not debated.

Mr. McCANN: That is because the hon. member was a member of it.

Mr. FULTON: And because it was favourable to government policy.

Mr. EMMERSON: Do not feel badly about it.

Mr. FULTON: This is one instance of political shading being given to a news report; but a more serious instance of political interference in the work of radio broadcasting was referred to in the proceedings of the committee itself, and it has to do with the granting of a licence for an Ottawa radio station.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. On Saturday I called the attention of hon. members to the fact that on second reading of a bill only the general principle should be discussed. My attention was drawn to the fact that there was an agreement between leaders of the different parties that they could discuss the report of the radio committee. This is Monday. I wonder whether it is my duty to remind hon. members that they ought to confine their remarks to the general principle of the bill which is before the house. After all, it is very short and has to do with receiving licence fees. The explanatory notes read as follows:

> Receiving licence fees are, at present, subject to deductions for collection and administrative expenses by the licensing authority. This amendment is to provide for the full licence fee paid by licensed listeners and private station broadcasting licences to be used exclusively for broadcasting.

May I ask hon. members to confine their remarks to the principle of the bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Speaker, there was a complete understanding that there would be no limitation on the discussion of this measure at this time.

Mr. REID: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRACKEN: That was the arrangement made by some member of the government with those on this side of the house.

Mr. REID: It certainly was.

Mr. BRACKEN: I respectfully suggest, therefore, that no limitation be put on the discussion at this time, in view of the understanding I have mentioned.

Mr. FULTON: My opposition to this measure is based largely on the fact that the present set-up is subject to political influence, and I am now seeking to support that statement. I go further than that and say that not only is it subject to political influence but when we seek the true reasons behind some of the decisions which are made by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, or the licensing authority, these reasons are suppressed and the full information is not made available to members of the committee.

During the proceedings of the committee on Friday, June 27, I made reference to the granting of a licence to station CFRA in Ottawa. The situation behind that, Mr. Speaker, is this. An application was made before June of 1945 for a licence for an additional radio station in Ottawa. That application was turned down. After June of 1945, which was, you will recall, the date of the last general election, three applications were submitted, amongst them one by the same man who had made the previous application. After June of 1945 the application for a licence was granted to the person who had been turned down previously. I referred to this matter in the committee and asked for a copy of the

briefs submitted in support of the application, because I had been given to understand that one of the unsuccessful applicants had submitted the best brief that had ever been submitted in support of an application for a radio licence. Therefore I wanted to get the briefs, and I also asked the chairman of the board of governors if he could tell me why this individual who was previously turned down should, a few months later, be given approval of his licence to broadcast. I received no satisfactory explanation. I suggested in the committee that it was because this individual was the radio publicity manager for the Liberal campaign, particularly the Prime Minister's campaign, in the last election and had been the cheer leader at the Prime Minister's last meeting here in Ottawa on June 8. The fact was questioned, Mr. Speaker, by the chairman of the committee. He asked whether that was true or not. Since he questioned it I read to the committee a report of the meeting from the Ottawa *Journal,* which reads as follows:

Five minutes before Mr. King spoke, a Montreal man, Frank Ryan, explained to the crowd how to applaud "to make it sound good." They must, he instructed, start the applause with a short sharp burst, sustain the volume and then cut it off abruptly. "You must clap loudly," he advised, "to show that you have plenty of enthusiasm." At that one of the hecklers in the upper seats shouted: "But we haven't any enthusiasm, Bud." During the early stages of Mr. King's address, and at its conclusion, Mr. Ryan "cued" the applause. To bring it up he swept his hands up from the floor and pushed them above his head. And to cut the applause, he flattened his hands in the manner of a college cheer-leader "ending a stunt."

I asked the chairman of the board of governors whether these facts had any influence on the granting to Mr. Ryan of his licence. He said no, so far as the C.B.C. itself was concerned. I asked him for an explanation of why this man who had previously been refused his licence should subsequently be granted it, and in my submission, as is supported by the report of the proceedings, he was not able to give that explanation. I asked him for a copy of the briefs tabled in support of the various applications so that we might have an opportunity to compare them to see whether Mr. Ryan's application was a better one than the others. That will be found on page 497 of the committee's proceedings. I asked Mr. Dunton this question:

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. May I repeat my request for the other two briefs?—A. I have a copy of Mr. Freiman's brief which, again, I would ask to have back because it is the file copy. I have a copy of the endorsations for Mr. Shearer. I do not think Mr. Shearer had any written brief.

[Mr. Fulton.]

Before I go any further I charge that the documents we asked for were, firstly, suppressed and secondly, when they were tabled they were distorted. I ask the house to listen carefully to the reply made by Mr. Dunton:

I have a copy of the endorsations for Mr. Shearer. I do not think Mr. Shearer had any written brief. He presented his arguments orally and supported them with copies of endorsations from various organizations who thought there should be another station.

Q. You say he did not submit an engineering brief?—A. When I refer to a "brief" now, I am using it in the sense of arguments and reasons why a person should have a licence, not a technical brief. These briefs dealt with considerations as to why there should be a station and why these people should be the people to have it.

He said that Mr. Shearer had not submitted a brief, so we were not in a position to compare Mr. Shearer's brief, which I had been informed was one of the best ever submitted, with Mr. Ryan's brief. Mr. Ryan was the successful applicant for the reasons I have submitted. Shortly after that, when these proceedings had been printed and circulated, it came to my attention that Mr. Shearer had in fact submitted a brief in support of his application, and I have a copy of it in my hand. On reading it through—I shall be glad to show it to any member of the house—it seems to me to compare more than favourably with the brief submitted by Mr. Ryan, both in its contents and when read together with the endorsations of Mr. Shearer's brief by those who supported his application, and also in the general arguments set forth by him as to why he should have his station. It is clear that his was a better presentation than the presentation of the successful applicant, the one who was subsequently granted the licence.

Perhaps this might have been an oversight or an omission, a spell of forgetfulness on the part of the chairman of the board of governors. But it has come to my attention further that this brief of Mr. Shearer's was, when he presented it, an integral part of his whole submission. We asked the chairman of the board of governors to table copies of the briefs submitted by the three applicants. He did so, but in Mr. Shearer's application there is only the endorsation; there is no written brief.

It has come to my attention since that time that this brief of Mr. Shearer's, a copy of which I now hold in my hand, was at the time he made his submission bound with and formed an integral part of the whole thing presented to the chairman and board of governors, Doctor Frigon and Mr. Manson. So

that the only way this document in the black cover could have been tabled in the committee without the brief was by undoing the binding and taking out the brief and so tabling the document. The copy of the brief that I have is punched in such a way that it could be bound in, and it was bound in with this other document.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Where did you get it?

Mr. FULTON: Hold your horses. I will come to that. In case anyone thinks I am only fabricating a case and that I should have brought it to the attention of the chairman of the committee or some other government official—

Mr. MAYBANK: I am not a government official.

Mr. FULTON:—I want the house to know that when it was discovered that this was the situation a letter was written which confirms my statements. I have a copy of this letter now and I should like to read it:

61 Marlowe Crescent,
Ottawa, 9/7/47.

Mr. R. Maybank,
Chairman,
Committee on Radio Broadcasting,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir:—

On reading section 11 of the minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (Page 497) I note that the chairman of the board of governors, Mr. Dunton, stated, in replying to a question asked by committee member Fulton, that he was under the impression that no written brief was presented by the writer on the occasion of appearing before the board to make formal application for a broadcasting license in the city of Ottawa.

In order to correct any misunderstanding on this matter I am accompanying this communication with a copy of the submission made to the board by myself on the above mentioned occasion. You will note that it consists of a brief together with letters of endorsation bound together in one folder. Copies were submitted to the chairman, members of the board, Dr. Frigon and Mr. Manson.

That letter is signed by the applicant.

Mr. MAYBANK: Will the hon. member permit one question?

Mr. FULTON: No, not at this particular point. Wait until I am finished with this paragraph. So that by that letter an opportunity was given to make a statement to explain why the brief was not tabled. That explanation has not been given either publicly, to date, or privately, because I know that no answer has been received to that letter.

Mr. MAYBANK: This is my question, if the hon. member will now permit it. Am I to understand that there is any suggestion here that I withheld something from the committee that should have been presented to the committee? Is that his suggestion?

Mr. FULTON: No.

Mr. MAYBANK: Thank you. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. FULTON: I said that this letter was addressed to the chairman of the committee so that it cannot be said that I have kept these facts secret and am now trotting them out without giving the government a chance.

Mr. MAYBANK: Nor does the hon. member mean to suggest that the chairman of the committee had it and withheld it? Does he?

Mr. FULTON: No.

Mr. MAYBANK: Thank you. That is all I want to be sure of.

Mr. FULTON: That was not suggested nor was it stated. The statement I make is that the chairman of the committee had this letter and had it on July 9, so that there was an opportunity to investigate the whole matter.

Mr. MAYBANK: That is just the point. On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, if the charge is that I had the letter which the hon. member has read, or anything he has now referred to, from Mr. Shearer, before the committee had closed, I say now that is not true.

Mr. FULTON: I did not say before the committee had closed.

Mr. MAYBANK: Before there was an opportunity of dealing with it.

Mr. FULTON: On the 9th of July.

Mr. MAYBANK: Well, all right—

Mr. FULTON: This letter was addressed and left in the office of the chairman of the radio committee, so that there has been an opportunity to explain, either privately or publicly, the facts I am now laying before the house, and that explanation has not been given. If the hon. member wants to give the explanation I shall be glad to have him explain it.

Mr. MAYBANK: How could I explain it privately to him when he was off in Haliax?

Mr. FULTON: I wanted to take this opportunity to make this explanation. I do

not think there is much more to say on that point, but I suggest, in fact I state, that these facts indicate that there were political considerations present in the granting of the Ottawa licence and an attempt was made to keep the true facts from the committee, so that we could not assess the thing at its face value. With the brief we now have which was submitted in support of Mr. Shearer's application—

Mr. MAYBANK: On a question of privilege—

Mr. FULTON: It is clear that this brief—

Mr. MAYBANK: Mr. Speaker, I demand that so far as I am referred to in the remarks of the hon. member, they be withdrawn. They are absolutely untrue. They lack any scintilla of truth.

Mr. FULTON: I have made no reference to the hon. member in my remarks, and, as far as he is concerned, I have nothing to withdraw.

Mr. MAYBANK: He made a reference to me and stated that there were political considerations.

Mr. FULTON: With deference, I submit that the hon. member is distorting what I said. I did not make reference to him and say that there were political considerations. I said that in the evidence presented to the committee there was a suppression of facts, which facts now being disclosed make it clear that there were political considerations in the granting of the licence.

Mr. McCANN: By whom?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I rise to a point of order. There are rules, as your honour knows very well, in regard to innuendo. My hon. friend (Mr. Maybank) was chairman of that committee, in complete charge and direction of its activities. The hon. member for Kamloops says there was a deliberate suppression of material evidence before that committee. That is a definite implication of motives and an innuendo, and I think is against the established rules of procedure of this house.

Mr. FULTON: The minister is entitled to his opinion, and I am entitled to mine. I suggest that his opinion indicates that he has not been following the controversy very closely.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Too closely.

Mr. FULTON: I said that in the evidence submitted before the committee, the whole evidence was not tabled.

[Mr. Fulton.]

Mr. MACKENZIE: I never listened to such nonsense in this house in all my life.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. May I suggest to the hon. member who has the floor that if hon. members do not insist upon his withdrawing what he has said, at least he should modify his statement. If I understood him rightly, he said that the truth was hidden, and that it was done for a political purpose. He knows very well that is against the rules of the house, which protect members. The rules say that hon. members must not impute motives. If an hon. member does not refer to another hon. member particularly but refers to a committee and makes subjective accusations, motives are imputed not only against one member but against many. I do not think it is fair for the hon. member to use in this house the expression he has just used. If hon. members do not insist upon asking the hon. member to withdraw, I think he should at least modify what he has said.

Mr. FULTON: I appreciate what you have said, Mr. Speaker, but I should like to explain clearly what I have said. I did not say that the evidence was suppressed in the committee by the chairman or any member of the committee. Nor did I say that it was suppressed by the committee for political reasons. What I said was that political considerations entered into the granting of these licences.

Mr. McCANN: By whom?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, by whom?

Mr. FULTON: And it was sought to establish—

Mr. MACKENZIE: By whom?

Mr. FULTON: By the licensing authorities.

Mr. McCANN: What was the political consideration?

Mr. FULTON: What we were seeking to establish was the truth with regard to applications for and the granting of licences. This evidence was suppressed. That is what I said and that is what I maintain; and I do not think I have anything to withdraw.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I ask the hon. member who suppressed the evidence?

Mr. FULTON: I do not know. I wish someone would find out.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If my hon. friend does not know, he has not any moral or parliamentary right to say what he has said in this house.

Mr. FULTON: If the Minister for Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) thinks he can shout me down, he is wrong. I have considered this matter carefully and I repeat my statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is nothing but suspicion, surmise, and a sinister mind.

Mr. FRASER: That ought to be withdrawn.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. member should substantiate what he says.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I understand the hon. member for Kamloops to say that the accusation he made during his speech was not directed at the radio committee. If it was not directed against the radio committee, of course, it is not directed against any member of the house. That being so, it is not my duty to intervene. It is not my duty to protect strangers to the House of Commons.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): To whom it may concern.

Mr. FULTON: I have only this to say with regard to the matter: had I any reason to believe that any member of the committee or of the house suppressed this information, I would have made the same accusations, realizing full well my position.

Mr. MITCHELL: Is the hon. member looking for a black cat in a dark room without a candle?

Mr. FULTON: No, I am not.

Mr. FRASER: He has found the cat.

Mr. FULTON: No, I am not. The Minister of Labour was in such a hurry to interrupt me that I did not hear him in full.

Mr. MITCHELL: I will repeat what I said: I asked if the hon. member was looking for a black cat in a dark room without a candle.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is a clever remark.

Mr. FRASER: He has found the cat all right. Hon. gentlemen opposite want to watch out that it does not scratch.

Mr. FULTON: I am looking for light in the dark recesses of what goes on when broadcasting licences are granted. If the Minister of Labour objects to that, perhaps he will look into the question himself and have it straightened out, because three other departments have not been able to do anything better with it so far.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Two or three more candles are required.

Mr. FULTON: What I have had to say I have said because I feel there is political consideration and political influence in the operation of radio broadcasting, in so far as government control is concerned. What we want to see is the public control of radio broadcasting, and the granting of licences particularly, removed from the operating body and removed farther from immediate direct interference by ministers. In that connection I want to read a passage from the radio committee's report, because it does not accurately reflect the submissions which were made. At page 737 . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to have to interrupt the hon. member again, but his time has expired.

Mr. FULTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, there were a number of interruptions.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Who brought them on?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member wishes to conclude his speech, with the unanimous consent of the house he may do so.

Mr. FULTON: No. I should just like to say one or two things.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Time!

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege, which, as the house knows, can be taken up at any time according to the rules.

Mr. KNOWLES: It must be with regard to a recent occurrence.

Mr. MACKENZIE: In *Hansard* of yesterday, page 5546, the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Archibald)—

Mr. KNOWLES: Saturday. We did not sit yesterday.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I hope my hon. friend went to church yesterday.

Mr. KNOWLES: And I hope the minister went to church with the hon. member for Skeena.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. member for Skeena, in finishing his speech is alleged to have said, "Long may your chimney smoke." That is an affront to the vocabulary of one of the most ancient countries of the world. The proper quotation is, "Lang may your lum reek." The hon. member is misquoted, and I take up the cudgels on his behalf.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present when the radio committee report was before the

house, but I have noted that there was a suggestion to the effect that some latitude might be allowed in this debate. I do not propose to speak at any great length, and may I add that I think no member of this house at this stage of the session should be accorded the privilege of speaking beyond the time allowed by the rules of the house. If I am in the house I intend to object to any such course; and I hope that if I exceed my time or attempt to do so, I too will be stopped at the appropriate moment.

Mr. MACKENZIE: We will look after that.

Mr. COLDWELL: I merely want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that the privileges which have been granted to the private stations over the years have accumulated to the extent of endangering the whole future of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I regretted that there were some recommendations in the report of the committee which made a further step in the direction of interference with the nationally-owned system. I have reference particularly to the extension of the licence for a period of three years. I think that is a mistake; I believe it places the private stations in a position which was not contemplated either when the Aird report was made or when the various parliamentary committees reported to this house from time to time. I feel that we are now suffering from an accumulation of weaknesses on the part of the broadcasting corporation to whom we entrusted the authority with regard to broadcasting in this country. Step by step, year by year, one can trace the granting of further bits of privilege; the kilowatt power of a private station increased, and so on, until today, contrary to the very fundamentals of the radio and broadcasting acts, the private stations believe they have an unlimited vested right in public property, that is, in wave lengths. That point of view has been placed before the public through advertising and various forms of propaganda during the sittings of the committee.

In my view the brief presented by the private broadcasting corporations was not a brief directed only against the method of operating the corporation under the departments; rather it was a criticism, a condemnation of our whole system of parliamentary and representative government, and I felt that the brief was written by people who had no appreciation of our British institutions and of the representative system under which we operate in this country. If we allowed the kind of organization to be set up which they propose in their brief we would be setting up in this country one of those organizations which would lead us into what is popularly called throughout the world a fascist state.

So I regret that some of the recommendations by the committee were in the nature of giving further privileges. I am sorry, too, that the report seems at least to condone both multiple ownership, which I believe is a menace to freedom in this country, and the newspaper ownership of radio stations, which restricts the free control of news services. May I just add that I know from conversation—and I repeat that—I know from conversation with at least two gentlemen who are members of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, the private interests, that while they are members of that organization they did not agree with the brief or the recommendations contained in the brief. I have since learned that there are other stations in much the same position; but in spite of their belief that the C.A.B. is more or less dominated by one or two powerful radio stations in this country, and because they need certain services which the C.A.B. gives them, they did not like to come before the committee or to dissociate themselves from the representations which were made mainly I believe on behalf of several large stations or groups in this country.

A moment ago I said I was not going to make a long speech. I have referred briefly to matters which I think are of fundamental importance in the radio field. I regret that something was not done to order the divorce of radio stations from newspaper ownership, and to break up those monopolies which are growing up in relation to multiple ownership. In this province we have one group owning or operating some six or eight radio stations, I believe; and the kind of service they give at Kirkland Lake, Timmins and other places, with the advertising all day long, the use of recordings, and the way those stations are operated, have caused the people in those districts to complain. And may I add that in this province of Ontario there is another very legitimate complaint. That is that we have one important part of this province where there is not proper coverage by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I refer to the Windsor area, where there is one powerful station, CKLW, which is advertised throughout the United States as "CKLW, Windsor and Detroit" and is classified in United States lists of broadcasting stations as an American station. As I said to the committee when I was there on one occasion the people of that city resent very greatly the fact that over that station they cannot get the news summaries of the Canadian Broadcasting Corpora-

tion, but they do get news commentaries from the American side. One of the reasons this broadcasting corporation was set up years ago, when the late Right Hon. R. B. Bennett was in power in this country, to some extent was to safeguard our radio from domination by our great, powerful and friendly neighbour to the south. I say to the minister and through him to the board of governors of the broadcasting corporation that they should make every effort to establish in the Windsor area a station that will give the service the people of that area require, and which will be a thoroughly Canadian station with sufficient coverage for the area that should be covered from that point.

I am not joining the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) in his remarks concerning political interference, because I have no direct evidence of it, and I do not like to make statements without the evidence to back them up. But I do think it more than passing strange that in the last two or three years forums which discussed public affairs in a very broad manner and from many points of view have been discontinued. There is the labour forum, for example. I know there are difficulties in a country where you have two labour congresses involved, but two or three years ago when the labour forum was operating it discussed labour problems; and as the committee knows there are some stations in this country which have made it very difficult indeed under certain circumstances for labour to get its point of view before the public.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not the C.B.C.

Mr. COLDWELL: No. I qualify that statement to that extent; not the C.B.C. but private stations. I was going on to say that one of the reasons I believe we should make sure we have the labour forum on the C.B.C. is found in the restrictions imposed by certain private stations.

Mr. REID: There should be some way to correct the pressure groups that attend those stations. I do not know your experience, but our experience on the coast was that many speakers had a very hard time of it owing to the crowd being packed.

Mr. COLDWELL: If the broadcasts are from public meetings and people are invited to attend, you cannot say to certain people, "You cannot come to these public meetings because you hold a certain point of view."

Mr. REID: I realize that.

Mr. COLDWELL: It is up to the people who want to get their own point of view supported at those meetings, if you like, to see to it that those who hold similar points of view are invited. I know of no pressure exerted on any groups of people to attend, but I imagine there are some people who are a little more interested than others in public affairs the year round, who are not only interested in public affairs when elections roll around. These people probably do attend the forums. The point I am making, however, is that because of the undue restrictions imposed and the difficulties placed in the way of labour getting time on certain private stations, the labour forum should be continued by the C.B.C. The farm forum is rendering a splendid service.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Why was the labour forum discontinued?

Mr. COLDWELL: The reason that has been given, I think, is that it was so difficult to organize them when you had a divided labour force; but I say to the minister I think that difficulty can be overcome.

I have noticed also changes in the corporation's broadcasts in other respects. Up to two or three years ago we had some fine programmes with social implications with which I sometimes found myself in sharp disagreement. However, I notice that that kind of dramatic presentation, Stage 47, Stage 46, Stage 45 and so on, has been replaced by programmes that are also excellent but different. I can think of the presentation of one or two Shakespearian plays and some Dickens stories in drama form which were done most splendidly last winter. I regret to note that we are losing to the Columbia Broadcasting System in the United States some of the personnel who undertook these splendid pieces of drama.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What does my hon. friend think of the idea of the radio committee of the House of Commons working out a tentative programme for the year?

Mr. COLDWELL: I think that would be an infringement of the right of the corporation to decide on broadcasts for this country. I do not think a parliamentary committee or any member of the government or any member of the opposition should interfere with the plans of the broadcasting corporation. The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario said he can think of nothing which would be more inefficient than a parliamentary committee drawing up a programme. Obviously we are not well enough equipped to do that kind of job whereas the experts in the broadcasting corporation should be. I would like to see every attempt made to keep personnel here, and largely that is a matter of dollars and cents. One of the reasons

I am for the bill now before the committee is that it will give more revenue to the corporation and perhaps will enable them to do better than they have been able to do lately.

I regret to see the infringement of advertising on the time of the corporation's broadcasts. Some of these programmes give me, if I may use a colloquialism, a pain in the neck. When I hear some of these soap operas I can almost smash my radio, especially when I hear someone crying over the radio, "Rinso white" and whistling or something of that sort. Some of these advertisers underrate the intelligence of the Canadian people when they insult us with that kind of advertising and that kind of crooning over the radio.

Mr. REID: You can include Sinatra in that.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, I include Sinatra quite gladly, and I would include some other people I know as well.

I was diverted from what I was saying about the censorship exercised by private stations over the kind of programme that shall be given, the refusal to give time to labour organizations, and so on. I have run across a case—I shall not give the name of the station because they are doing a good job otherwise—in which a station took the position that when one spoke on the radio and discussed matters of public interest he must not name any company. For example, if I wanted to say that the profits of the Aluminum Company of Canada or of Canada Packers in a given year were so and so, I could not give the name of the company; I would have to say, "a certain company". That is carrying the law of slander to a degree which is utterly ridiculous.

An hon. MEMBER: What station is that?

Mr. COLDWELL: I said I did not want to say, because the station is rendering good service. I shall be glad to give the corporation the name if they desire in order that they may send out a memorandum to the station as to what constitutes the law of slander.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is permitted to ask where the station is?

Mr. COLDWELL: If I tell my hon. friend that it is not in Vancouver, that should satisfy him. I hope hon. members from various parts of the country will not ask the same question.

Mr. HACKETT: The charge of unfairness will rest against all stations unless the hon. member states where this one is located.

Mr. COLDWELL: I suggested there was just the one station.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Mr. HACKETT: They all remain under that charge.

Mr. COLDWELL: Let the corporation send out a general directive, because I imagine there are other stations which take an unfair position in regard to this matter. There is one other thing I should like to say with regard to stations. It was stated some time ago in this house that the national system of broadcasting meant that provincial governments should not own or operate radio stations. The province of Manitoba continues to own CKY at Winnipeg and CKX at Brandon. Some time ago the province of Saskatchewan, from which I come, tried to buy CHAB at Moose Jaw, but they were denied the right to purchase that station on the ground that henceforth no provincial government was to be permitted to own a radio station. I understand the radio act in the province of Quebec has never been implemented, but that act would permit provincial ownership of radio stations.

I am in agreement with the principle that there should not be two governmental authorities involved in the radio field because of the difficulties that might arise between them. I have supported that policy, but if we are to have that policy, let it be carried out. Let the government of Canada say to the government of Manitoba, "We have denied Saskatchewan, we have denied Alberta, we have denied Quebec the right to own and operate radio stations. On and after a certain date in the near future unless we can come to an arrangement with you or you cannot otherwise dispose of your station we shall have to take steps to expropriate the station in Manitoba." There is a present injustice to Saskatchewan, Alberta, Quebec and any other provinces which desire to own and operate radio stations.

Mr. REID: Would the hon. member be in favour of the recommendation of the Aird commission that provincial governments be represented in regard to the programmes?

Mr. COLDWELL: That is a little different from owning and operating a radio station. I think representation by the provinces on the authority was a good recommendation by the Aird commission.

Mr. McCANN: There is geographical representation now.

Mr. REID: Every provincial government acquiesced in and was willing to co-operate in connection with that suggestion of the Aird commission.

Mr. COLDWELL: Under the act that is a matter for the minister to decide. At the moment the contention is that we do have geographical representation. That is a matter we may discuss in the radio committee another year. I am not going to prolong this debate because I think I have made the points I had in mind. In my opinion and in the opinion of many thousands of people in this country, the majority of the people, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is performing an excellent service. Recently I spent a week in the west—

Mr. MACKENZIE: I thought you were in Halifax.

Mr. COLDWELL: I was in Halifax more recently. I was unable to get back to my constituency before because of the meeting of the assembly of the united nations last year; I promised that I would go there the first week in July and I fulfilled my promise. I was interested in meeting a number of people and asking them casually about the C.B.C. I drew their attention to the fact that a public opinion poll had been taken by Elliott-Haynes which would seem to indicate that the people in rural areas preferred listening to private stations. I think I got an explanation of that. "Yes," they said, " we like the private station at certain times and would not like to do without it, because we get something over the private stations that we do not get over C.B.C. The C.B.C. programmes are fine and we like them. They are better as a rule than the programmes we get over the private stations, but we tune in at eleven o'clock in the morning to Saskatoon, Prince Albert or Regina and we hear how our neighbours are. They give us the hospital reports, and a little later in the day events that are coming off in which we are interested. Consequently when we are asked if we like the programmes over the local station our answer is an emphatic yes, but that does not mean that we dislike the programmes over C.B.C." Indeed, when you pin them down they will tell you that the best programmes they hear come over the national station at Watrous, but they tune in as well to the local stations to get hospital news and local events in which they may be interested. I think that is the explanation.

Speaking for myself as an inveterate listener to the radio when I have the opportunity, I think that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has done a wonderful service over the years in improving the taste for good music, good drama and good literature, and I want to see it continued. I do not want to see mere money-making organizations utilizing the air waves to give to the people programmes that will entice them to listen to all kinds of advertising. Amusement, entertainment—yes; that is part of the work of C.B.C., but not all of it. Part of the work of the broadcasting corporation should be step by step to raise the cultural level of the Canadian people. I wish we could have two or even three national networks in this country giving the people a chance to hear what they want. They are doing that with great success in Britain now, but we are such a large country which presents so many difficulties that that cannot be undertaken. But this I do say, that the local community station does perform a service and should remain a local community station and no more. The C.B.C. also performs a great national service and parliament should do all it can to protect them in the national interest. I support this bill because it does go a little way in doing what I believe sooner or later we must do in a larger way, and that is provide the corporation with additional funds.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the radio committee. I remember when I was a member of the House of Commons in 1936 the Conservative government under Mr. Bennett introduced a bill regarding this corporation. I object to the principle of the bill before us for three or four reasons and my objections are these. You are handing over this money to the government-controlled radio. The auditor general has no control over it because the corporation have their own auditors. As for the board of directors, they are a political board and always have been. The only one who was not, Fred Crawford, was one of our leading citizens in Toronto who was greatly interested in community and social work of all kinds, a sportsman and a good business man all combined, one of our most popular citizens.

What are you going to do by this act? If you pass this bill the House of Commons washes its hands of any control over this corporation. In the first place this corporation has not sufficient business capacity to handle the job. I got a return brought down in the house the year before last and last year as to the number of prosecutions, by provinces, for failure to pay the licence fee of $2.50. The fee should be abolished altogether. If you are going to have a monopoly corporation you should have a free system. That should have been done long ago. I can tell you this, that the return I got in 1945 and 1946 showed that 70 per cent of the prosecutions were taking place in our city; in Ottawa and Hull there were practically no prosecutions and few in

any of the other provinces. When the money provided by this bill is turned over to the corporation we have no longer any control over it. Yet it is proposed to hand this money over to the C.B.C. board. In the dying days of this session boards seem to be paramount. We are creating all kinds of boards. If you want a radio board why do you not have an independent board like the transport commission? You might just as well hand control of the C.P.R. over to the C.N.R. as to appoint a board like this.

Our city has been a dumping ground for employees of the broadcasting corporation since it was set up. I do not blame the present minister because he has a very likeable personality in my opinion—although I am only one. I do not blame him for what is going on. I blame nobody except the high court of parliament for taking control every session out of the hands of parliament. I remember what went on in radio before the war. Everybody who was a pacifist was hired as a commentator over the radio. It was ridiculous. All these commentators were political appointments.

I do not blame the C.C.F. for wanting this and for wanting these commentators, but I say to them that if we pass this bill we shall make the broadcasting corporation a public monopoly, and the auditor general will be nowhere. He will have no control over the expenditure of that money, nor will parliament; they will say it is statutory now and refuse to give us any information. They must be pretty hard up, this corporation, and they are going to get still further hard up. When I see the waste that is going on in their purchasing of property in Toronto, at this time when there is such a shortage of houses, I am shocked. They are bringing people into Toronto from all over Canada from Vancouver to Halifax. These people do not belong to our city. They are being given good big jobs and some of them have very little to do. I remember a man called John Fisher, being brought into Toronto from Halifax. He had been attacking our city for years because of its political leanings. He was brought to Toronto. He has nothing much to do. He can occupy his time with his private interests on the radio for advertisers, boosting advertising, and so on. He is not the only one. They are bringing them in by the dozen, but I do not know of a Toronto citizen who can get a position with C.B.C. I do not know any of the directors or top officials of C.B.C. except that one very good man to whom I referred a moment ago. I paid my $2.50 and shut the radio off and did not turn it on for six months. It is simply ridiculous. I remember on a Good Friday they were putting on jazz and all that kind of thing, on one of the greatest days in the Christian church. But they forgot all about that. I do not criticize them so much because there is no doubt they have some good programmes, but they are Washington-minded.

With all the advertising we have they are going to have a dictatorship; there will be no public control. We have one or two private stations in our city. No one has spoken to me about this bill. I have not had one person speak to me. I went down to the radio committee one morning to see one of our members. There was a big sign on the door marked "private". A messenger came to the door and told me it was private, that I had no business to go in, so I did not go in. I did not even attempt to enter the room. That is what happened. I never saw such nepotism in my life as exists in Toronto radio. They bring in their sisters, their cousins, their aunts and their uncles; they come from Halifax and Vancouver. That is the kind of commission we have.

The same thing applies to sports on the radio. Some of the individuals were never sportsmen at all. If we adopt this measure you can say goodbye to any public control of radio by the high court of parliament. It is no wonder that people are criticizing the House of Commons. In the dying days of the session a matter like this is brought up. The same thing is true of foreign affairs and everything else. They are all brought up in the dying hours of the session and are given five minutes' attention. We might just as well not be here at all. The committee was appointed early in the session and did not meet until after Easter, and then this came on. I do not mind my friends to the left getting up and speaking in favour of it. I am not objecting to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) speaking in favour of this bill. I spoke to the Minister of National Defence one night, when the hon. member was going over to Moscow, to pacify Russia, and I told him he ought to send a bodyguard to ensure that he would get back; I was afraid he might be kidnapped. I am glad to see him here today.

I am not going to say any more. If the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. Henderson) will second my motion I shall move the six months hoist to this bill. Since I should like to see the house close on Wednesday morning I shall not say any more at this time. I do not see how the Liberal party and a government which believes in responsible government can bring in a measure like

this giving this corporation absolute control of radio broadcasting. The commission has done nothing about aids to education in our public, separate and secondary schools. In England the British Broadcasting Corporation have done a great deal along that line.

As I said a while ago, not one single person has spoken to me about this bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Church moves, seconded by Mr. Henderson:

That Bill No. 453 be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months hence.

Mr. J. M. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I am not going to apologize for rising to speak on this bill at this time because I regard it as a matter of importance. It is not the fault of anyone on this side that for the second year in succession this matter has been left to what we all hope are the dying moments of the session. I think it is a great pity; it is a matter of great importance, and at any rate I am going to have my brief say today.

I am against the bill, not because I do not want to see the C.B.C. get a good show. I do want to see it get a good show. I have no desire whatever to see it cramped or hampered or badly treated, but I think this is the wrong way to give the money.

In his statement the minister confined himself, and properly so, to a mere statement of the reasons for the need of money and the adequacy of this means of raising the money. The minister did not go farther afield and deal, as some other hon. members have, with some of the more important questions which I submit underlie this. I want to refer briefly to these and in particular to one of them. I am not going to deal with a wide variety of subjects.

To my mind it is of great importance indeed to have what the committee report calls a "separate regulating board." Up to the present in this debate I think it is fair to say there has been no justification even attempted of that stand. The two persons who have referred to it are the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart)—and if I do not do him an injustice what he said was that he thought it would be worse to have the Canadian Association of Broadcasters in control than to have the C.B.C. I would not argue with him on that point because so far as I know nobody suggests that the Canadian Association of Broadcasters should be put in control. All that is being suggested is that we should have an independent body, and that is what I want to speak about. The other person who referred to this was the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid). While he did not commit himself to an independent board—because he said his mind was open on the subject, he said there had been difficulties with regard to the transport board—nevertheless he did indicate great dissatisfaction with the report of the committee.

Incidentally may I draw particularly to the attention of the house the arresting statement which was made with regard to the hon. member for New Westminster. Somebody to my left referred to him as the one just man, in the Liberal party. I think he said the one just man in the Liberal party or the one honest man. I wish to point out that I looked up the book of Genesis yesterday and I found that Abraham in his trafficking with the Almighty got to the point where Sodom and Gomorrah would have been saved had there been ten just men in those cities. It did not get any lower than that. I submit that the Liberal party is in very great difficulty if it has only one just man in the party.

Mr. McCANN: Make another count.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I am not making the statement myself; I am merely quoting the statement.

Mr. MAYBANK: There were other cities at that time.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I want to make a brief reference to a separate regulating board. This is what the report said:

In the result, your committee is not prepared at the present time to suggest any fundamental change in radio regulation. The national broadcasting system is still in the transitional and developmental stage and the principles underlying its institution have the same force to-day as when the decision to establish it was made. Notwithstanding arguments advanced we do not feel justified under all the circumstances in recommending a fundamental change now.

I submit therefore that this, to me, very important matter, more important than anything else in this discussion, has not even been argued. There has been no reason given, so far as I am aware, against this board. My feeling is that the reasons in favour of it are more strong now, and that they are just as much in the interest of the C.B.C. as they are in the interests of the private stations, and that is why I am in favour of this independent board.

The report itself is a disappointing document; it seems an apologetic document. It says that there is not much competition and that the operators are making money. To me the whole tenor of the report is apologetic. We have further the definite statement from the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) indicating the very unsatisfactory manner in

which the report was arrived at, and that to my mind greatly accentuates what to me was the unsatisfactory present situation, and which I think is quite properly described by saying that the C.B.C. at the present time is judge and policeman, and somebody said executioner as well.

The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) referred to the Canadian National Railways. I want to carry it one step further. He said it would be very unfair if the Canadian National Railways should be not only an operator but should control and dictate the whole railway policy of Canada. I go further than that and suggest that nobody would suggest that the Canadian National Railways should be put in that position. I should be very much surprised if anybody would suggest that. Why is it we have this situation in broadcasting? Why is it that what ordinarily would be regarded as the fair thing is not being done?

I made some inquiries and as far as I can discover the only reason is that in the early thirties when this was instituted—and incidentally the name of the former leader of this party was extensively quoted a year ago as having favoured it, which I believe he did —I am informed that at that time the guiding reason was that it was feared unless we appeared as a government, unless it was a government monopoly, we might not get anything like a fair share of the wave lengths. That was the reason which directed it at that time. Whatever may or may not be the reason then, so far as I can understand the situation, that reason has disappeared. We now have some kind of judicial allotment of wave lengths as between the countries, and therefore I suggest that we can go back to what I believe is the fair way and the only way of dealing with this situation. As things are at present we run into the situation where you have many of the evils of a monopoly.

I submit that uncontrolled monopoly is a bad thing. It is a bad thing if it is private monopoly, and in a way it is worse if it is government monopoly, because then unfortunately no one believes, at least a great many people do not believe, that it is entirely uncontrolled by government. Therefore I submit that makes an additional reason for setting up an independent board.

To me it is a great disappointment that this matter has not even been discussed. It is important. There has been no speech on the opposite side apart from the minister's, except by the hon. member for New Westminster, who was critical. We have had no expression of views from the other side, and I do not believe for a moment that there are not people sitting opposite who have a feeling in favour of an independent board. It seems to me therefore that the situation we have here is nothing but a running away from the discussion of this question. No serious attempt has been made to raise any question. The member for Rosetown-Biggar made an interesting speech in which he referred to various abuses which he thought might creep in, and all the time he was speaking I was thinking the best way of removing that feeling was to have an independent board, so that there might be no suspicion at all that the government interferes with its creature.

I want to say a word as to the bill itself. I began by saying that I was the last person who would wish to see the C.B.C. starve. I want to see it generously dealt with. But I submit that for reasons already given this is the wrong way to go about it. This is an indirect way which can only lead to misunderstandings and difficulties of various kinds. If the government wishes to give them further money, as it very well might, it should make a grant in the ordinary way and not adopt this indirect way, which defies all laws of good business and good governmental procedure as well.

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I intend to commend very strongly the address of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) in this debate. Some of us were in this house when this act was passed, and I may say, with reference to a great gentleman now gone from us, that a finer speech in regard to public ownership of radio was never made than that made by the then leader of the government, R. B. Bennett. It was a sincere, a magnificent speech. However, sir, I must say this. In recent days, in recent years, I have found something amounting almost to a sinister conspiracy to take away from the ownership of the people one of the great organs of public opinion in our land, and that is the control of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I have no objection to private stations but I have a tremendous objection to the overwhelming infiltration of private stations in broadcasting in the dominion of Canada. I believe that the voice of the people should be heard through an organization controlled—

Mr. CASE: By the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not by the government, sir. I want to tell my hon. friend right now, and I defy him to prove me untrue, that the present Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is more anti-government than pro-government.

Mr. CASE: I would not like to admit that.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is certainly true and I know it to be true. I am not blaming them for that, because they are an independent corporation. Please remember that. They are not an organ of the government. They are subject of course to the revision and the judgment of the radio committee of this house from year to year, but they are not an organ of this government, never were and never will be. My hon. friend should try to learn some of the elementary lessons in political procedure before he affronts parliament by making such a peculiar remark as he has just made.

Mr. HACKETT: It is not a peculiar remark. It is true.

Mr. CASE: I am only expressing public opinion.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Even my Tory friend from Stanstead cannot prove it true, with all his legal acumen. He cannot prove it true that the C.B.C. ever leans to this government. As a matter of fact, the opinion of the government, if I can be confidential with the house, is that they lean the other way.

Mr. FRASER: Oh, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Be that as it may, that is purely an aside. I was going to suggest, sir, that after these few brief remarks, possibly disturbing to the consolidated toryism of Stanstead, and to the peculiar interpolationist habits of the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Case), if hon. members can nurse their wrath and keep it warm, I would move the adjournment of this debate until a later date, possibly tomorrow morning first thing. I will tell the house later on.

Mr. HANSELL: The debate on the broadcasting bill is likely to call for a vote. Is it understood that this bill will be proceeded with tomorrow?

Mr. MACKENZIE: It will definitely go ahead either later this day or tomorrow morning.

Mr. HANSELL: That does not mean a thing.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

MILITIA PENSION ACT

PENSIONS FOR LESS THAN TWENTY YEARS SERVICE UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence) moved the second reading of Bill No. 456, to amend the Militia Pension Act.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1.

Mr. CLAXTON: I should point out that this applies to thirty-six men who would, under the existing legislation, be unable to get their pensions. The provision is to make it clear that we can find them to be disabled, so as to qualify them for pension, when they are totally and permanently disabled to perform their duties as soldiers. It is to correct an error of drafting when the amendment was made in the Militia Pension Act in 1946.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PRIVILEGE

MR. KNOWLES—REFERRING TO REMARKS IN DEBATE ON JULY 12

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Before the leader of the house accedes to the request of the leader of the opposition, may I say a word with regard to what is really a question of privilege, and it will take only a moment. In the debate on Saturday, as reported in *Hansard* at page 5547, during the speech of the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Jaques) there were certain interjections. It is obvious that the reporters were unable to get down all of the interjections, but one of the omissions leaves an inference with regard to myself which means that I must rise to a question of privilege. The report reads in this way:

> Mr. Irvine: That shows some wisdom anyway.
>
> Mr. Jaques: It does, of course, to the communist people and to their fellow travellers who make up the bulk of the C.C.F. party.
>
> Mr. Low: Including the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that after the reply of the hon. member for Wetaskiwin to the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine) my colleague from Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart) made an interjection that the hon. member for Wetaskiwin was psychopathic. This does not appear, but the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low) was referring in his reply to what the hon. member for Winnipeg North had interjected, and said "including the hon. member for Winnipeg North." In other words, he sought to include my colleague in the remark he made about the hon. member for Wetaskiwin. The hon. member for Peace River agrees with me that he did

not make any inference such as that recorded in *Hansard*. I trust the proper correction will be made.

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker, that is quite right. My interjection had reference to the interpolation of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart), not the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

Mr. KNOWLES: Thank you.

Mr. LOW: Which interpolation was inadvertently left out.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

The house resumed at two o'clock.

REDISTRIBUTION

READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Hon. COLIN GIBSON (Secretary of State, for the Prime Minister) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 18, to adjust the representation in the House of Commons.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Mr. Chairman, in considering the report of the special committee on redistribution I should like first of all to pay a tribute to the chairman and also the members of that committee. While not a member of the committee myself I understand the members worked together in a spirit of good will and a desire for fair play. The chief electoral officer has informed me that never in his experience has he seen such harmony as existed at the meetings of this committee; and I think this statement will be supported by such experienced members as the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol).

As the report of the committee shows, the members were unanimous in their recommendations as to the amendments to sections 4 and 7 of the bill and as to the schedules relating to New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan and Alberta. The report, though not unanimous as to section 2 and the schedules of the other provinces, according to the report of the special committee represents a very substantial measure of agreement. For the benefit of the members of the house who were not members of the special committee I should like to outline the main changes that have been recommended in the various provinces.

[Mr. Knowles.]

British Columbia receives two additional seats under redistribution. The members of the British Columbia subcommittee unanimously agreed that these seats be created in the lower mainland area, one within Vancouver city to be called Vancouver-Quadra, and the other a suburban seat composed of the municipalities of Burnaby, Richmond and Coquitlam, now part of New Westminster and Vancouver North, and called Burnaby-Richmond. As the remaining part of Vancouver North contains no part of the city of Vancouver, it has been renamed Coast-Capilano, describing the two principal districts of the riding. The only other change in the British Columbia seats is the transfer of that part of the present Cariboo riding which is south of the 52 degrees 30 minutes parallel, to the Kamloops riding. The present Cariboo riding is the largest in the province, and lies on both sides of the Rocky Mountains. A measure of relief has been provided by the transfer of the southern part of the riding to the adjacent and much smaller Kamloops riding.

Saskatchewan loses one seat, and a seat was eliminated in the southern part of the province, which was the drought area. Since 1931 a large number of people have left this section and settled, to a considerable extent, in the more northerly part of the province. It was not only necessary to consider the elimination of one seat in the southern part, but also the question of moving the limits of most constituencies further to the north. The Saskatchewan sub-committee brought in a unanimous report.

There were no changes made in Alberta.

Manitoba loses one seat, but changes in population made it desirable to have a rather extensive alteration in the limits of the constituencies. The present ridings of Lisgar and Macdonald were combined and the present ridings of Portage la Prairie and Neepawa were also combined. This permitted the establishment of a new constituency out of part of Selkirk and the suburban area of Winnipeg to be known as Selkirk. The remainder of the former constituency of Selkirk will be known as Norquay.

The representation of Ontario is increased by one, and this seat was allotted to northern Ontario. In addition the committee decided to allot an additional seat to northern Ontario, and this was found by combining the district of Muskoka with the present constituency of Parry Sound, and by annexing the remainder of Muskoka-Ontario to the present constituencies of Victoria and Ontario. In order to reduce the population of Ottawa West, which was over 94,000, the southerly part of the

riding was transferred to the riding of Carleton. In order to reduce the population of Ottawa East the town of Eastview was transferred to the riding of Russell. One township now in Peterborough West was transferred to Northumberland, with a result that the whole of Northumberland county is now together for electoral purposes. The township of Markham and the villages of Stouffville and Markham were transferred from York East to York North. The town of Weston was transferred from York South to York West. The township of Burford was transferred from Brant to Brantford. The remainder of the riding of Brant was combined with the townships of Beverly, Ancaster, Glanford and Binbrook from Wentworth to form a new constituency of Brant-Wentworth. The township of Logan including the town of Mitchell was transferred from Perth to Huron-Perth. The township of Biddulph and the town of Lucan were transferred from Middlesex East to Middlesex West. The townships of Tilbury West and Sandwich South were transferred from Essex North to Essex South. The township of Oro was transferred from Simcoe North to Simcoe East. The township of Baxter was transferred from Muskoka-Ontario to Simcoe East. In northern Ontario, the present ridings of Nipissing, Timiskaming and Cochrane have been rearranged into five seats known as Nipissing, Timiskaming, Cochrane, Timmins and Sudbury.

Quebec gained eight seats on redistribution, and in addition to allotting these, it was necessary for the committee to readjust many of the existing boundaries in view of the changes in population. The committee recommended the elimination of the existing constituency of Laval-Two Mountains so there were nine new seats to be allotted. The committee has recommended that four of these be allotted to the island of Montreal, the new constituencies being known as Laval, Lafontaine, Mount Royal and Papineau. The committee also recommends the creation of a new riding of Villeneuve out of the northern portion of Pontiac; a new constituency known as Lapointe out of the western half of Chicoutimi; the present constituency of Charlevoix-Saguenay was divided into separate constituencies of Charlevoix and Saguenay; and the present constituency of Lac St. Jean-Roberval was divided into separate constituencies of Lac St. Jean and Roberval. In addition, the Magdalen Islands are allotted a separate seat in view of the fact that these islands are 150 miles from Gaspe, to which they had been attached for electoral purposes.

In New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island no changes were made.

Nova Scotia is entitled to one additional seat on redistribution. This was provided by joining the municipalities of Queens and Shelburne to form a constituency to be named Queens-Shelburne. No changes were made in the island of Cape Breton other than the joining of Hillside and South Forks, which previously formed part of the constituency of Cape Breton South, to the constituency of Cape Breton North-Victoria. It was recommended by the committee that the dual constituency of Halifax be divided into two separate constituencies. Since the bringing in of the report of the special committee strong representations have been received from Halifax that the city and county of Halifax be continued as a dual constituency. In view of these representations I intend to move at the proper time that items 8 and 9 of the Nova Scotia schedule be deleted so as to leave the Halifax constituencies unaltered.

The special committee has also recommended that under the provisions of section 51, subsection 2 of the British North America Act 1867-1946, that part of the Mackenzie district of the Northwest Territories lying west of 109th meridian of west longitude be added to the Yukon territory for electoral purposes to form a constituency known as Yukon-Mackenzie River.

While some of the members will find their constituencies altered, or in a few cases either combined or eliminated, I feel sure that they will realize that these changes have become necessary due to changed conditions, and in order to carry out the spirit and the provisions of the British North America Act. In conclusion I would move:

That items 8 and 9 of the Nova Scotia schedule be deleted and that the following be substituted therefor:

"8. Halifax consisting of the city of Halifax and the county of Halifax, which shall return two members."

And that the subsequent items of the schedule be renumbered accordingly.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to say a word about the proposed redistribution in so far as it affects my own province of British Columbia, and then go on to make a few remarks with regard to the other features of the proposed redistribution of electoral seats. The Secretary of State has intimated to the committee that British Columbia is getting two additional seats, bringing our total to 18. One of those new seats is to be in the city of Vancouver and the other in the suburban area surrounding that city.

At the present time Vancouver has four seats, Vancouver Centre, Vancouver-Burrard, Vancouver East and Vancouver South. The

changes that are being made are to cut off a small portion of Vancouver Centre and Vancouver-Burrard and add them to the present Vancouver East; then to take the southern portion of Vancouver East and add it to Vancouver South, which is the largest seat in population, and divide that into two seats, a new Vancouver South and a seat to be known as Vancouver-Quadra. The feature about this division is that the boundary line between the new Vancouver South and Vancouver-Quadra is not a straight line.

A line should have been drawn across that portion of the city but the government supporters, led in so far as British Columbia is concerned by the hon. member for Vancouver North, saw fit to put a jog in that boundary with the result that the population of Vancouver-Quadra will be considerably larger than that of the new Vancouver South. In my opinion there was no excuse for having a jog at all. The line should have been run straight across that portion of the city; in fact it could very well have been run along Thirty-third avenue which is the natural boundary between the ridings.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Section 1 is the short title. I was wondering if in this particular case the committee would not agree to a general discussion at this time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. GREEN: I think the answer to that point of order is that the Secretary of State has already moved an amendment with regard to the Halifax seat.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the committee will agree that any hon. member can carry on a general discussion.

Mr. GREEN: The jog between the new Vancouver South and Vancouver-Quadra is in fact made for political purposes, in the vain hope of building up support for the government in the new Vancouver South. I do not think there is any doubt as to the defeat the government candidate will get in that riding at the next election.

I should like to say a few words about the name of the new seat, Vancouver-Quadra. I foresee that there may be much questioning after the next election when some one comes here as the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra. That is a name which means much on the whole Pacific coast. Quadra was a daring Spanish explorer on that coast. In 1775 two Spanish ships explored the coast as far north as Alaska and one of them was under the command of Quadra, who was then a naval lieutenant. Hon. members will be interested to know the size of his ship. It was thirty-six feet in length, and had a twelve foot beam, which is not nearly as wide as the space from my desk to the desk opposite, with an eight foot depth of hold. As I have said, he went in that ship as far as Alaska. All but two members of his crew were stricken with scurvy, and finally Quadra himself had to climb the masts to look after the rigging. He was a bold explorer.

About twenty years later, in 1792, Quadra again visited the coast of British Columbia, this time as commander of what the Spanish called the settlement of Nootka on the west coast of the present Vancouver island. He was also in command of California and practically the whole western coast of North America. At Nootka, in 1792 he met Captain George Vancouver, who had been sent out from Great Britain to negotiate with the Spanish concerning a dispute as to who should own Nootka, the British or the Spanish. Another British explorer, Captain Cook, had been there in the intervening years between 1775 and 1792, and had obtained from the Indians sea-otter skins which were of great value on the Chinese market. As a result, different explorers had sailed for the west coast and trouble had arisen as to whether Nootka belonged to Spain or to Great Britain. By the way, Burrard is named after one of Captain Vancouver's officers.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Lieutenant Burrard.

Mr. GREEN: Yes. Quadra and Vancouver met at Nootka and negotiated for a settlement of this dispute. They were unable to agree upon anything having to do with the dispute, but they became the warmest of friends. A few months later Quadra entertained Captain Vancouver off the coast of California, and the description given of him by Captain Vancouver is as follows:

> He was the mainspring of a society that had produced so much happiness, who had rendered us so many essential benefits, and whose benevolence and disinterested conduct had impressed our minds with the highest esteem and veneration.

Actually Quadra named the present Vancouver island the island of Quadra and Vancouver, but eventually his name was dropped. So this name "Quadra" has a historical significance for those of us who are fortunate enough to live on the west coast of Canada, and we are very proud to have a riding named after this great explorer.

The other new riding is to be known as Burnaby-Richmond. It is in a suburban district around Vancouver. I have some doubts whether the two main municipalities in that new riding have sufficient interests

in common to warrant putting them into one riding. However, we shall just have to see how it works out. It may be a very satisfactory riding.

My main point today concerning the British Columbia redistribution has to do with the Kamloops seat. That seat was created in 1933. It was a seat fitted into the main railway lines that run across the province. Along the Canadian Pacific railway it reaches from Ashcroft right through to Glacier, within fifty miles of the Alberta boundary. It also includes the main line of the Canadian National running up the Fraser valley and the valley of the Thompson to Kamloops and almost to the junction with the line that runs out to Prince Rupert. It has been a big seat to cover. Kamloops city is pretty much the centre of the riding. One has to go back to Kamloops, if he is coming in from the east on the main line of the Canadian Pacific, to get up the main line of the C.N.R. It has been a difficult riding to cover. There is also quite a large area lying to the south of the main lines of these two railways.

The interests of the present riding are with the people who live to the south, in the present riding of Yale, not with the people who live to the north or to the west but primarily with the people who live to the south. The population of Kamloops riding in 1941 was 27,387. The population of Yale, lying south of that riding, was 51,874, almost twice as much. In fact, Yale is the biggest riding in the province outside of the ridings which include the larger cities. The fair way to add to the population of Kamloops would have been to take in the northern part of Yale.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Does the hon. member for Yale concur in that?

Mr. GREEN: I do not know anything about that. But instead of doing that the government has seen fit to take in part of Cariboo riding lying west and north, over a mountain range, by the way, and in another railway belt, a belt that is served by the provincial government railway, the Pacific-Great Eastern. It has taken a large bit of territory from Cariboo and added it to Kamloops. Cariboo's population according to the last census was 33,002. That part of Cariboo riding which has been taken in does not look to Kamloops at all; it looks to Vancouver. Traffic is from Vancouver up the Cariboo. I have here a map of British Columbia which shows that the portion of Cariboo added to Kamloops is geographically as big as the present riding of Kamloops, which is even now the third largest riding in the province. The riding will now stretch from within fifty miles of the Alberta boundary to the heads of two of our great inlets on the sea coast, Jarvis inlet and Bute inlet. The additional territory is about 200 miles in width, and it makes the riding of Kamloops an area that is almost impossible to cover because largely the communications run the opposite way, and as I have said, the new area is served by a different railroad entirely.

This change means that now Kamloops riding will have a population seven or eight thousand greater than the new Cariboo riding. That is on the 1941 census basis. On the ration book basis the difference will be much greater. The ration book figures are Kamloops, 35,098, Cariboo 38,657. The redistribution switches 10,031 from Cariboo to Kamloops and the result will be that Kamloops will have a ration-book population of 46,129 and Cariboo 28,626.

The result of this change is very noticeable politically. Kamloops riding as I said was formed in 1933. In 1935 it was carried by T. J. O'Neill, the Liberal candidate, with a majority of 1,216 and in 1940 with a majority of 1,331. In 1945 the present member for Kamloops, Mr. Fulton, carried the riding by a majority of 177. The figures were, Fulton, 4,401, O'Neill, 4,224, McKenzie, C.C.F. 4,003, Codd, Labour Progressive 666.

The portion of the Cariboo which is now being added to Kamloops gave the Liberals a majority of 500, so that on the basis of the results of the last election it would seem fairly obvious that the new riding is a Liberal riding. The portion added to Kamloops also gave the C.C.F. a majority over the Conservatives, so that the C.C.F. are the secondary beneficiaries; they are just one removed.

This change in my opinion is made purely for political purposes—we might as well face that fact—and it is made against one of the most promising young men in the public life of Canada today. The hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton), thirty-one years of age, led a company of our famous Seaforth Highlanders in action in Italy. He was mentioned in dispatches. He had a splendid record. Before that he was a Rhodes scholar. He was one of the outstanding young students of British Columbia. He is a young man who has made his mark right in this House of Commons in a way that has not been equalled by any other young man since I came here in 1936. His father sat in this house from 1917 to 1921. Before that he was a member

of the McBride cabinet, which was the finest cabinet British Columbia has had since it entered confederation.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES: Why don't you fellows agree on the coalition you have now?

Mr. GREEN: His maternal grandfather was premier of British Columbia; his maternal uncle was Speaker in the British Columbia house a few years ago. This young man is in a position to render great service to Canada. He has already done so. He will render greater service in the years that lie ahead, and I want to assure hon. members opposite that no gerrymander now or at any other time is going to knock him out of this house. He is also dominion president of the Young Conservatives, and in that capacity too has made a great contribution to the public life of this nation.

I said a few moments ago that I did not think he could be knocked out in spite of this gerrymander. I say that for this reason. I believe that the people of that portion of Cariboo that is being added to his riding, and the people of his present riding of Kamloops, will have nothing to do with a dirty deal of this type. They will rally to his support and handle the deal which has been made in the redistribution of this particular seat. Then I think he will win for another reason. He will win because he will serve the people in the new part of his riding as he has served the people of the present riding of Kamloops. No one has given more attention to the needs and the interests of the people of his riding than the hon. member for Kamloops. For that reason also I believe that the hon. member will win this new seat.

So much for the province of British Columbia. The onus for this change rests on the government; it rests primarily on the member for Vancouver North (Mr. Sinclair), himself another young man, who represented the government on this redistribution committee. I am quite sure that had the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) been the government supporter on the committee for British Columbia he would not have made such a change, because he is a fair man. I am equally sure that the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Mayhew) would not have done so, nor would the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) have made an unfair change of this type.

Then, to go beyond the boundaries of British Columbia, I should like to say just a few words with regard to some of the other changes that are being proposed. First of all,

Lake Centre: we have here representing Lake Centre the most able debater in this House of Commons, a member who has the measure of every member of the cabinet, a member known in this country from coast to coast as probably Canada's ablest parliamentarian today, a man who has contributed a great deal to the public life of this country and will contribute more as the years go by. What is being done in his seat? We have changes made in the first place helping out the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), who got in by the skin of his teeth in the last election, and other changes trying to throw the seat of Lake Centre to the C.C.F. That is the sort of thing the Canadian people will resent and rightly so. It is another case of a gerrymander, the person concerned being another leading member of the official opposition.

Then we come to Manitoba. What do we find there? We find that the seat represented by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) is being wiped out, if you please—the leader of the opposition, who alone with the Prime Minister of this country has had the administrative experience to lead Canada. Nobody else in the cabinet can compare in any way, shape or form with the twenty years' administrative experience of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Just pipe dreams.

Mr. GREEN: I expected my noisy friend to interrupt; he has been doing so and may continue to his heart's content, but it is time for him to keep quiet for a while. There is the picture in Manitoba. This government is trying to gerrymander the leader of the opposition out of his seat.

Mr. VIAU: That is a lie.

Mr. GREEN: What happens to the Prime Minister's seat? He has a nice safe little pocket borough down here in Glengarry, the smallest seat in Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE: One of the best.

Mr. GREEN: It is not touched. The Canadian people are fair. They will have to be judges of this sort of thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear; you are talking a lot of nonsense.

Mr. GREEN: And I think they will be. The old seat of Neepawa is now to be combined with Portage la Prairie, in which Mr. Miller won an outstanding by-election last fall. The riding is now to be known as Portage-Neepawa.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Was it a small riding?

Mr. GREEN: Then in Ontario the one seat being wiped out is Muskoka-Ontario which is represented by the dominion president of the Progressive Conservative Association, Mr. J. M. Macdonnell, the financial critic of the opposition, and a man who in his two short years in this house has made a great name for himself as a public servant. No one is listened to more intently by everybody in this house than the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario. I do not think government members will deny that fact. His seat is wiped out in this redistribution. This is another very unfair change. By the way, he will get elected even if they do wipe out his seat because he is that kind of public servant.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Why worry?

Mr. GREEN: Right here under our eyes we have the same sort of gerrymander going on. Everybody knows the position in Ottawa West, but I shall not go into it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Look at the last Tory redistribution.

Mr. GREEN: The hon. member may keep on mumbling away.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What did you do about it?

Mr. GREEN: Everybody knows what is going on here in Ottawa West, but I shall let the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Boucher) deal with it.

Then we go down to Nova Scotia and what do we find?

An hon. MEMBER: A by-election.

Mr. GREEN: It is easy to tell there is a by-election there by the amendment the Secretary of State moved a few minutes ago. In Nova Scotia we find another Liberal seat carved out where the population did not warrant the change at all.

Mr. ABBOTT: They are all Liberals down there.

Mr. GREEN: The population in Cape Breton is such that that is where the new seat should have been made, or in the northwestern portion of the province. Instead another attempt is made to put a safe Liberal seat in the area where the new seat is to be.

Mr. MACKENZIE: They are all safe down there.

Mr. GILLIS: There are no safe seats in Nova Scotia today.

Mr. GREEN: These are just a few of the highlights—

Mr. KNOWLES: Lowlights, you mean.

Mr. GREEN: Yes. I am not surprised that the Minister of Veterans Affairs and his associates are so touchy on this subject. They have good reason to be.

Mr. ABBOTT: Just amusement.

Mr. GREEN: These actions in deliberately trying to behead the leaders of the Progressive Conservative party across Canada—

Mr. MACKENZIE: No, no.

Mr. GREEN: These actions show the straits in which the government finds itself today. They are the actions of a worn-out government and they do not deserve to be supported by the people of this nation nor do I think they will be when the votes are counted.

Mr. MACKENZIE: They have been for twenty years.

Mr. GREEN: You will not be here again.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Won't we! I would like to bet you on that.

Mr. GREEN: I am going to move, Mr. Chairman:

That the bill be amended by deleting from the schedule thereto under the heading of British Columbia all reference to the ridings of Cariboo, Fraser Valley, and Kamloops, and substituting therefor the description of the said ridings as contained in the schedule to the Representation Act of 1933.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I am very sorry to see that the Prime Minister is not in his place. What I have to say might be of some interest to him. However, I wish to give the house a certain text from the book of Job, chapter 31, verse 35:

Oh . . . that mine adversary had written a book.

I should like to paraphrase that text so as to bring it up to date: Oh that mine adversary would make a speech. The adversary I have in mind at this moment is the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), who throughout his years has made many speeches, some of which he must regret having made, because the skies today are dark with the wings of the chickens that are now coming home to roost.

Mr. KNOWLES: Flying saucers.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): The last time there was a debate on redistribution was in 1933, fourteen years ago, and the then leader of the opposition was very irate with the Tory government for bringing down the measure only five days before the session ended. Now we have been told by the acting leader of the house, the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) that he hopes that

we shall close tomorrow night. Yet here we have a government which, when in opposition, deplored the bringing down of a bill five days before the end of the session now brings down the same sort of bill a matter of hours before the house concludes its business.

I should like to read what the leader of the opposition had to say at that time. My quotations will all be taken from volume V of *Hansard* of 1933, and first I would quote from page 5235:

Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I think it desirable to point out immediately the unfairness of the government having left consideration of this most important measure until the very end of the session. That fact of itself, it seems to me, is prima facie evidence of a desire on the part of the administration to exercise its power as a majority to press through this bill under circumstances which are most unfair to the minority in the house. I would point out that the government has known from the time it came into office that at this session a redistribution bill would have to be introduced.

The government has known for a long time now that this bill would be introduced at this session.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It was introduced in February.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): In spite of their knowledge that this bill would be brought down they have waited until the dying days of the session to bring on this discussion.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It was introduced in February.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I must ask the minister not to do with me as he has done with others. Please do not shake your jowls at me.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Facts are facts.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): The last time the debate took 380 pages and most of those pages were devoted to the situation which then existed in the constituency of Prince Albert. The leader of the opposition, who was the member for that constituency, objected strenuously to the idea that Prince Albert should be made smaller. He wanted it made larger. There was a certain inconsistency there, because he is the member today for the smallest constituency in Canada, and yet he has not a word to say about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: And one of the finest constituencies too.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): This measure is of course a very obvious attempt at gerrymandering, and to keep the record clear I wish to read what the Prime Minister said at page 5276 of *Hansard*, the same volume. Prince Albert runs through my remarks as a sort of refrain, but I cannot help that. I quote:

When one comes to examine the other constituencies having representations of less than 40,000 one sees how this particular constituency of Prince Albert has been cut up in order to legislate out of his seat in this parliament the one who represents it at the present time and to help make absolutely secure at least one hon. gentleman who sits on the other side of the house.

The moans of the leader of the opposition were loud because he was going to be deprived of his opportunity to come back here, but I have heard no objection to the present leader of the opposition suffering from the same sort of treatment. To continue:

May I point out how the change has been made, and in so doing I would say that this constituency, as redefined, is a fine exemplification of what is meant by the word "gerrymander." The word gerrymander in political parlance simply means that in redistributing a constituency the boundary lines are so altered as to do an obvious injury to one political party and give an obvious unfair political advantage to another party.

From that definition one would say that the Liberal party were obvious experts at gerrymandering. The member for Vancouver South told us what happened to certain members of the Progressive Conservative party. I do not like either the ideas or the principles of the Progressive Conservative party, even though I may have some regard for some of them as individuals in their private capacity, but I have a regard for justice, and I do not think that justice is ensured in this case. As the member for Vancouver South told us, four of the most prominent Tories are in grave danger of losing their seats. In other words, the government intends to keep out of the house seventy-five per cent of the fighting strength of the Tory party, and one can only conclude that this is not chivalrous. The Prime Minister in the last debate had something to say about chivalry, in which I assume he is an expert. At page 5277 of *Hansard* of 1933 he made this statement:

If the last election had been fought within the boundaries proposed at present, instead of having a Liberal majority of 1,192 I would have been defeated by a Conservative majority of 618.

One member of the house was sufficiently ill advised to shout, "Hurrah"! The report goes on:

Mr. Mackenzie King: Some hon. gentleman says "hurrah." That may be very chivalrous,

but let me tell my hon. friends opposite it is not in accord with the sense of chivalry of the people of Canada as a whole. It may be Tory chivalry but it is neither British chivalry nor British fair play.

Let us make a comparison. The Tories were going to legislate out of existence one seat. The Liberals propose to get rid of four of the most prominent members of the Progressive Conservative party. One would assume then that there was a higher sense of chivalry in the Tories than in the Liberals, though I think that neither of them have the faintest idea of what is meant by British chivalry or British fair play. However, as the Prime Minister said in that debate fourteen years ago, the most important consideration is the political consideration, and this is being lived up to fully in this case. Justice and equity apparently have little to do with it.

Now I wish to refer to something nearer home so far as I am concerned, and that is the attempted gerrymander in the constituency of the member for Dauphin (Mr. Zaplitny). I am not surprised, because the hon. member has been consistently a thorn in the side of the government. He has exposed the pretentions of their legislation on more than one occasion, and he has harried and harassed the members opposite. The situation is this. Here is a constituency which is already larger than most of the other rural ridings in Manitoba. The new piece which is added by this bill has a large Liberal majority, but the citizens who live there have really no relationship to the constituency of Dauphin. Their relationship is more to the towns of Neepawa and to Portage la Prairie. This is an obvious attempt on the part of the government to secure for themselves another seat, but let me assure them that they cannot do. They may as well give up Dauphin as a lost cause because the present member will be here in the next parliament.

There is another matter that perhaps affects me more personally. There has been a slight attempt at gerrymander in Winnipeg North. There is one section known as Elmwood, which is a geographic, social and cultural entity. In their wisdom and, I suspect, on instructions from Manitoba, the government decided to split this area in half and give one portion to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. He needs it as a duck needs a third leg. In the last election all his opponents lost their deposits and, of course, that will happen again in the next election because he is inheriting a sound and wise C.C.F. majority. My objection is not to this area going to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, but if anywhere I think it should have gone to the hon. member for St. Boniface, for this area is contiguous to the constituency of St. Boniface. But if it had gone there we should have had another C.C.F. member for St. Boniface in the next house. It is quite obvious that the government has no desire whatsoever to see that happen, and they have stripped from me a certain majority and given it to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. As I say, it is a flagrant attempt at gerrymander; there can be no other word for it.

I wish to bring to the attention of the house some of the other things which the Prime Minister had to say fourteen years ago when he was in opposition. This I assume may have been Philip when sober.

Mr. MACKENZIE: He was on the committee.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): A few months ago we introduced in this house an amendment suggesting that there should be an independent commission to define the constituency boundaries, and the house Liberal majority, with some Conservatives decided to vote it down. But first, I should like to read what the present Prime Minister had to say fourteen years ago about proportional representation, at page 5422 of *Hansard*:

I believe that the only true method of securing a representative parliament is by a system of proportional representation properly worked out with regard to the dominion as a whole. The reform should commence with the cities and the larger municipalities in our country. When the Liberal government was in office we introduced into this house a measure of proportional representation in connection with city constituencies. It was fought for some little time, there was considerable opposition from the then opposition and the measure was not proceeded with. It was not reintroduced because the government of the day had not a majority in the other chamber which would ensure its enactment, and there were more pressing matters requiring attention. I might add the late Liberal government did not have a majority in the senate all the time it was in office. If we had had a majority in the other house upon which we could have relied, we would have proceeded with our proportional representation measure.

For the last few years the Prime Minister has been appointing his own emissaries to the senate and having them sign on the dotted line. He had a majority which he could have used to that end, to secure P.R., if he had reintroduced such legislation. It was not done. The then leader of the opposition goes on:

If we are ever returned to power a proportional representation measure will be a feature of the Liberal platform and programme of legislation.

That is another Liberal promise. The Liberals have been returned to power three times since and nothing at all has been said

or done on this issue. Then on page 5476, when the member for Bow River, Mr. Garland, was discussing this matter, he pointed out how certain Liberals had voted against proportional representation, and he said this:

I should like to ask the right hon. gentleman—

That is the present Prime Minister.

—if he has consulted those ministers and received their consent as well as the consent of these various genial French Canadian members to the legislation which he now proposes?

Mr. Mackenzie King: I might say that the matter has been discussed and agreed to in a Liberal caucus.

Later on Mr. Stevens, with prophetic wisdom, said, "They are just kidding the troops."

That, of course, has been amply proven.

Then I should like to read for the sake of the record what the Prime Minister said at page 5425—and it is interesting to see how his protestations stick up against his actions:

My own view, and I have come to it after observing pretty carefully what has been taking place and what has been said in debate in this house as well as in the corridors, is that redistribution should be taken out of the hands of the House of Commons, where the parties are immediately interested, and should be put into the hands of a commission of judges.

We advocated its being put into the hands of an independent commission, but the government turned it down. Then this is significant:

I would have that commission composed of judges selected in equal numbers by both sides of the house. The redistribution, if it is carried out in a fair way has not to do with party advantage at all.

That again was when the Prime Minister was leader of the opposition. He continues:

It ought to have solely to do with seeking to effect a fair and impartial division of the constituencies, and if three judges were named from one side of the house and three from the other, and if the choice were made, if you will, from among those who have been in politics and who therefore may be presumed to know something about conditions generally as they exist throughout the country, I think a redistribution which would be regarded as fair might be arrived at.

On various occasions the hon. member for Stanstead has objected to judges being in politics or being at times attacked in this house. I have sympathy with him. But I consider it a regrettable thing that the then leader of the opposition, now leader of the parliament of Canada, believes that judges who are in office should step off the bench, don again the political mantle, decide redistribution and go up to the bench once again, I suppose to be impartial. In the past the trouble with our judiciary has been that too many politicians who have not made the grade in this house have become judges. So long as that happens, the judiciary will not be regarded with the respect which is due to it. Then at page 5468, I feel I must quote this:

Of one thing we can be perfectly sure: a very limited number of those who are here today will be here to speak ten years hence of what has taken place at this time. It was because of that and because of what must have impressed itself upon everyone who has been present during the past two weeks, that I thought it advisable to say that when the House of Commons was again confronted with the question of redistribution of the constituencies of Canada, it would in my opinion be wise for it to adopt the plan of referring the whole matter to a commission composed of judges—

Et cetera, et cetera. And he concludes:

That is the position which I took this afternoon and which I take again tonight.

And the next morning apparently the right hon. gentleman had forgotten all about that position which he had taken.

In those quotations which I have placed on the record, Mr. Chairman, I think I have said enough to show the difference between Philip drunk and Philip sober; I think I have said enough to show the difference between the present Prime Minister's protestations of virtue and his actions; I think I have said enough to show the difference between his position when he is in opposition and when he is in power; indeed, I think I have said enough to show the absolute worthlessness of Liberal promises.

Mr. LACOMBE: During the budget debate I said a few words concerning redistribution of electoral divisions. Nobody is more anxious than I am to have Quebec assume a greater influence in the House of Commons, but this influence should be based on equity, justice and right. I will not tolerate that Laval-Two Mountains be suppressed from the electoral map through the use of false excuses. Consequently I wish to denounce right now the shameful attitude of those who are endeavouring to proceed with redistribution in defiance of the importance of the population, history, geographical position and individual character of the county of Laval-Two Mountains.

This problem is nothing but an electoral scheme. They would not be worthy of sitting in this house who would take advantage of a redistribution of such national importance to satisfy their mean ambitions or protect the interests of a political party, even if it is the party in power. I now quote figures which are more eloquent than the best speeches. According to the 1941 census Laval-Two Mountains had a population of 33,498. Glengarry, which is represented by the right hon. Prime Minister,

had a population of only 18,000; Vaudreuil-Soulanges had a population of 22,498, which is exactly 11,000 less than that of Laval-Two Mountains. Chateauguay-Huntingdon, Stanstead, Wright, Dorchester, Levis and Shefford, not to mention any others, all have populations less than that of Laval-Two Mountains; 25,339; 27,972; 28,771; 29,773; 30,411 and 33,387 respectively. When it is alleged that the population of Laval-Two Mountains is insufficient, such an argument can be termed ridiculous and a pure fabrication. On several instances I have protested against this division of Laval-Two Mountains. In proof thereof I read the following letter which I received on May 1, 1947, from the hon. member for Quebec South, who is chairman of the committee on redistribution:

Ottawa, May 1, 1947.

Mr. Liguori Lacombe, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Colleague:

I beg to acknowledge your letter of April 30, to which you annexed a resolution passed by the municipality of the parish of St. Augustin, county of Two Mountains, together with copy of a protest against the dismemberment of Laval-Two Mountains, which protest was signed at Ste. Scholastique by Mr. Albert Laframboise, mayor of Ste. Scholasitique and president of the Catholic farmers' union for the district of Montreal, and by Mr. J. O. Latour, notary public at St. Benoit.

I see that, on several instances, you gave the subcommittee on redistribution for the province of Quebec, the reasons in favour of maintaining the status quo.

I remain,

Yours very truly,
(Signed) Charles G. Power.

Every day I receive from municipal councils in my own riding, resolutions requesting that Laval-Two Mountains be not dismembered. I have sent copies of each of these resolutions to the hon. members for Quebec South and for Outremont; the latter, as you know, is the chairman of the subcommittee on redistribution for the province of Quebec. Under the circumstances, the committee cannot claim that they are unaware of the facts and of the case.

There is another point I would like to explain. The great majority of the population of l'Ile Jésus, which is a portion of Laval-Two Mountains, is made up of farmers and gardeners. If you annex l'Ile Jésus to Montreal, you are annexing a farming district to industrial areas. I do not need to add that the interests of the producers and of the consumers are not the same. During my political career, which covers quite a few years, I have come to realize quite often that the interests of producers and consumers are radically opposed. It would have been quite easy for the committee to accept my representations and maintain the riding of Laval-Two Mountains in its true character. I know that my constituents will disapprove the changes which have thus been effected.

As to Argenteuil, there was a good reason why it should not have been changed. In that riding there is an important English-speaking minority ranging from 37 to 39 per cent of the total population. Why should the representation of minorities in the House of Commons be established in such a way that it loses its representative character? Minorities are entitled to be represented in the House of Commons. They pay taxes of all kinds, to the same extent as the majority. The action of the committee concerning the riding of Argenteuil and its English-speaking minority is exceedingly regrettable. This is a very serious wrong against this minority which deserves a better treatment. Furthermore, it creates a dangerous precedent. If the same treatment should be applied to present minorities in every province of this country, French-Canadians would revert to the position they occupied one hundred years ago in the history of Canada. We would have to do once more everything we did to conquer and defend our rights. Anybody with a sense of justice and equity would approve what I am saying. Those who framed this infringement upon the rights of the English-speaking minority of Argenteuil will have to bear the responsibility of this action. Since I was elected to this house I have always defended the minority rights in Canada. I am still doing it for the sake of liberty, justice and equity. In the name of these great principles, Canada mobilized all of its resources. We are now witnessing the denial of the very rights of minorities in Argenteuil. I know the constituents of Argenteuil as well as those of Laval-Two Mountains. I have met them quite often in public meetings. I have the greatest respect and most sincere admiration for this population, whatever be their racial origin or their religious creed. For this reason, I know that these people will be deeply upset by the changes which are being effected in the federal representation without respecting the rights of an important part of its population. The population of Laval will resent deeply being separated from the population of Two Mountains to which it has been attached by economic and political ties for thirty years. I know that I am expressing the feelings of the people of Laval-Two Mountains as well as those of Argenteuil, which riding is adjacent to my riding and with which I am equally familiar.

In participating in this debate I have the satisfaction of defending to the last the rights of my constituents to be justly and equitably represented in the Canadian parliament. So far as Laval-Two Mountains is concerned this redistribution is a masterpiece of disloyalty and unfairness. Some will claim that this redistribution is based upon population and geographical location, but it will take a great deal of impertinence to put forth such an argument.

The population of Laval-Two Mountains exceeds 33,000. The population of Vaudreuil-Soulanges is at least 10,000 less than the population of my riding, which exceeds by exactly 15,000 the population of Glengarry. Argenteuil has as large a population as Vaudreuil-Soulanges and Glengarry, and Laval-Two Mountains is much more populous than the two counties I have mentioned.

This is simply a prextext to get rid of a member who many times has been the object of similar and unsuccessful attacks on the part of the Liberal party. This is the same Liberal party which I defended most sincerely for more than twenty-five years. Forty years have gone by since the general election of 1917 when I endorsed the candidacy of my predecessor in this House of Commons who was a member without interruption from 1896 until 1925. I became his successor in the House of Commons on October 29, 1925, and I am still here. It will take more than this unfair deed to get rid of me. My good friends of the committee will have me visiting in their constituencies at the next general election.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): You are welcome.

Mr. LACOMBE: And I will be welcomed by your electors. My colleague over there is very nervous.

Mr. MICHAUD: You are nervous.

Mr. LACOMBE: I do not want to change his record in the House of Commons. When I go to these constituencies—

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Any time you want to.

(Translation):

Mr. MICHAUD: Speak French. You have more eloquence.

(Text):

Mr. LACOMBE: I should not be interrupted without permission. I want more than forty minutes to finish my speech. I know that the two members over there are organized to interrupt me.

[Mr. Lacombe.]

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind hon. members that the member who is speaking must not be interrupted without his consent.

Mr. MICHAUD: Hang yourself.

Mr. LACOMBE: From 1896 to date, for more than forty years, the Liberal party has received the support of Laval-Two Mountains and Two Mountains. It will pay dearly for this act of treason. I never witnessed so much cowardice coupled with such ungratefulness. I lay before my constituents and the whole country the revolting cynicism of those who framed this shameful plot. Do you believe that with one stroke of the pen you can stamp out the aspirations, the convictions and the glory of Laval-Two Mountains?

The county of Two Mountains has been in existence for over a hundred years. Over a century ago it took up arms to conquer a responsible government. In contempt of the history, traditions and rights of minorities residing in Argenteuil you are doing a serious wrong which history will brand as it deserves. The population I represent is honest, loyal and proud. It will not run away before the storm. Since these people are free and proud they will defend their honour and their past. You will find them more determined than ever against the swindlers and petty politicians who are threatening their rights.

These people have no use for this unkindest cut, this Judas kiss framed by certain newspapers and financed by the powers-that-be. They will hold out proudly because they have been hardened by this multitude of insults and because they are convinced that their member has been the victim of worse misdeeds. They know that the one who is now addressing this house will never fall a prey to blackmail or to the bargaining of the executioners of dictatorship. The best proof of this is to be found in the general protests I am now receiving against what I term the dirtiest political deed of all times.

Hitler would never have done otherwise. Mussolini did not suppress only one county, but all of the Italian parliament in order to substitute for it the high fascist council. And what about Stalin, the dictator upon whom the government bestowed favours, money, munitions and food? Stalin does the same to redistribute representation. He suppresses, he annihilates. Believe or die. Stalin, the man who has killed the bishops, the archbishops and the priests. Such is the fate of every opponent of the dictator in Russia whose gratitude towards Canada asserts itself in a network of espionage.

The committee on redistribution did not have any spies. It is far above spy-work.

It does not prize the commonplace or old cliches. It wishes to be original. For this reason, one of its members is a colleague of mine whose diplomacy, ability and intelligence are undoubtedly unknown to the committee. Because he is intelligent, like the intelligence service, he knows how to render a service. To prove this statement, I will refer to this innocent letter which my charming and candid colleague sent me on April 2, 1947. This house and the whole country will be enlightened to take cognizance of this masterpiece of diplomacy. Before I read it let me explain that my colleague came to see me and asked me to see him in his office, and he offered not to touch my county if I crossed the floor. My answer was no.

(Translation):

Who says that this is untrue? Has he left the house? Others have asked me the same question. They had better not interrupt me, or else shall name them.

(Text):

Mr. Chairman, would you prefer that I read this letter in French and give the English translation afterwards?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can read it in either language. Both languages are official.

Mr. LACOMBE: The letter reads as follows:

House of Commons, Canada,
Ottawa, April 2, 1947.

Mr. Liguori Lacombe, M.P.,
Ste. Scholastique, P.Q.

My dear Colleague:

After you left yesterday, I thought of suggesting to you that, after this recess—

Referring to the Easter recess.

—when Hartt is introduced in the chamber, this would be a proper occasion for you to cross the floor.

May I suggest that you prepare for the newspapers a statement about communism and the dangers of numerous parties—

That is the C.C.F. and other parties.

—which can only benefit the Conservative party, which party the great majority of French Canadians do not want to see leading the government.

The more I think about this, the more I am convinced it will be to your future advantage.

An hon. MEMBER: Who signed it?

Mr. LACOMBE: H. E. Brunelle, member for Champlain, on the redistribution committee. This is the scandal of the Liberal party.

An hon. MEMBER: A big one.

Mr. LACOMBE: Yes, it is a great scandal. I will produce in a few moments, Mr. Chairman, a photostat copy of the letter in French sent to me by the member for Champlain. I wish to denounce this shameful bargaining.

Mr. MICHAUD: Who is bargaining?

Mr. LACOMBE: This is bargaining. He offered not to touch my county if I crossed the floor, and I refused. I do not want to be interrupted. I want forty minutes or more than forty minutes to make my speech.

I wish to denounce this shameful bargaining, together with the business of this blackmail. I shall never give in to this disgrace. I have been on this side of the house for five years because I am certain of my principles. I am a member of the House of Commons, and if I run again I will still be a member as long as Providence gives me health and strength to protect myself against traps which are set for me. Some people like the hon. member for Portneuf tried to do away with me at the general elections of 1940 and 1945. But I am here in the House of Commons and I will remain here whenever I choose to run, because my compatriots are grateful, loyal and proud.

I would draw to the attention of the committee and of the hon. member for Champlain standing order 78 of this house, which reads as follows:

The offer of any money or other advantage to any member of this house, for the promoting of any matter whatsoever depending or to be transacted in parliament, is a high crime and misdemeanour, and tends to the subversion of the constitution.

Many persons make it the aim of their lives to upset the constitution of this country. Where will this lead them to? What do scoundrels and fanatics of every kind intend to do with our tottering democracy? It is easy to solve this problem. I am not interested in the plots of those who amend the constitution of this country for the very purpose of further transgressing it. Nobody will believe that the best way of increasing the influence of the province of Quebec in the House of Commons is by acting in a way contrary to justice and equity. You cannot create eight new constituencies by suppressing, in contempt of freedom, justice and right, a county whose population, seniority, geographical position, and individual character and aspect entitle and authorize it to remain what it is and what it always was.

With this explanation of the reasons why Laval-Two Mountains should retain its status quo, I believe I have performed my duty towards my constituents. I sincerely hope that enlightenment will prevail in order that the authors of this error be not subjected to the condemnation of every honest person in this country.

I have only one thing in this world, the most precious of all, my honour. I will defend it against every attack from all sides. I spurn with contempt this groundless insult which is thrown at my constituents, because its origin is too low to reach their dignity and their honour. These conspirators will be crushed under the weight of their ignominy. If they perform this vile deed, they will go down into history as prominent robbers. They stole from Laval-Two Mountains its true character, its history, even its glorious name. The populace will point them out and say: Here are the conspirators of the year 1947 who are going into oblivion. Since everything dies, disappears and fades away in this world, they have nothing to fear since they are already dead in the mind and memory of their compatriots.

Here is part of an editorial in *Le Canada*, dated April 28, 1947:

> At the end of his career, Mackenzie King, this foremost Canadian, while taking a solitary walk in this ancient city of Virginia, must have remembered his grandfather, William Lyon Mackenzie, who with Louis Joseph Papineau, was the father of democracy.

This is why I am requesting the Prime Minister, in memory of his ancestor's struggles towards the establishing of a government responsible to the Canadian people and towards democracy, to prevent this foul deed concerning the riding I am representing. This is the constituency where the ancestors of responsible government and Canadian democracy fulfilled a magnificent duty towards the country. The glorious history of Laval-Two Mountains must not be struck off with a stroke of the pen. In the name of truth, equity and justice, the Prime Minister must see to it that this shameful deed be not performed.

Before ending this speech, I would like to answer the remarks of the hon. member for Outremont addressed to me in a letter on May 29, 1947. I am sure the hon. member has a copy of the letter; I have not. The hon. member claims that it is impossible to increase the division of Vaudreuil-Soulanges whose population is less than that of Laval-Two Mountains by exactly 11,000 persons. To support his contention, he states that the boundaries of Vaudreuil-Soulanges are, on one side, the limits of the province of Ontario and, on the other two sides, the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa rivers. And what are the boundaries of Vaudreuil-Soulanges on the fourth side?

The hon. member is a very clever lawyer. I cannot believe he forgot that Vaudreuil-Soulanges has four boundaries. But, for his purpose, he forgot that the riding of Jacques-Cartier is also adjacent to Vaudreuil-Soulanges. He made no bones about throwing in l'Ile Jésus beyond the river des Prairies or Back river. As chairman of the sub-committee of the province of Quebec, the hon. member, if he had repressed his scruples, could have suggested that Vaudreuil-Soulanges be enlarged at the expense of Jacques-Cartier. And thus his first excuse is null.

Let us examine the second one. In the same letter, the hon. member claims that there was a substantial increase in the population of the ridings I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks. I quite agree with that. But the same applies to Laval-Two Mountains. And the hon. member is well aware of these facts. During the last ten years, the agricultural and labour population of Laval-Two Mountains has increased to a considerable extent.

In short, I lay the fate of Laval-Two Mountains in the hands of the hon. members of this house, for whom, as goes an old French saying, "success means nothing; but duty before all."

I cannot end these remarks without paying tribute to the memory of a man for whom I had great admiration. His stirring eloquence, his deep culture, were often responsible for the victories won by the party in power. Several times he was a minister in the federal cabinet. In the full bloom of his admirable career he was torn away from the admiration in which he was held by his city of Montreal, over whose destiny he presided as first magistrate. I do not know why it was in this very chamber that the most meagre tributes were paid to his memory, this chamber which he honoured with all the magnificence of his brilliant eloquence.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Let him go on.

The CHAIRMAN: I doubt whether the hon. member is speaking to the amendment.

Mr. LACOMBE: With the unanimous consent of the committee.

Mr. RINFRET: Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Très bien.

Mr. LACOMBE: History will vindicate his memory from the conspiracy of silence which was planted over his grave. Fernand Rinfret was a statesman in the fullest meaning of the word. Because he was a man of sincerity and honour, he never would have permitted this unfair deed towards Laval-Two Mountains. He was my friend, and during every election campaign I was fighting for him in St. James, Montreal. Who will give us men like Fernand

Rinfret? The hon. member for Outremont bears a great name. I ask him not to tie this name to this infamous bill whose only purpose is to delete from the electoral map the division of Laval-Deux Montagnes, where the builders of responsible government died sword in hand so their country could be great and immortal.

Finally, to excuse their attitude, some will say: A Liberal member, in this redistribution, is also losing his constituency. Nobody will be led to believe that a prejudice can be rectified by adopting an act of injustice.

After all, the attitude of the member for Champlain, as a member of the committee on redistribution and appointed to such committee by the government, can be termed the greatest scandal of the present administration. Before the people of Canada, the government must bear the serious responsibility of such an act.

Mr. TIMMINS: The introduction of this bill proves the truth of an old saying, that there is nothing new under the sun. Bills of this sort have been introduced before, some in this house and some elsewhere. I have been looking for precedents and I find one almost on all fours with the present bill. It is found in the well-known book by Lewis Carroll, Alice in Wonderland, at page 85. I hope the house will bear with me a moment while I quote from this well-known law book:

> And the queen said, "Call hither the Lord High Chamberlain, for I would speak with him."
>
> And the Lord High Chamberlain, having been summonsed said, "At your service, Your Majesty!"
>
> Said the queen: "I have been greatly distressed by the reports from some electoral constituencies in this fair domain, namely Muskokas, Central Waters, Pawneepa, Kaloopus and Mount Laval. It would seem that there have appeared in these constituencies, certain men of intelligence and fortitude, leaders in their communities, who, unfortunately for me, are gifted with wisdom and speech, and who claim to be versed in the principles of a cult known as "democracy," under which they claim the right to speak against my authority to rule this domain. My Lord High Chamberlain, will you please accept my order to take these disturbing subjects out and chop off their heads."
>
> Lord High Chamberlain: "Do I understand Your Majesty to instruct me to chop off all their heads?"
>
> Her Majesty: "All their heads."
>
> And the Lord High Chamberlain, having retired from the queen's court, returned in an hour's time.
>
> Lord High Chamberlain: "Your Majesty, I have rounded up the members of Muskokas, Central Waters, Pawneepa, Kaloopus and Mount Laval, and I have taken them out and chopped off their heads."
>
> Her Majesty: "Are their heads all chopped off?"
>
> Lord High Chamberlain: Yes, Your Majesty, their heads are all chopped off."

I know that the house will agree with me that this was a very sad incident, but the precedent is apt.

Mr. KNOWLES: The only difficulty is that Alice woke up.

Mr. J. M. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): It is only suitable that the intended victims should be heard from. Like the member for Winnipeg North, I am sorry that the Prime Minister is not in his seat—not because we would salute him, like the victims in the arena of old, saying "We who are about to die salute thee", for we do not propose to die. But it would have been nice to have him here particularly because, like the member for Winnipeg North, I propose to quote from him also and to quote somewhat freely. I should think the Prime Minister would be highly flattered with the extent to which we on this side find it convenient to quote him, and it is surprising the number of wise things he seems to have said in the past.

Mr. HACKETT: That was long ago.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): It would be hypocrisy for anyone to pretend that he does not feel deeply aggrieved when he finds that he is to be turned into a kind of stranger and sojourner in the land, and certainly after the labour of winning a constituency one feels very badly that it is being suddenly dismembered. You cannot do the work which is necessary in order to win a constituency without making a great many friends, and however high your hopes may be that you can find some other dwelling place and come back here in spite of all, nevertheless you feel very badly at the thought of losing friends or the thought of being separated from them, whatever the final result may be.

However I am not proposing today to spend much time talking about my own woes. One of the reasons is that I doubt very much whether I shall wring very many tears from hon. gentlemen opposite by talking about my woes. I imagine they have discounted these feelings in advance and therefore I will not discuss them.

I do, however, wish to talk about my own constituency. In my first speech I pointed out that we are here only because our constituents cannot be here. We are here representing them and I believe that in what I say I shall be representing them. At any rate I shall try to.

What do they think of all this? I have been up there and I have heard from a number of them and so far as I can find out there is a surprising unanimity that they do not like being pushed around in this way. They will like it still less, I hope, when they have read what I have had to say, and which I propose to send them, because if I have the least bit of success in what I say, they will feel that this is an arbitrary, unreasonable, unreasoning and, I might say, preposterous thing that is being done. I cannot find a reason for it, and if I am successful they also will feel that there is no reason for it.

I do not in this matter represent wholly and exclusively my own riding of Muskoka. The people of Parry Sound, I may say, do not like this and I have had the honour of receiving communications from one or two of them. Of course, I have received communications by the hundred from my own constituents and many communications from town councils, municipal councils and various organizations of that kind. I wish to read one communication from Parry Sound, partly because it is very short, partly because it is direct, and partly because it is from the Parry Sound Liberal Association. It is addressed to me, and by the way, they say:

> You are at perfect liberty to use this as you wish in your endeavour to maintain the present standing of the ridings.

This is what they say:

> In connection with the proposal of the committee on redistribution, in the matter of the electoral ridings of Muskoka and Parry Sound districts, I wish to state that we wish to protest against their action, and regard it as unfair, unjust and an infringement on the rights and liberties of the good people who go to make up these two grand old ridings of Muskoka and Parry Sound districts.

This is signed by D. F. Quinlan, president of the Parry Sound District Liberal Association. I was glad to receive that, because it will supply some evidence of what I believe to be the fact, that a large number of people, utterly regardless of party, will dislike thus being pushed around. I can see no reason why this should be done. They are being dealt round like a pack of cards, and I shall have something to say about that in a few minutes.

I have one more word to say about myself. I seem to be in good company, because apparently there are some other people who have worked for this party and done their best and who will be kept out of this house, if it is possible to have that done. I do not know whether we should flatter ourselves that it is thought desirable to pin us down as much as possible. We are constantly assured that the government is confident that nothing can shake it. I do not think this will be regarded as exhibit A for that confidence.

I am glad to have received these communications from Parry Sound, because after this redistribution goes through I hope I may be fortunate enough to get the nomination in the new riding. I shall try to get it and if I do get it I believe that I and my good friend, who is not in his seat today, will be able to carry on the election in a decent and sporting manner, though I am glad the contest is not to carried out on the ice.

I thought it was best in this matter to try to find some principles which might guide and which might be of interest. Certainly they are of interest to me. I thought it well, as far as possible, not to quote anyone who might be regarded as in any way prejudiced in favour of the party to which I happen to belong. I have been fortunate in finding some interesting quotations laying down, as I think, sound principles, from Sir Wilfrid Laurier and also the present Prime Minister. First I should like to quote from Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Speaking in this house on February 17, 1914, in a redistribution debate, he quotes with approval words which he himself had used in an earlier debate in 1892. Here are the words:

> But I fully recognize that in such a measure the guiding principle should be as far as possible to equalize the population in all the constituencies.

He quotes that from 1892 and adds, "I have nothing to retract of those words." He is careful later on in his speech to point out that you cannot have absolute arithmetical equality. I want to read this part because I think it is important; it also points out at any rate one of the great qualifications of arithmetic equality. Sir Wilfrid said, as reported at page 847 of *Hansard* of February 17, 1914:

> Without going into all the reasons, there is one supreme reason, namely, that in a country like Canada, where there is a very large territory with a sparse population, if you were to give the same unit of population to cities and counties, in rural constituencies you would have such a large area of territory as to be almost impossible to control or to cover. This is quite sufficient to justify the principle which has been adopted on every occasion on which we have had redistribution.

The second principle which Sir Wilfrid lays down happens to be important on this occasion, because, as I see it, this riding of mine has been dealt around like a pack of cards. Sir Wilfrid says this, as reported at page 845 of *Hansard*:

> There is another principle of almost equal importance, and that is regard for the compactness of the constituency, and, as far as possible,

for the county unit. Under our system, the county is the unit of population, so far as public life is concerned.

Later, on the same page, he said this:

It seems to me obvious that if you interfere with the lines of the county units, separate those who meet periodically for the discharge of their municipal and other duties, and provide that they shall only meet once in four or five years to decide on political questions, you detract from, rather than add to, their appreciation of public questions.

In my opinion that statement by Sir Wilfrid Laurier was an extremely wise one, and I believe that anyone, even one who has had as little experience in country ridings as I have had, will have been greatly struck by the fact that the people you run into who are interested in politics are almost to a man those who have taken part in municipal associations. I was interested in making a rough calculation and I came to the conclusion that in a country riding like mine there are somewhere between one hundred and two hundred times as many people taking an active part in self-government as there are in a large city. I believe if anyone works that out he will find it is nearer two hundred than one hundred. That is why I think Sir Wilfrid Laurier was on sound ground when he said that you take these people who are engaged in political life in their own county and you try as far as possible to maintain that principle when you are making constituencies.

The third principle that I want to quote was laid down by the present Prime Minister on May 23, 1933, when he was leader of the opposition. He says this as reported at page 5238 of *Hansard*:

And may I say with respect to a question like the redistribution of seats in the House of Commons, on which the whole basis of government itself rests, that this parliament is not merely exercising its function of legislating, it is exercising the function of the high court of parliament wherein it is expected to see that justice is done to all electors in the country, those who may not be in a position to represent their own views except by the members who happen to be representing them in particular constituencies at this time, as well as those who speak through their members. I submit that there is no higher trust imposed upon a House of Commons under our constitution than that of justly redistributing the constituencies. That trust is one which must be exercised not alone in the light of what is in the interest of the sitting member or the constituency he represents, but in a wholly or impartial and broad-minded way in the light of what is most just and fair to the great body of the electorate.

I should like to quote just one further passage from the Prime Minister later in the debate where he raised the question of the previous redistribution. That was in the twenties, when he was Prime Minister, and when there was some question with regard to his then constituency of North York. The Prime Minister has been around quite a bit since then.

Mr. KNOWLES: Involuntarily.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Speaking here, he says as reported at page 5279:

I took the position that as Prime Minister I was not going to ask any favours for myself, or expect for the constituency I represented, anything which I would not ask equally for any other constituency.

I am particularly sorry that the Prime Minister is not here to hear that, and I hope that some good angel will see to it that he reads that part of my speech, if no other.

We have three principles laid down there by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and by the present Prime Minister. The first is the substantial equality of members, subject to what Sir Wilfrid pointed out as to the difference between city and country; the second is adherence to municipal and county boundaries, and the third is justice to all the electors. I have been careful to take those principles from authorities which I am sure the government will not question.

If we accept those principles, let me apply them to my constituency of Muskoka-Ontario. I can be brief on this, because the argument, I think, is not hard to make. Muskoka-Ontario has a population of just a little over 35,000. It is large for a country riding. When this redistribution came up I felt absolutely invulnerable, because I thought it was too large to be regarded as a small riding and on the other hand was too small to be regarded as a huge riding. I thought I was on safe middle ground. Therefore I was incredulous when I first heard of the suggestion which was made. I thought that some enemy of mine must have suggested it. I now know that he was not an enemy but was merely a well-informed man. I should like to make two points here, and I think they are both important. A good deal will be said later on about averages, and I just want to make one point. My constituency of Muskoka-Ontario has a population of 35,000. There are nineteen Ontario ridings with a population of under 30,000, and the smallest, of course—and I mention this rather hesitantly; I wish the Prime Minister were here to hear it—is Glengarry, which heads or tails the list, whichever you like, with a population of 18,732.

I make one further comment on that. A little mental arithmetic will have shown hon. gentlemen already that my constituency as it stands is approximately twice the size, in the matter of population, of the Prime Minister's; but the new constituency which is to be set up—and for which I hope, with good luck, to get the nomination—will have some 51,000 of population, or approximately three times that of Glengarry. I submit that the figures I have given show that this proposal to wipe out or butcher the constituency of Muskoka-Ontario disregards in the most flagrant manner every one of those three principles which I have quoted from authorities which will be accepted. Let me recall to your mind, Mr. Chairman, what they were: First, substantial equality, as explained by Sir Wilfrid; second, adherence to municipal and county boundaries. There I should digress for a moment. As I said a few minutes ago, the riding is being dealt around like a pack of cards. There are six townships in the Ontario part of that riding. Two of those are being attached to southern Ontario, and they do not much like that because they feel they are just an appanage to the city of Oshawa, which now dominates that riding. Four are being tossed over into the next county, Victoria. Then you come to Muskoka. Part of it, as the Secretary of State explained earlier, is being cut off and thrown across to North Simcoe, I think it is. The balance, truncated in that way, is to be attached to the district of Parry Sound. That is what is being done. As I say, they are reduced to bits and pieces, thrown all over the map; and I don't believe they like it.

I submit that I have made out something in the nature of what the lawyers would call a prima facie case; but against this you will naturally say there must be some arguments for it or it would not have been done. Quite true; and I am coming now to the arguments for it. The chairman of the subcommittee was kind enough to give me a memorandum. I doubt very much if the hon. member for Grey-Bruce was very happy about this thing; I doubt very much if he felt entirely convinced about his memorandum, but however that may be he gave me a memorandum from which I now propose to quote. The first reason, quoting from his memorandum which I have here, is this:

> Some of us decided on Muskoka-Ontario simply because it was nearest geographically to what is generally referred to as the north—

That is the northern area. There are two reasons in one here, really:

> —and on the ground that the unit of representation of Parry Sound would be almost the same as the average of the north constituencies.

[Mr. Macdonnell.]

I submit that those two reasons, as they say somewhere in Gilbert and Sullivan, like the flowers that bloom in the spring have nothing to do with the case. What possible bearing on the question of redistribution or on the wiping out of my constituency has the fact that it happens to be near the northern constituencies? I cannot see it. If you look at a map you see that Muskoka-Ontario is near the northern counties, but what earthly reason is that for suggesting that regardless of population and regardless of all the considerations which must be taken into account you can pick on this constituency, merely because it happens geographically to be near some others? I say that has nothing whatever to do with it.

The second part of the reason is that Parry Sound will have almost the same average population as the northern constituencies. What has that to do with it? Why pick out the northern constituencies? Why not pick out the southern ones, or the western ones, or the eastern ones? Why not remember Glengarry? Why not remember, too, that there are nineteen ridings in Ontario with populations of less than 30,000, while the population of my present riding is 35,000. I doubt very much that the hon. member for Grey-Bruce was very happy with the first reason, and I doubt if he was even that happy with the second one. Here is the second reason:

> Others considered Muskoka-Ontario to be a combination of diverse economic interests and subject to improvement.

Somebody said, "subject to political improvement." However, I am not going to try to be funny about it, because there is a point in that reason which I want to discuss. The point is the reference to a combination of diverse economic interests, and I think it very interesting that this reason should be given. The suggestion there, as far as I can make out, is that when a member comes down here he is a lobbyist, that he is just to represent the interests of his riding, that he has no broader duty and that therefore if possible you should give him just one interest to represent. I think this would be a most extraordinary place if we had here 245 people each feeling himself pledged to represent one interest. I say that would be the destruction of democratic government. I believe that reason is one of the most vicious and unsound reasons that could be given. Incidentally, and happily, I think the fact is that if you took stock of the ridings here you would find at least one hundred, I suspect one hundred and fifty and I hope even more members who on analysis would be found to represent a combination of diverse economic interests. I

hope that is true, because if it is true it is healthy, and if it is not true it is unhealthy. Therefore I say to me that reason is not only no reason, but it is in reverse, a reason for leaving the riding as it is.

The final reason is a rather complicated statement of the average population figures for ridings in central southern Ontario and eastern southern Ontario. I find this very complicated, and therefore am reading it. I can hardly understand it myself, and I am not sure I could state it without reading it. Beginning with the proposition that a seat must come from southern Ontario, the memorandum proceeds to argue on the basis of the figures given that it must be from central southern Ontario, in other words from a bloc of constituencies which includes Muskoka-Ontario. But that again entirely ignores the fact I have already pointed out, that this constituency of mine is much larger than nineteen other ridings in Ontario, all of which have less than 30,000 population, and many of them very much less. I have looked at some of the figures. Beginning with Glengarry with 18,732, they show population of 21,000, 21,000, 22,000, 23,000, 25,000, and so on—much smaller than my riding.

Now I should like briefly to take stock of the situation. I have tried to glean some principles which seemed to me sound in dealing with this matter. I have taken them from recognized authorities; they seem to me wise. If I have not completely failed I have done something to persuade you that on these reasons there is no case whatever for the dismemberment of Muskoka-Ontario. As I said a little while ago, I am in good company; but that does not do anything to comfort me, and still less to comfort the people of my riding. As things are now we have the hon. member for Lake Centre, who is a special target and whose constituency has had such an amount of axe and shovel work done on it that I think it would take a combination of a civil engineer and a Philadelphia lawyer to find the boundaries. The hon. member for Vancouver South has already dealt with Kamloops and with the constituency at present represented by my leader. But I want to say one thing further, because naturally the question has arisen in one's mind as to what the Prime Minister has to say about all this. Again let me say I am sorry he is not here, because I am going to quote from him, and indeed discuss him a little in the few minutes I have remaining to me.

Before I forget I should like to say one thing. That is, there was one member of that committee, the hon. member for Quebec South, who seemed to me to show some spirit of fairness and sportsmanship in this business. I think he did not like this, and my understanding is that he tried to have it sent back but was overruled. I imagine there are other people who are more biddable than he, and who carry out the orders of the boss with greater complaisance. But now I am coming back to the Prime Minister. I have here a clipping from the Ottawa *Journal* of April 28. This was just after the right hon. gentleman had come back from the south, and I suppose he was full of the milk of human kindness. This clipping is headed, "Mr. King not pleased with changes in ridings". I propose to quote somewhat freely from this article. It begins by saying:

> With the return of Prime Minister King to his office in Ottawa today, it is expected that a considerable number of recommendations recently made by the House of Commons redistribution committee will be turned back to Chairman C. G. Power and his associates for reconsideration. A source close to the Prime Minister told the *Journal* today that Mr. King is not altogether satisfied with the committee's reports and recommendations.

Mr. McILRAITH: Is the source identified?

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I am reading from the Ottawa *Journal* of April 28. As far as I know this has never been denied, and this is a well recognized way of putting out information. I do not suppose anyone is called upon to establish the credibility of a newspaper report unless the person quoted takes the trouble to deny it: and as far as I am aware this has been allowed to stand.

Mr. ABBOTT: But nobody is quoted except "a source".

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Nobody is quoted, but we are very familiar with that, too. I think we may say it is a well recognized technique of government now—

Mr. ABBOTT: A technique of the newspapers.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): A technique of government, too. In his more objective moments I imagine the Minister of Finance would agree with that. Just let me read this, because as I say it has never been denied. The time for denial has passed, no, it has not passed; it can be denied now if necessary. This reads:

> A source close to the Prime Minister told the *Journal* today that Mr. King is not altogether satisfied with the committee's reports and recommendations. It is said also that as member of parliament for Glengarry, with a population of only 18,000, he is sensitive about the "tinkering" with ridings with larger populations.

Then there is another thing. This sounds encouraging, but I want to read again from the same article:

The Prime Minister, it is said, has no wish to appear in the light of a member of the commons entitled to special privilege. It is certain that this charge will be made if Glengarry is left intact and other ridings with equal claims are sliced up for partisan reasons.

I only wish to point out that I think that is a very fair statement, a very accurate statemen, I should like to point out it is not only other ridings with equal claims that are being sliced up; it is other ridings with twice the claim, with twice the population.

My last quotation from this article attributed to the Prime Minister and which has never been repudiated is as follows:

The *Journal's* informant said there was little likelihood of the committee's recommendations being "jammed" through the commons by the weight of a Liberal majority. They will all be carefully examined by Mr. King in consultation with his colleagues before the redistribution bill is submitted to the house.

Well, the redistribution bill is here, and there may even be some suspicion that there is an intention of jamming this thing through. We may have our own views as to what would happen if it were left to a free vote, but I doubt if there is any chance of that. I am sorry the Prime Minister is not here, because he might tell us whether he has examined this bill and what his own conclusions are. Again speaking for my constituents, I would say to the Prime Minister that he should not be surprised if I suggest that my constituents will find it hard to believe that he is very sensitive in the matter if they are treated as it is now proposed to treat them.

Sensitivity is a thing which is hard to measure. I think myself that there should be a differentiation in favour of a prime minister. The Prime Minister is a busy man. He cannot spend the time in his constituency that other people can. I think that is one of the reasons why he has been a bit of a wanderer.

An hon. MEMBER: The wanderer has returned.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I am glad he is here. I was just saying that the people in my constituency will find that hard to believe. Perhaps I should refer to the fact that I had previously quoted a statement which appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* of April 28 stating that the Prime Minister was sensitive about any tinkering with ridings of larger population, that is larger than Glengarry. I was just about to deal with the sensitivity of the Prime Minister. I was saying that I think that there should be some differentiation in favour of the Prime Minister because he is a busy man and has not the same time as other people to go through his riding. I was saying that that was one of the reasons he had become a bit of a wanderer.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my hon. friend excuse me for a minute? I understand that when I was out of the house engaged on some rather important work in my office in another part of the building he stated that I had made some statement about not being pleased with the work of the committee having charge of the redistribution and that I took exception to what was being done and intended to see that it was changed or altered. I think he was quoting from an Ottawa *Journal* article by Mr. Jackson. May I say that if I am informed correctly as to what he said there is not an iota of truth in it. I never at any time had anything to do with the work of the committee regarding redistribution. One or two members came and spoke to me about their difficulties and I said that I preferred to leave everything to the committee itself. I have never at any time stated that I was in favour of changing in any particular anything that the committee might agree upon.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): May I comment on that and say simply that I am sorry that the Prime Minister was not here when I read earlier some very admirable comments. All I can say is that to me it is a most astonishing thing if the Prime Minister of this country entirely disinterests himself in an important matter of this kind and knows nothing about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend is entirely misstating what I said. I did not say that I was not interested in a matter of this kind or that I was not concerned about it one way or another. What I did say was that I had not interfered with the work of the committee while it was at work. I have adopted that rule at all times.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I may have misunderstood the Prime Minister but I got the impression that he said he had nothing to do with it. I thought that he should have had something to do with it. That is the opinion of a private member and I hope the Prime Minister will now allow me to finish my speech.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me also to say something.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I was saying that I think there should be a differentiation in favour of any prime

minister. I do not know what that should be. I think any fairminded man would see that it should be ten per cent, twenty per cent, twenty-five per cent or perhaps fifty per cent, but I think the people of my riding for whom I am now speaking will find it a little difficult if it is suggested to them that it should be two hundred per cent. If Glengarry is left at 18,732—I think that is the population, and I do not want to minimize it by one single inhabitant—if it is left at 18,000 odd and my riding, which is now 35,000, is increased to some 50,000, which it will be if it is attached to Parry Sound—what I am saying is that I doubt very much if the people in my riding will think that there is anything fair or proper, or I might say that they will regard it as arbitrary, unreasonable, unreasoning and I do not think it would be going too far to say that they will regard it as preposterous.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my hon. friend if he is trying, either directly or indirectly, to insinuate that I have had anything to do with the work of the committee in a single—

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I am not insinuating anything. I read an article in good faith—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my hon. friend allow me to finish my statement?

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): No, I do not think I will. The Prime Minister has said that I am insinuating, but I am not. I rather resent being asked if I am insinuating, because that is not my practice. I read in good faith statements which appeared in a journal issued in Ottawa two months ago. Those were important statements made with regard to the Prime Minister's attitude and I accepted them in good faith. So far as I know those statements have not been denied.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Am I expected to answer allegations made against me in the *Journal* or any other paper? That is not my practice.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): This is not an allegation. I think that is rather unworthy of the Prime Minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I do not have to regard the Prime Minister as if he were Lord God Almighty. I have a proper respect for the Prime Minister. I made no insinuation. I read statements which appeared in a reputable journal here in Ottawa and which were never questioned and which so far as I am concerned had the earmarks of reasonableness about them.

An hon. MEMBER: What was the source?

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Incidentally I shall be very interested to hear what the Ottawa *Journal* has to say about it. I would never believe that the Ottawa *Journal* would stoop to improper tactics to manufacture reports of this kind out of whole cloth. I say quite frankly that I took this report at its face value and I was puzzled and surprised that the Prime Minister should repudiate it. If he repudiates it, as far as I am concerned that ends it, of course. I did not make any insinuation.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I mentioned that I understand the article was written by Mr. Jackson, but I do not know by whom it was written.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Answering the Prime Minister, there is no statement here as to who wrote it.

If I may finish after these various interruptions, I have tried to say what I believe the people of my riding will think about this matter. So far as our party is concerned I suppose it might be a good thing if this thing went through, because I am quite satisfied that the Liberal party will make a lot of bad friends up there. I wish to end by saying that if this goes through I believe that the people of my riding will think that I have been badly treated, and I know very well that they will think they have been badly treated.

Mr. CAOUETTE: Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I am trying my luck speaking in the house in English and I hope that hon. members will pass over any mistakes I might make.

The bill before us deals with the constituency I have the honour to represent in this house, the constituency of Pontiac, which is to be divided into two, Pontiac-Temiscamingue and Villeneuve. Politically speaking the constituency of Villeneuve is a really good one because it is a stronghold of the Union of Electors and Social Credit. But the idea which I have and which I hope we all have is not to regard this as a political question but as a matter of doing justice and right to the citizens of the whole country. A part of this new constituency, Temiscamingue which is to be annexed to the southern part of the present constituency of Pontiac, has already made known its wishes. It appears that a few organizers in Ville-Marie and Lorrainville have made representations to the committee

asking that that area be annexed to the lower part of Pontiac. From the standpoint of geography, communications, and from the business point of view that is nonsense, because Temiscamingue naturally belongs to the northern part. They are dealing with Rouyn and Noranda all the time, and they have nothing to do with the lower part of Pontiac. If they want to go to lower Pontiac they cannot reach it by roads in their own constituency because they have no highway; they have nothing; they are obliged to go through North Bay or to go through Montreal to reach Shawville and Campbell's Bay. I met some people of Temiscamingue a couple of weeks ago and they asked me to tell the committee and the house that their desire and will is to be connected with Rouyn and Noranda and with the northern part of Pontiac. If there are any political ideas behind this division of the constituency of Pontiac I think the organizers certainly missed the point, because we can organize there just as well as anywhere else in Canada. The only thing I am asking for today is justice for the people of Temiscamingue who want to remain connected with the north. If we have too large a population in the north it is up to the committee or the house to divide the northern part in two, leaving lower Pontiac alone or annexing lower Pontiac to another riding in the south. Then all the people in the north will be satisfied. We want justice and nothing else.

I should like to say a few words about Laval-Two Mountains. I am one hundred per cent in favour of what the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains said this afternoon. It is certainly an injustice to him to have his constituency struck off completely. He is an old member of the house, but now that constituency is to lose its name and be annexed to another riding. I think that something should be done and could be done in this matter which would be to the advantage of the population. I am not looking at this matter simply from the point of view of the member who represents that constituency, but from the point of view of the will of the people of Laval-Two Mountains. Our obligation is to forget political considerations, and if some of the organizers are not pleased with the present set-up they have only to cross their fingers and wait until the election comes, when we will show them what the people of this country want. They want justice; they want their rights protected, and when the majority of the people have expressed their wishes the government should concern itself with the will of the people and should legislate accordingly.

[Mr. Caouette.]

Mr. BOUCHER: Bearing in mind that if this bill passes as it stands, it will add a population of approximately 25,000 to the constituency of Carleton, which has already a population of approximately 44,000—

Mr. McILRAITH: Where do you get your figures?

Mr. BOUCHER: The hon. member for Ottawa West has interrupted several times. He has already said too much or too little on this bill because he is the man who is understood to have said that this change was no part of his requirements, that he did not ask for it and did not want it. May I in turn ask him to explain to the committee who did ask that Ottawa South be added to Carleton riding. Probably he could tell us that.

The riding of Carleton is one which I am sure any hon. member would feel it a great privilege to represent. I personally do, and I think any member would feel it also an honour and a great distinction to represent that portion of Ottawa South which the member for Ottawa West is now losing and is sorry to lose, if the report he gave is correct. The fact remains that Carleton county now has a population of 44,000 and that there is to be added to it one of the most rapidly growing sections in the Ottawa area. The constituency of Carleton has a staunch, loyal, rural population with a long tradition in this county. A great number of the people of Carleton county come from ancestry who have lived in Carleton for over 125 years. I am pleased to be associated with those people as having come from ancestors, as I do, who have lived in Carleton for a century and a quarter. They are in the main a rural people. The constituency of Carleton has now a population of approximately 44,000. According to the 1941 census, it is the fourth largest constituency in eastern Ontario. As a matter of fact according to the 1941 census taken immediately preceding the change in population due to wartime conditions, the constituency of Carleton had a population of 34,607. Since that time the municipality of Nepean, located immediately west of the city of Ottawa, has increased in population, according to the statistics of the municipality, from 12,062 to 19,522 in the years 1941 to 1946. That population has increased greatly since 1946. Consequently, whoever may be the next member for Carleton will represent a constituency that has a population greatly exceeding 70,000. Compare that with the population of the constituency of Glengarry which is 18,000, and you will find that the comparison is four to one as of this time.

The city of Ottawa had in 1941 a total population of something like 158,000 votes.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Not votes.

Mr. McILRAITH: Forty-one thousand votes.

Mr. BOUCHER: Add to that Ottawa East and you have the population I mentioned. The two Ottawas, if you like to explain it that way, had a population of 157,519 in 1941, but it greatly exceeded that in 1946. If you were to divide either the 1941 population or the 1947 population by 18,000, the population of Glengarry, you would find that, on a like ratio, there should be seven ridings in Ottawa alone. But the point I wish to make today is that in my humble opinion the city of Ottawa merits at least three ridings. I do not think there can be any argument in that regard.

In the province of Ontario there are, I believe, over thirty ridings with less than 40,000 population each. In the province of Quebec there are approximately the same number of ridings with less than 40,000 population each. In Manitoba there are at least ten ridings with less than 40,000 population each, and in Saskatchewan there are at least twelve ridings with less than 40,000 each. In Ottawa the total population is something in excess of 157,000, but it has only two representatives, and 25,000 of that urban population are being added to the rural riding of Carleton to make a third riding with a population of over 70,000. It must be borne in mind that redistribution is being done in the year 1947 allegedly on the 1941 census, and that another redistribution will have to take place in four years, after the next census is taken. Therefore I say it is not merely a matter of transferring 25,000 people from one riding to another that I oppose.

Mr. McILRAITH: It is 18,000, not 25,000.

Mr. BOUCHER: My hon. friend continues to interject. Perhaps he will deny the statement of the authorities of his own city; I am not prepared to do that.

Mr. McILRAITH: I take the figures of the bureau of statistics.

Mr. BOUCHER: Would my hon. friend kindly refrain from making his objections? He can make his own speech and we shall allow him to do so, if he wishes to deny the statement of the assessment commissioner. According to the statement of the assessment commissioner in a letter dated April 26, 1947, which I am prepared to file, the population of the portion of Riverdale added to Carleton is 13,879; the population of that portion of Capital ward being added is 10,948; the population of that portion of Elmdale now in Carleton is 6,752. Adding the first two amounts together we get a population of 24,000 and some odd. Then we have a part of Dalhousie ward being added to Carleton which has a population of 815 people, according to the assessment commissioner of the city of Ottawa. That does not take into account the 185 people at H.M.C.S. *Carleton.*

Mr. McILRAITH: You have taken the whole of Riverdale ward; there is a mistake.

Mr. BOUCHER: If my hon. friend wants to make a speech he had better get his own figures. I have taken the portion which the city commissioner has taken, and that is the portion added to Carleton. There is no mistake.

Mr. McILRAITH: That is not right.

Mr. BOUCHER: I do not wonder at my hon. friend being confused because he represents the riding of Ottawa West, and apparently is pleased to get rid of five sections of five different wards and have them added to Carleton county. Carleton county will now include not only a portion of the county, but also a portion of Victoria ward, a portion of Elmdale ward, a portion of Capital ward, a portion of Dalhousie ward and a portion of Riverdale ward. If my hon. friend adds these together he will get five.

Mr. McILRAITH: Who put Elmdale and Victoria wards in Carleton county?

Mr. BOUCHER: My hon. friend can tell that himself. Who asked to put a portion of Capital ward, Riverdale ward and a portion of Dalhousie ward into Carleton county? It was not Riverdale; it was not Dalhousie; it was not Capital ward, and it was not Carleton county that asked that these wards be added.

Mr. McILRAITH: Tell us where you live.

Mr. BOUCHER: My hon. friend is more anxious to know where I live than to know anything about the riding he represents and now apparently rejoices in losing.

Mr. ABBOTT: Do you live in Riverdale?

Mr. McILRAITH: Answer the question.

Mr. BOUCHER: My hon. friend wants a few more particulars.

Mr. BROWN: Answer the question.

Mr. BOUCHER: He may have them. If this bill goes through there will be added to Carleton county from Dalhousie ward a total of 815 plus 185 who are living in H.M.C.S. *Carleton*; from Riverdale ward, 13,879.

Mr. McILRAITH: No, only 5,000.

Mr. BOUCHER: From Capital ward, 10,948; from Elmdale ward, 6,752; from Victoria ward, 2,331, making a total city population in the new riding of 34,910 as of 1946. In the rural area, including all of the township of Nepean which is partly suburban, the population is 33,915. The old historic and traditional riding of Carleton, having been predominantly rural, having been a composite group, is now becoming a deeply concentrated city riding to the extent of approximately fifty per cent. Not only that, but the part added to Carleton county is not a part that is the natural boundary of Carleton, because it is joined by a very narrow neck in the southeast corner and extends away to the southeast.

As an individual member I do not think that I or anybody else would have anything but the highest praise and approval for the people who are being added, but I say that if a redistribution bill is to be just to the population, to the area or to the territory it should not add a population of 25,000 to an existing 44,000 and expect that the people of Canada will approve that kind of distribution.

Mr. LENNARD: I rise at this time to make a protest against the mutilation of the good old riding of Wentworth. I may say that I protested several months ago. I did not leave it until the dying hours of this session. I wrote to the editor of the Dundas *Star* on April 25. He published this letter in his issue of May 1, and it reads as follows:

Gordon Anslow, Esq.,
Editor, Dundas Star,
Dundas, Ontario

Dear Mr. Editor:

The redistribution committee, predominantly representing this present government, are proposing to remove from Wentworth the townships of Beverly, Ancaster, Glanford and Binbrook and are going to put them into a new constituency to be called Brant-Wentworth.

I have protested against it! I am protesting against it, and will have more to say about it when the bill appears in the house. Wentworth has not had its county boundaries broken in over forty-five years, and there is no good or sensible reason for doing it now. I object to being kicked around, and we are. It is just plain political skulduggery, and I have had and I am having no part of it. I am making that statement now at this first opportunity and am not waiting until the damage is done. Mind you, I am leaning backwards politically, as every one of those four townships returns a Liberal majority, but if I did not protest this move I would not be doing my duty to the good people of Wentworth. I am placing the matter right on the doorstep of the Liberal organization of Wentworth riding and it is up to them. I am washing my hands of it. I will have none of it.

[Mr. Boucher.]

I have grave doubts whether the Liberal association of Wentworth were ever consulted about the matter or knew much about it until the damage was done. On May 17 I received the following letter from the county clerk and treasurer of the county of Wentworth.

Dear Sir: We are enclosing for your consideration a copy of a resolution passed unanimously at the recent session of Wentworth county council.

As the redistribution proposed at the present time involves the transfer to Brant riding of more than half the area of Wentworth county, it was strenuously opposed by all members of council.

By the way, I may say that about fifty per cent of the members of the county council of Wentworth are Liberals, the other fifty per cent being Progressive Conservatives. It was moved by councillor W. S. Milmine, seconded by councillor B. E. Corman:

That this council of the corporation of the county of Wentworth hereby records its disapproval of and protests against any redistribution of the federal ridings which may involve the transfer of portions of the federal riding of Wentworth to the Brant or any other federal riding, and

That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the chairman of the redistribution committee of the House of Commons.

This resolution was passed on May 15, 1947, and forwarded on May 17. I am sure it will be of interest to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Harris) the very fine chairman of the committee for Ontario, of which I have no criticism. I say it will be interesting for him to know that the motion was seconded by Mr. B. E. Corman, a brother of the former member for Wentworth, who is also a friend of mine. It seems strange that this should be seconded by Mr. Corman's brother.

In my opinion this thing started by putting the township of Burford in the constituency of Brantford City. The present hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) would have no objection to that, because Burford township has always returned a slight Liberal majority. But they take the remainder of Brant county and put it in that constituency with four townships of Wentworth, to make it one of the most rambling constituencies of Ontario. To quote from the Dundas *Star* of May 1, 1947, this is what the editor, Mr. Anslow, says in part:

Residents of Wentworth are wondering where the equity of such a "redistribution" lies. They look at a map and wonder just where such matters may end. They consider that for generations they have voted in Wentworth and feel that at this stage in the constituency's history no change should be made—especially when it will not result in at least a better geographical division.

If these two new townships of Glanford and Binbrook were to be taken from the riding of Wentworth, the right and proper place to put them would be the constituency of Haldimand.

In conclusion, may I say that I do not consider that in a riding such as Wentworth the removal of one or two or three thousand of its population from the constituency means anything at all when the constituency is so large. But I say that in a riding which has been either Liberal or Conservative since confederation, the committee should consider seriously making this alteration, because I am giving fair warning now that, whether the candidate be Liberal or Progressive Conservative, he will have far fewer supporting votes to carry into the more congested area of the present riding of Wentworth to fight communism.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): To me, and I am sure to many members of this house who have been here for a long time, this is a most extraordinary way of considering a bill in committee of the whole, to have a general discussion of amendments and particular sections instead of discussing the bill section by section as is usual. However, since this has developed into a free-for-all, I intend to say now what I intended to say on section 2.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I called the attention of the committee to that fact and the committee did agree to have a general discussion.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I will direct my remarks particularly to section 2 of the bill. The section adds to the federal district of Yukon that part of Mackenzie district west of the 109th meridian of west longitude, and the original bill added the whole of the Mackenzie district. The change to the 109th meridian of west longitude does not make much difference. It makes the boundary of the new constituency, if it becomes a constituency, as I hope it will not, that much more difficult to find. The east boundary before was the boundary of the district of Mackenzie. Now it is the 109th meridian of west longitude. How will anyone find that? It has not been surveyed or marked out, whereas the boundaries of Mackenzie district have been surveyed and marked out.

Why that change was made I do not know. Yukon has an area of 207,076 square miles and the Mackenzie district has an area of 527,490 square miles, a total of Mackenzie and Yukon, of 734,566 square miles.

The present section makes a constituency of over 700,000 square miles in area, if anyone can visualize that. It is unwieldy and so vast that it is impossible. I hold up a map of Canada on which hon. members can see Yukon and the Mackenzie. The combined area will be larger than British Columbia and Alberta combined; larger than Alberta and Saskatchewan combined; larger than Saskatchewan and Manitoba; as large as Ontario and almost as large as Quebec and the maritimes. That, to me, is a monstrosity. Why anyone took the notion to make such a constituency I do not understand, but I will make a guess before I get through.

To begin with, Yukon and this district of Mackenzie are separated by two high ranges of mountains. They have nothing whatever in common. Mackenzie district does all its business and all its trading with central Canada, with Edmonton for the most part. It would be much more appropriate to add the Mackenzie district to a northern constituency in Alberta or Saskatchewan than to Yukon to the west. Yukon does its trading with the west coast of Canada, with Vancouver, Victoria and Prince Rupert. The Mackenzie district does practically all its trading with Edmonton. We have nothing in common.

Does any member of the house feel that he could reasonably represent such a constituency and get around it? Is he wealthy enough to own or charter a plane to go and visit the people in his constituency from time to time, as he should? And not only in an election. In an election it will cost a fortune, and it will cost the government of Canada a great deal of money to carry on an election there. As evidence of that, they have already increased the chief electoral officer's pay by $2,000, because of the additional expense he would be put to in such a condition.

What is the population? At the last census the Yukon population of white people was only 3,174, and of Mackenzie district was 2,113, a total of 5,287. I estimate that today—and I am in a position to make a fair estimate—there are not 10,000 included in the two districts. Some people say that this is mandatory on the part of this parliament. We need only to look at the section of the British North America Act as amended to convince ourselves that it is not mandatory. Section 51 (2) reads as follows:

> The Yukon territory as constituted by chapter 41 of the Statutes of Canada (1901), together with any part of Canada not comprised within a province which may from time to time—

And note those words "may from time to time".

—be included therein by the parliament of Canada for the purpose of representation in parliament, shall be entitled to one member.

The parliament of Canada may or may not, just as it chooses. It does not have to do anything of the kind, and I say that it should not. Other people will say that they do not wish to disfranchise the people of the Mackenzie district. The bulk of the people of the Mackenzie district live at the new and coming mining camp of Yellowknife. That is a splendid gold mining camp which is bound to grow and will produce wonderful wealth. They have not a population of 5,000. The rest of the people in the Mackenzie district are but a few hundreds who live away up miles north of Great Bear lake where uranium is being produced. If this bill is not passed adding that part of Mackenzie district to Yukon, these people are not disfranchised. They are left as they are, and that is what they asked parliament to do. They have done that by telegram from their board of trustees. They have done it by petition and in every other way. They do not want the franchise on the terms of this bill and I do not see why parliament should insist on giving it to them. Back in 1930 there was before this house a bill, which happened to be Bill No. 13, an unlucky number. By that bill it was intended to add the whole of the northwest territories to Yukon and make one electoral constituency; in other words, that constituency would have been extended from Alaska on the west to the Atlantic ocean on the east and to the north pole on the north. It was so ridiculous that parliament would not listen to it and they dropped the bill. When I discussed this matter in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, I said, as reported at page 695 of *Hansard:*

I cannot better describe the section of the bill to which I have referred than to say that it is outrageous legislation, the iniquity of which could not be overstated. That portion of the bill seeking to form one constituency out of Yukon and the Mackenzie district is a legislative abortion.

I was followed in that debate by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who said:

May I just say a word in support of the grievance the previous speaker has presented to the house. When this matter was up for discussion at the time we had before us the resolution to Westminster asking for amendment to the British North America Act, hon. members of this group pointed out at that time how unfair it was to make one constituency across the whole of the North American continent, as the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black) has just described it.

[Mr. G. Black.]

That is how that group felt about it. As long ago as March 10, I said, as reported at page 1209 of *Hansard:*

I predict that before the legislation becomes law, in its present atrocious form—and it is in an atrocious form—the people in the Mackenzie district themselves will protest, and will not submit to being so ruthlessly pushed around. I believe they would prefer to remain unrepresented in parliament rather than have to accept representation on the fantastically ridiculous terms proposed. There has scarcely been time to hear from them, but I predict we shall.

And we have. This is what came in from Yellowknife on March 15, 1945. It is a telegram addressed to the Secretary of State who, in the absence of the Prime Minister, was handling the bill, and reads as follows:

Yellowknife district miners union opposed to amalgamation of Yukon Mackenzie districts for electoral purposes. We demand that Mackenzie district be given separate electoral status.

Then the chairman of the committee, the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), observing that they had not gone so far as to say that they did not want representation at all on those terms, had a telegram sent to them; and a telegram came back to the effect that they preferred to remain without representation rather than be joined to Yukon. They put the miners' union on record to that extent. The chairman of the committee will bear me out in that. Then there is another telegram to the Secretary of State, which reads as follows:

We the undersigned members of the local board of trustees of Yellowknife administrative district protest against proposed joint representation in parliament of Yukon and Mackenzie districts for the following reasons. No intercommunication between the two districts, no common interests among the people in the two districts, no desire by the people of either territory for joint representation. Financially impossible for one representative to serve both districts. Consensus of opinion would prefer no representative at present to proposed joint representation.

When that telegram was presented to the committee, what did the hon. member for Ottawa West say. The report in the *Globe and Mail* on March 26, in connection with the proceedings of the committee, reads, in part, as follows:

G. J. McIlraith (Lib., Ottawa West) just couldn't believe that any five men would send such a message. He pointed to a statement in the Yellowknife telegram that it was "financially impossible" for any man to represent the widely separated Yukon and Northwest Territories. How, he asked, did the Yellowknife trustees know for certain that Canada had not a solitary citizen financially able to afford to sit as M.P. for both districts?

He may be financially able, but I am not; and I doubt if ninety-five per cent of the members of this house are financially able to represent that district as it should be represented.

So much for finances. Then I have a telegram addressed to the Prime Minister, from Yellowknife:

At open public mass meeting called by Northwest Territories association and representing all parties and shades of opinion the following resolution was passed unanimously:

"This meeting is bitterly opposed to amalgamation of the district of Mackenzie with Yukon Territory as an electoral constituency and demands the immediate creation of a constituency for the Mackenzie district under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1886."

Exhaustive canvass of public opinion fails to disclose even one supporter of proposed electoral amalgamation. Objections cite preposterously unwieldy size of proposed constituency, absolute lack of community or economic interest or of direct intercommunication between the two areas.

That is signed by John Murray McMeekan, president of the Northwest Territories association. The previous telegram was signed, among others, by Mr. J. G. McNiven, who is the first citizen of Canada other than a civil servant to have been appointed to the council of the Northwest Territories. I asked him if his appointment to that council would in any way handicap his opposition to the union of these two districts, and he replied, "No. If anything my objection ought to have more weight as coming from a member of that council." Then on April 22 he sent me the following telegram:

Received following wire from Murphy. "Wrote you today. One hundred per cent citizens against amalgamation. Petitions being signed and will be rushed to Black this week. Citizens here prepared wait two years, I would estimate." Will advise you further.

Then Mr. McNiven wrote me from Toronto on April 23:

For your information I am enclosing copy of letter addressed to the Honourable J. A. Glen. You will note that Mr. Murphy is keeping his promise to do everything to get representative petitions in Ottawa at the earliest possible date.

This is what Mr. McNiven wrote the Minister of Mines and Resources on April 23, 1947:

Following our conversation on Tuesday, April 15, re proposed merger of Yellowknife and Yukon districts, I wrote to Yellowknife to ascertain the popular feeling there and have received a reply from Mr. G. D. Murphy which reads in part as follows:

"For your information and Mr. Glen's this will advise you that the Hon. George Black visited this town last week and interviewed many people, under the writer's guidance, and one evening held a public meeting. No one here that met him or that was at the meeting was in favour of the present arrangement, viz: union for electoral purposes of the Yukon district and the Mackenzie. They, these people, all preferred to wait until such time as we were able to have our own representative in the federal house. He said he thought petitions circulated and signed by the people would be much more important to the committee in making its decision than wires from organizations, and acocrdingly we are now in the process of getting these signed. They will be sent to George Black via air mail this coming week and will be presented to the committee and quite possibly be produced on the floor of the house."

You will note that this definitely substantiates my own opinion in the matter, and I hope you will take the necessary delaying action to await the receipt of the petitions mentioned in this letter. You will recall meeting Mr. Murphy on your Yellowknife visit last year as president of the local board of trade. I personally have a great deal of faith in his judgment on matters of this nature and recommend him highly to you in the same capacity.

As I understand it, this matter started in this way. Last summer the Minister of Mines and Resources made a trip to Yellowknife by plane, and they suggested to him that they should have representation in parliament, to which he quite agreed. But they never expected that their representation in parliament would be brought about by adding most of the Mackenzie district to Yukon, and they were disappointed and surprised when they found this was the outcome of their interview with the minister. As I see it—and I am sure hon. members will say I am right—it would be just as appropriate to add the Mackenzie district to Nova Scotia as to add it to Yukon. It is just as easy to get from Nova Scotia to Mackenzie as to get from Yukon to Mackenzie. It would be just as appropriate to add Mackenzie to Glengarry as to add it to Yukon. This is the petition that came in from the people of Yukon:

That parliament is now considering Bill No. 18 which if enacted will be "The Representation Act 1947".

That it is proposed by said legislation to include with Yukon electoral district the said district of Mackenzie and the electoral district so created shall elect one member of the House of Commons.

That in the opinion of your petitioners it is not desirable to include the district of Mackenzie with the electoral district of Yukon for the reason that it will create a constituency of the enormous area of over seven hundred thousand square miles in extent, unwieldy and impracticable in every respect.

That Yukon territory and the district of Mackenzie have nothing in common, no community interest of any sort. They are separated by ranges of mountains, have no direct intercommunication, are entirely foreign to each other.

Your petitioners therefore pray that Mackenzie district be not included with the electoral district of Yukon. . . .

Now I have the petition from Mackenzie, with the same preamble:

That in the opinion of your petitioners it is not desirable to include the district of Mackenzie with the electoral district of Yukon for the reason that it will create a constituency of the enormous area of over seven hundred thousand square miles in extent, unwieldy and impracticable in every respect.

That Yukon territory and the district of Mackenzie have nothing in common, no community interest of any sort. They are separated by ranges of mountains, have no direct intercommunication, are entirely foreign to each other.

Remember, these are the people of Mackenzie.

That your petitioners prefer to have the representation of Mackenzie district to parliament postponed and to remain for the present without such representation rather than to have the district included with the electoral district of Yukon.

These are the wishes of the people of that district. Opposition to this legislation is unanimous in both Mackenzie and Yukon. Not one supporting voice has been found; no one has said, "Do it," and I challenge anyone who says there is support for this step to show where that support comes from. The people out there do not want it. They are the people who are affected. They have told you so in telegrams and petitions. Are you going to disregard their wishes? What good will this do? Why force it on them? Yellowknife is a coming mining camp; probably it will be one of the best Canada has ever seen. During the Easter holidays I made a trip there by plane just to find out how the people felt about the matter. We had a public meeting, and no one at that meeting was in favour of joining Mackenzie and Yukon. They asked me how they could influence parliament against it, and I advised them to send down petitions signed by as many of the people of that territory as they could get to sign. I told them that telegrams from organizations such as the board of trade and the board of trustees were all very well in their way, but that they did not represent the wide range of public opinion that petitions represented. They asked me if I would draw up the petitions, and those petitions were drafted by me at the request of those people.

I say this community of Yellowknife in the Mackenzie district should eventually have representation, but they do not want it now at this price. Eventually they will be entitled to representation, and I would be the last to put anything in the way of their getting it, but they do not want it this way and neither do I. They ask you not to do this atrocious thing to them. I ask you on behalf of the people of Mackenzie and the people of Yukon not to do it. For my own sake it does not matter; it is neither here nor there, because this will probably be my last parliament. But I am thinking of the people who will come after me and who will be looking after the people in the great Yellowknife district and the people of Yukon.

As you know, or as you should know, Yukon has produced over $300 million worth of placer gold. They are now moving into hard rock gold mining, silver mining and lead mining. It is a coming camp just as the Yellowknife is. Eventually they should have representation in this parliament, but they do not want it at this price. Those who are best qualified say that they do not want it. I did not want to do it in this way; but, since the committee has decided that there will be a general discussion and the Secretary of State has moved an amendment to the clause in the schedule as to Nova Scotia, I would move:

That section 2 be amended by striking out the words, "including that part of the Mackenzie district of the Northwest Territories lying west of the 109th meridian of west longitude.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall have to deal with that amendment the same as we did with the other two. We will accept it, but it will have to be dealt with when that clause is called.

Mr. ADAMSON: Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks to make with regard to what has happened in connection with the four York seats surrounding Toronto. When the census was taken I think the norm was 54,000 of population to one representative in this parliament. Since that time the number of seats in parliament has been increased so that the representation is somewhat less than 54,000. Because of difficulties of travel and for other reasons it is reasonable to expect that a rural seat should contain fewer population than an urban seat. A member representing a rural seat has to travel greater distances and has all the other difficulties inherent to representing a larger square mileage of territory.

However, the situation with regard to the Yorks goes far further than what I think could reasonably be expected. Let us assume that a reasonable proportion as between rural and urban representation in this house is sixty to forty; that is, an urban seat should have a population of some 60,000 and a rural seat a population of some 40,000. There would be some exceptions of course, but that would be the over-all picture. Let us see what happens with regard to the York seats. I am speaking of York West particularly, because that is my

own seat, but I should like to give the populations of the four Yorks according to the 1941 census. They are:

York North	47,678
York South	78,167
York East	78,584
York West	69,089

A very rapid change in population has taken place since 1941. I submit that it would have been in the interests of proper representation in this house if some consideration had been given by the committee to the shift in population which has occurred since the 1941 census. The year 1941 was a war year, and there had been great shifts of population due to war industry and other reasons. That census perhaps did not give a true picture of the population of Canada. Some areas had grown and were growing on a temporary basis because of special industries which it was obvious would be disbanded after the war. I am thinking of Nobel which has been almost completely abandoned since that war industry closed down.

In many suburban districts, such as the one which I have the honour to represent, the population shift has been of a permanent nature, and it is still going on. I should like to refer to what has happened in York West. May I say here that in many ways I would welcome the addition of the town of Weston to York West. I have many friends there and I think the war effort of Weston was equal to any town of its size in Canada. There is one other slight reason why it might be considered as part of the riding. Weston and Mimico are arch enemies in the ancient Canadian game of lacrosse and it will be nice to have them in a single constituency.

Be that as it may, this is the situation with regard to population. In 1941 York West had a population of 69,089, and by 1945 that had grown to 82,656, an increase of 13,567. I am taking these figures out of the Toronto municipal year book for 1946. I think the committee will be interested in these figures because they show what is happening in the area around Toronto. York township has a population of 82,753. We usually consider that there is a proportion of three to five as between York West and York South, which would give York West an addition of some 30,133. The other population figures are:

Etobicoke	21,402
New Toronto	10,173
Mimico	8,785
Swansea	7,217
Long Branch	5,059
Weston	6,377

When you add the population of Weston you reach a total population, during the election year 1945, of approximately 89,000 people. Let us assume that the growth is continuous, and I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the growth is continuing and approximately at the same rate. Therefore we can expect to find an average annual increase of approximately 5,000 people for some years in that riding. This means that in this year the constituency of York West with the town of Weston will have a population approaching 100,000; and, with the growth continuing, by the time the next election comes round it will have the amazing population of approximately 110,000. We in the large urban centres of population should be expected and be prepared to represent a greater number of people than the rural parts of the country. But here you have a population in 1949 of more than twice that of York North. I think that is extremely unfair. I think it is a maladjustment of representation in this house.

I want to go a little farther, and give the population of urban Toronto versus Toronto city itself, and I am giving the figures for 1945. I do not include in them those parts of the riding of York North which are purely rural, Vaughan, Whitchurch, King and Gwillimburg townships, and the towns of Newmarket, Richmond Hill, Woodbridge, Aurora, which are all rural areas. The population of suburban municipalities adjoining Toronto for the year 1945—I am taking these figures from the 1946 Year Book, which is the most recent—was 260,689 versus a population in Toronto of 681,802. The suburban population reside mostly in York South, York East, York West. That is, three members of this house represent nearly 260,000 people. Actually York North has 26,000 of the 260,000, so that about 240,000 would be represented by three members of this house, which would mean that in the year 1945 the representation for the three Yorks which are nearest Toronto averaged 80,000 people per member. That, I think, should have been given more consideration by the committee. Here we have a permanently growing urban area of Ontario which, it is forecast, is going to grow at an even faster rate in the years to come, represented by only three members. Certainly some consideration should have been given to creating another York.

It has been said that York North was kept as a rural seat. I cannot agree with this argument, because York North is very similar to the other Yorks. It has industries and, while it takes in a larger territory, there are large parts in both York East and York West which are entirely rural and where the people are engaged in farming and market gardening. So I say that, had this change been necessary, some consideration should

have been given to equalizing the four Yorks in population; that is, bringing the population of York North more into line with the population of the other three Yorks.

Let us see—and I think this is interesting—how this compares with some other ridings. I think the largest riding in Ontario will still be Welland, although I am not sure.

I am not complaining of representing a very large riding. I think it is a great honour to represent a very large riding, but the case of Welland is probably equal to the case I am putting up.

In 1945 the electors on the list in York West numbered 49,042. The electors on the list in Glengarry, which is the smallest riding —I do not say that York West is the biggest —numbered 10,649. In other words, York West has five times the number of electors in Glengarry. There is pretty nearly a five-times differential between the smallest riding of Glengarry and York West, which is a large riding, and now to that five-times differential we are adding the town of Weston, which in 1945 had 4,767 electors on the list, or nearly fifty per cent of the number of electors on the list in Glengarry. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that is not a true and proper representation of population in this House of Commons. I say that more consideration should have been given by the committee to a just equilibrium in the representation.

I have given the population of the town of Mimico as 8,785. Today, so I was informed recently by the mayor of the town, Mimico has a population of over 10,000. New Toronto has a population of over 10,000 and Etobicoke township, I am informed, has a population of 27,000 at the present time. I have not official figures, but these are figures given me by word of mouth by responsible officials in the various municipalities.

I consider that there is shocking discrepancy in the representation as brought down by this committee. I feel that the member for York West, in the twenty-first parliament, will be representing, at the beginning, 110,000 people, and if the growth goes on, at the end he will be representing probably 120,000 or 125,000 people. Compare that with Glengarry of 18,000, a static population, and we get a discrepancy of over six to one. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that is out of line with a proper differential between an urban and a rural seat. I believe that the committee have failed, for reasons best known to themselves, to take proper consideration of the population discrepancy which many of the large industrial ridings of Ontario will be forced to face.

[Mr. Adamson.]

Mr. LOW: I have listened with keen interest to the debate which has taken place this afternoon. While, from the point of view of Alberta, there is little that I can add by way of protest, yet there is something I should like to say that has arisen from the speeches of some of the hon. members, and from the details and facts in the bill.

The Alberta subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of the hon. member for Athabaska, did a very fine job. Their relations from the beginning were harmonious. They worked quickly and with predetermined intent and were able to get their work done to the satisfaction of all concerned. They gave what I think should have been a good lead and demonstration to the subcommittees of the other provinces on how to deal with this whole matter of redistribution at this time.

The Alberta subcommittee recommended no changes in this present bill for several good reasons. In the first place, the number of constituencies in the province was to remain exactly as before, seventeen. In the second place, there can be a matter of only three years until the next decennial census is taken, which will provide the basis for a new distribution of seats.

Mr. KNOWLES: Four years.

Mr. LOW: It is past midsummer.

Mr. KNOWLES: 1951.

Mr. LOW: That is so, but here we are in the mid-summer of 1947; perhaps three or three and a half years. This new census will provide the basis for a new distribution of seats. It would be clearly a waste of effort to upset things now, and that is the way the Alberta subcommittee looked at the matter.

In the third place, the last census upon which the present redistribution plans have been made was taken when wartime dislocation of population had just about reached its height. Therefore the Alberta subcommittee preferred not to disturb the present constituency arrangements in the province until the population had had a chance to become stable again, as it possibly will be by the time of the next census. This leaves our group largely without any direct or personal grievance against the work of the redistribution committee. We are quite satisfied, as far as our group is concerned, with the one possible exception of the constituency of Pontiac where it seems quite certain that political considerations were allowed to weigh much more heavily in the efforts of the committee to redistribute than any other; in fact I should

say, above all other considerations put together. They cut off Timiskaming from that constituency and added it to lower Pontiac. My colleague, the hon. member for Pontiac, has already dealt with this matter and has registered his protest. I wish merely to emphasize one thing that he said in his short speech this afternoon, upon which I want to compliment him. By the way, it is the first time that he has attempted to speak in the house in English and I think he did a splendid job. He said that if the division that he mentioned, whereby Timiskaming was cut off from Pontiac as it now stands to be added to lower Pontiac, was made for political reasons he is certain that it will not help the Liberal party any; in fact it will rebound upon them to their great disadvantage. I believe that he is correct. I do not think there is any doubt about it.

This brings me to another consideration. I should think that the Liberal party would have bent over backwards in this redistribution to see to it that the bill brought before this house was absolutely above reproach, to see to it that it was the embodiment and essence of fairness and justice. I say that for various reasons. I believe that the thinking Liberal today has some interesting memories in the back of his head, some that are quite likely to becloud his pride.

Mr. KNOWLES: Who is the thinking Liberal?

Mr. LOW: We shall let them demonstrate. I am not going to make specific references, but in this country during the past year or so a number of things have happened which should make most Liberals hang their heads in shame. I have drawn attention to some of them in the house before, and when the time is right and I am free to do so I am going to bring them up again and perhaps have much more consideration given to them than my protests have had in the past in connection with them. I say that if for no other reason than to try to redeem themselves from some clouds under which they were living the Liberal party ought to have seen to it that there was brought into this house a bill which was completely above reproach, which was the embodiment and essence of fairness and justice.

After listening to what has gone on in this debate this afternoon, I am sure that this bill is not the embodiment of justice and fairness; that this bill is full of injustices; that this bill is full of attempts to tamper with the boundary lines of certain constituencies. I think it is quite clear and evident. I do not need to name constituencies. If I do so it is not because I am protesting personally on behalf of the sitting member; not by any means. I would do the same, regardless of who happened to be representing the constituency.

We must face this question. The people of the country are going to ask, how are we to justify what has happened to Muskoka-Ontario, to Lake Centre, to Dauphin, to Kamloops, to Neepawa, to Portage la Prairie and to Laval-Two Mountains? I could go on and name others.

Mr. WHITMAN: Mount Royal.

Mr. McIVOR: Lisgar.

Mr. LOW: I should like hon. members to stand up and tell us something about those so that I can take up their cases too. Hon. members just sit there and say nothing but snipe at other hon. members. You have to stand up and tell what your grievance is.

Mr. WHITMAN: We will.

Mr. LOW: That is what I am looking for. I say, is it mere coincidence that in the instance of every constituency that I have named there happens to be sitting at the present time a member on the opposition side of the house? The people of this country will not think it is mere coincidence, and it will be a most difficult task for the Liberal party—and I speak advisedly when I say "the Liberal party"—to make the people of this country think it is mere coincidence. The people of this country know it is the Liberal party largely who must take the responsibility for the bill that is now before us, simply because of the preponderance of Liberal members on the committee and on the subcommittees. The people of Canada will have to be shown that the constituency boundaries have not been tampered with. As I said, it does not affect me personally at all, and it does not affect my group, with the one exception of Pontiac, but I protest vigorously against the injustices which are so apparent in this attempt at redistribution. For that is what I call it—an attempt at redistribution. I sat here and listened with amazement to the speech given by my hon. friend the member for Laval-Two Mountains. I am amazed that nobody on the Liberal side has had the courage to get up and say whether this man was right.

An hon. MEMBER: He is not.

Mr. LOW: I am not saying he is right, but he made a serious charge. If that charge is proved it ought to receive a whole lot more consideration than I can see being given to it at the present moment; and I demand, on behalf of all decent members of the house—I hope that includes all—that this thing be

cleared away, so that we may not all rest under a cloud. This thing seems to me to warrant the most vehement denial if it is wrong, and it warrants complete castigation of those who are responsible if the hon. member is right. I should like to see the matter dealt with here on the floor of the house.

Let me say one thing further in conclusion. I should like to support the appeal made by the member for Yukon (Mr. Black). I know something about the people in that part of the country and about what they want and I can say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the people in Mackenzie do not want to be made a part of the Yukon. They should not be made a part of Yukon for representation in this house. Their will ought to be respected, and the hon. member has gone a long way in providing for this house evidence upon which to base his statements that the people there do not want that sort of treatment. We sit here in these committees and subcommittees and completely ignore the wishes of the people. We will give them what we darned well please. It is high time that the people organized unions of electors to stand up and tell those who are supposed to represent them exactly what they want us to do and to see to it that they get the results. If ever there were a time when unionism should spread among the people who mark ballots it is now. That ought to be patently clear.

I had not intended saying very much about this; but as I sat and listened to the all too patent political moves being made I could not resist the opportunity to register my vehement protest over the thing that has been done.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am not going to spend a great deal of time on this matter on this occasion for when the schedules come up I intend to have more to say than in these my opening remarks. I will direct my appeal today not to the house but to the Prime Minister of the country. As he said in 1932 my appeal goes to Caesar. I was very much surprised when he said this afternoon that he had no idea regarding what this committee had done or the recommendations that it had made.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend is not quoting me correctly. I did not say I had not any knowledge of what the committee had done or of its recommendations. I said I had not interfered in any way with the committee while it was at its work or tried to influence its members.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I hasten to accept the correction. Then the Prime Minister does know what has been done.

[Mr. Low.]

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Well, he reads the bills.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes; he knows what has been done. In view of that fact, many of the things I would have said, it becomes unnecessary for me to place before this committee and the country. My hon. friend the member for Peace River suggested that someone might endeavour to explain what was done as being a matter of coincidence. Mr. Chairman, coincidence becomes conspiracy when it is repeated over and over again. I suggest at this time that if it is coincidence, then never before has coincidence in the matter of redistribution resulted in the position that those who are gerrymandered out of their constituencies are leaders in an opposition party. I would point out that the leader of the opposition, the president of the Progressive Conservative Association of Canada, and the president of the Young Progressive Conservative Association are of those whose constituencies are interfered with. I ask you, sir, how did it come about that these are the persons whose seats have been marked out for interference—interference, did I say? —annihilation in so far as the leader of the opposition is concerned.

I am going to speak now of my own constituency. The constituency of Lake Centre is surrounded by more constituencies than any other riding in the dominion—ten in number. Naturally it was felt that changes would be made in Saskatchewan. Naturally, when the reduction in the number of members by one took place, changes would have to be made. But, sir, how can the government explain the manner in which it went about the changes so far as Lake Centre is concerned? I make my appeal, not to the head of the committee, not to a committee for the province of Saskatchewan. I am making my appeal to Caesar himself.

This is what was done. It was necessary to increase the population of Lake Centre. It may be only a coincidence, but the first plan removed from the south end of the constituency of Lake Centre twenty-three townships. It may be only coincidence that these twenty-three townships returned a substantial Progressive Conservative majority in 1945. Then, in the northwest corner—I am speaking of the original plan—two townships were to be removed, one of which contained the largest town in the constituency, namely the town of Watrous. The makers of the plan removed a number of townships on the west side—seven townships on the west side of the constituency, in which there was a small majority for the C.C.F. candidate in the elec-

tion of 1945. It is said that they made these changes to increase the population of Lake Centre, and they commenced to increase the population by immediately removing twenty-three townships from the south side of the constituency, seven on the west side and two off the northwest corner.

Mr. BRACKEN: Townships.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Townships, as my leader points out. Then, on the east side of the constituency sixteen townships were added out of the constituency represented by the Minister of Agriculture. It is again merely a coincidence that those sixteen townships returned a substantial majority for the C.C.F. candidate as against the Minister of Agriculture in the last federal election.

Mr. KNOWLES: That seems to be the hon. member's main trouble.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Then a portion was added from Yorkton constituency. I would not argue about those additions, and I would accept the plan as it is if there were missing from the plan an addition on the north side of the constituency. They removed from the bottom; they removed from the sides; they added on the east side and then finally added in the northeast corner of the constituency three townships out of the constituency of Humboldt. Never have those townships been in Lake Centre or in its predecessor, Last Mountain constituency. As a matter of fact, in winter time it will be impossible to get to the three unless one travels into Saskatoon, a distance of 140 miles. They have always been in Humboldt. They are connected directly through Humboldt, on a line of railway passing through the constituency; and yet they have been added to the constituency of Lake Centre. I am not here for the purpose of asking for consideration, but I am here to ask for justice. I am going to ask for justice from the Prime Minister, as he asked for justice in 1932.

An hon. MEMBER: He did not get it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am not here to defend. The right hon. gentleman pointed out the situation in Prince Albert, namely, that 6,000 of his electors on the south side of that constituency had been removed and were joined to the constituency of Rosthern. He pointed out to the then prime minister that what was planned was wrong and unfair. He said that it transformed a majority for him in Prince Albert constituency of some 1,100 into a minority of 600 odd. He said it was obvious that it had been done for a purpose; he appealed to the government of the day, in the interests of the preservation of the principle of fairness, a principle inherent in parliamentary government, to change the plan and it was changed. Sir, I point out what has been done in this constituency of Lake Centre in the area where a Progressive Conservative majority was given in the last election. It has been removed and to Lake Centre has been added a voting strength of 4,900, of whom only 286 were Progressive Conservatives in the last election.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did I understand my hon. friend to say that a change was made in Prince Albert?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to know the extent of it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have the Prime Minister's own admission before me, or rather his thanks to the government for having made the change. He points out on May 27, 1933, after having debated the matter in the house for a period of five days, that changes had been made, and he says, as reported at page 5559 of *Hansard* for that year:

> I have made my appeal to Caesar, and I propose to abide by the decision which has been given and not argue the matter further.

Then he went on to point out that a change was made in the southern portion of the constituency which altered the original plan, and he spoke his appreciation on behalf of the constituency of Prince Albert to the government for having made the change. The Prime Minister is now conversant with this matter. He can see the picture in the constituency of Kamloops. He can see the situation—and he knew of it before—in so far as the leader of this party is concerned, as a result of joining two Progressive Conservative seats in Manitoba. Is Portage la Prairie to be penalized because in a by-election it defeated the government candidate? Is that one of the reasons why Pontiac is being altered as well? Are they being penalized because in by-elections each defeated the government condidate?

There is nothing sacrosanct about the findings of a committee. In committee there was an agreement in so far as Nova Scotia was concerned. It was agreed that there should be two seats in Nova Scotia created for Halifax, one a city and one a rural seat. Was there anything sacrosanct about it? The day before yesterday we were advised in Halifax, that the government had decided not to follow the recommendations of the committee.

Mr. KNOWLES: Advised by whom?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: We were informed by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Isnor) on Saturday last, that the government had decided not to follow the unanimous recommendation of the committee. I do not argue that question at all in so far as Halifax is concerned. I understand the situation there. But if there was nothing sacrosanct about an agreement on the part of the members of the committee in so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, why should others be about the findings of the committee where any other part of this country is concerned? I am asking the Prime Minister to reconsider the matter. In 1932 he pointed out that nothing was more dangerous to the public life of the country than to bring in what he called a gerrymandering measure in the last days of the session. It undermined democracy, it was a dangerous proceeding, and, regardless of whether parliament was to prorogue within the next day or so as planned, he and those associated with him intended to fight until they obtained justice.

An hon. MEMBER: He did not get it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I will deal with that question a little later on. I wish to adopt the definition of "gerrymander" as given by the right hon. gentleman at page 5276 of *Hansard* of 1932-33:

> The word "gerrymander" in political parlance simply means that in redistributing a constituency the boundary lines are so altered as to do an obvious injury to one political party and give an obvious unfair political advantage to another party.

That defines what a gerrymander is. Tell me what justification there is to take away township after township from a constituency and then say that it is necessary in order to bring up the population and make it equal to that of constituencies adjoining it, to add on other parts of other constituencies?

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): Why did the hon. member recommend it to the committee?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There is a fine question; I have heard that before. It was once raised as a defence by a highwayman who stuck a gun into the face of a victim and said, "Your money or your life"; and then afterwards said, when charged, "Why did he consent?"

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Did the hon. member not sign the recommendation?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That was exactly my position in so far as that committee report was concerned.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Six o'clock.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. McCANN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BRACKEN: Will some minister advise what the government has for us this evening?

Mr. McCANN: At seven o'clock it is proposed to take up private bills. When they are disposed of we shall resume the debate on Bill No. 453, to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act. After that is disposed of we shall go into supply.

Mr. GREEN: What department?

Mr. McCANN: Fisheries.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: We shall not go on with this tonight?

Mr. McCANN: No; tomorrow.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at seven o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 416, to incorporate the Yellowknife Telephone Company.—Mr. Robinson (Simcoe East).

Bill No. 173, respecting the Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 414, to incorporate the Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Labrador (as amended, and recommending that the title be changed to, "An Act to incorporate The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Labrador").—Mr. Dorion.

Bill No. 28, for the relief of Charles Gordon Nelson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 29, for the relief of Pamela Mackay Alderdice Johnstone.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 30, for the relief of Lilly Evans Auty.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 31, for the relief of Esther Lancit Weiss.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 32, for the relief of Bruce Montgomery Cooper.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 33, for the relief of Marion Naomi Gomery McGee.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 34, for the relief of Margaret Hazel Reid Koppel.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 35, for the relief of James Alexander King.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 36, for the relief of Proctor Clifford Neil.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 37, for the relief of Elizabeth Anne Eden Lindsay.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 38, for the relief of Ernest Edward Joslin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 39, for the relief of Jessie Alberta Allan Derby.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 40, for the relief of Dorothy May Duff Hisey.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 41, for the relief of Elizabeth McIntosh Barber.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 42, for the relief of Muriel Lucy Brighton Burdon.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 43, for the relief of Constance Mae Ponman Newman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 44, for the relief of Florence Alice Mapston Calcutt Doak—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 45, for the relief of Rose Housefield Blumstein—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 46, for the relief of Gertrude Loiseau Gaulin—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 47, for the relief of Marie Rose Alba Bernadette Lapointe dit Robin Ricard—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 48, for the relief of Thelma Genender Lefkowitz—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 49, for the relief of Mary Joyce Joly Clark—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 50, for the relief of Gertrude Helen Cayford Collins—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 51, for the relief of Francis George Isaac Fellows—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 52, for the relief of Elly Maria Charlotte Alden McBride—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 53, for the relief of Gladys Elizabeth Thompson Dorrance—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 54, for the relief Una Kathleen Balmfirth Little—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 55, for the relief of William Walter Woodall—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 56, for the relief of Helen Lilian Jaques Bowen—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 57, for the relief of Doreen Jeanette Sibley Tirbutt—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 58, for the relief of Ida Norma Thompson Thornton—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 60, for the relief of Evangeline May Connelly Stervinou—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 61, for the relief of Olive Viola Olsson Ferguson—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 62, for the relief of Evelyn Ethel May Reich Macdonell—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 63, for the relief of Ernest Edward Lippiatt—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 64, for the relief of Elizabeth Butler Roberts Lambton—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 65, for the relief of Libby Margolese Smith—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 66, for the relief of Jean Elizabeth Thompson—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 67, for the relief of Isabella Hodgson McRae Edwards.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 68 for the relief of Marjorie Aileen Copping Ladouceur.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 69, for the relief of Annie Mildred Parnell Smellie.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 70, for the relief of Veronica Donnelly Hope Johnstone Shelley.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 71, for the relief of Irja Alina Agnes Vaisanen Shanahan.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 74, for the relief of Isabel Lindsay Mackay Dietz.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 75, for the relief of Edith Dean Michaels.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 76, for the relief of Maurice Michael.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 77, for the relief of Otto Hemlein.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 78, for the relief of Mary Josephine Jessop Croker.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 79, for the relief of Rose Lazar Nadigel.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 80, for the relief of Frances Clare Lynch Layton.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 81, for the relief of Robert Alfred Nall.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 82, for the relief of Juliette Adrienne Labrosse Renaud.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 83, for the relief of Jean Isabel Dalton Ryan.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 84, for the relief of Rose Elkin Steinman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 85, for the relief of Clinton Escott Vipond.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 86, for the relief of Alison McKinnon Palmer.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 87, for the relief of Ralph Wighton.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 88, for the relief of Claude Garcin Coffin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 89, for the relief of Bea Helen Taffert Levin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 90, for the relief of Elsie King Moorhouse.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 91, for the relief of William John Edgar McVetty.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 92, for the relief of Alfred John Holton.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 93, for the relief of William Howell MacDonald Brown.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 94, for the relief of Henrietta Elizabeth Forde Norrie.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 95, for the relief of Gaston Cartier.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 96, for the relief of Margaret Lillian McCorkell Baldwin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 97, for the relief of Hilda Wylie Bannister.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 98, for the relief of Sarah Goldberg Cohen.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 99, for the relief of Esther Mary Harding Breeze.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 100, for the relief of Jessie MacFarlane Boyle Smith.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 101, for the relief of Paul Jaeggin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bili No. 102, for the relief of Murial Agnes Martin Adams.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 103, for the relief of Edwin Theophilus Phillips.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 109, for the relief of Lillian May Alsop Mackenzie.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 110, for the relief of Robert Crawford Kirk.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 111, for the relief of Robert Thomas Jackson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 112, for the relief of Ernest Wright.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 113, for the relief of Theresa Sherpitis Morganti.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 114, for the relief of Omer Montpetit, junior.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 115, for the relief of Harold Robinson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 116, for the relief of Margaret Cote Truax.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 117, for the relief of Netta Cheyne Lee.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 118, for the relief of Bessie Letovsky Silverman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 119, for the relief of Percy Coleman Stuart.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 120, for the relief of Pearl Vesta Fields Hollenbeck.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 121, for the relief of Adele Kuznetz Lesser.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 122, for the relief of Joseph Alexander Oswald Mercier.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 123, for the relief of Michael Maturjiw, otherwise known as Michael Matwijow.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 124, for the relief of Eugenie Beatrice Smith Ricketts.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 125, for the relief of Hilda Mary Charlotte Kelly Smith.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 126, for the relief of Eileen Louise Thomas Bleakney.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 127, for the relief of Eugenia Drake Armstrong Newell.—Mr. Boucher.

Bill No. 128, for the relief of Muriel Aileen MacKeage Fewtrell.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 129, for the relief of Evelyn Marie Elliott McGrath.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 130, for the relief of Mary Nellie McGurk Stone.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 131, for the relief of Cipoire Segall Wurmbrand.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 135, for the relief of Violet Olive Magdalene Allchin Clark.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 136, for the relief of Victor Reid Murray.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 137, for the relief of Agnes Jane Irwin Everitt Dixon.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 138, for the relief of Peter Samuel Rosen.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 139, for the relief of Rose Waselevsky Balakirsky.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 140, for the relief of Sophie Wener Finestone.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 141, for the relief of Norma Mary Sharp Chapman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 142, for the relief of Douglas Wilson Bradshaw.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 143, for the relief of Muriel Amelia Dufty Rochet—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 144, for the relief of Ethel Ornstein Pfeffer—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 145, for the relief of Hilda Katz Delnick—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 146, for the relief of Emilienne Grinsell Daoust—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 147, for the relief of Alice Hamilton Peck Stevenson—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 148, for the relief of Doris Victoria Bellisle Page—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 149, for the relief of Sydney Beaver—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 150, for the relief of Gladys Kathleen Wilkins Todd—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 151, for the relief of Norma Elizabeth Jane Murray Hanko—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 152, for the relief of Bernadette Mayford Roy—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 153, for the relief of Ellen Irene Gertrude Preston Hastie—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 155, for the relief of Marjorie Winnifred Bearman Smeall—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 156, for the relief of Mary Winnifred Joyce Dick Dunford—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 157, for the relief of Eileen Ardis Locke Thompson—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 158, for the relief of Margaret Hamilton Bergeron—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 159, for the relief of Norma Marzitelli Rudzik—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 160, for the relief of Eileen Millar De Levi—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 161, for the relief of Hilda Constance Caroline Mosley Dwyer—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 162, for the relief of Louis Marcel Frigon—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 163, for the relief of Florence Nancy Maria Haworth Stewart—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 164, for the relief of John Bernth Jones, otherwise known as John Berth Jones—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 165, for the relief of Patricia Violet Puttock Bromby—Mr.. Maybank.

Bill No. 166, for the relief of Dorothy Hawkins Myers.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 167, for the relief of Evelyn Deltoff Moore.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 168, for the relief of Eveline Hache Groulx.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 169, for the relief of Annie Lucy Hurteau.—Mr. Boucher.

Bill No. 170, for the relief of Evelyn Alice Lancaster Chenoweth.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 182, for the relief of Robert Lussier.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 183, for the relief of Robert Rosaire Loiselle.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 184, for the relief of Marjorie Evelyn MacPherson Puley.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 185, for the relief of Sarah Rafferty Jackson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 186, for the relief of Ida Berman Zatz.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 187, for the relief of Patricia Ellen Burt Williams.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 188, for the relief of Charles Alfred Michel Kelly.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 189, for the relief of Pearl Summers Slater.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 190, for the relief of Aime Jacques. —Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 191, for the relief of Grace Evelyn Smith Copeland.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 192, for the relief of Jesie Gertrude Noel Magee.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 193, for the relief of John Luchuck. —Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 194, for the relief of Rhondda Blanche Peace Hurford Smith.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 195, for the relief of Mabel Grace Mattinson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 196, for the relief of Marcel Simonon.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 197, for the relief of Marian Susan Willson Roberts.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 198, for the relief of Jean Gainforth Grossman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 199, for the relief of Evelyn Mildred Cook Stone.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 200, for the relief of Lily Elizabeth Harris Cunningham.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 201, for the relief of Mildred Merica Ruth Goodreau Snyder.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 202, for the relief of Harry Powell. —Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 203, for the relief of Margaret Patricia Fairhurst Richards.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 207, for the relief of Evelyn Florence Esson Pugh.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 208, for the relief of Katie Rhoda Brick McGrath.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 209, for the relief of Louise Guiol Ghetler.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 210, for the relief of Georges William Curtis Johnson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 211, for the relief of Melville Mae Rundle Swinburne.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 212, for the relief of Ruby Weldrick Hunt.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 213, for the relief of Doris Shapiro Kolman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 214, for the relief of Mary Margaret Rider Brown.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 215, for the relief of Fennie Nettie Adelstein Waldman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 216, for the relief of Gustave Lucien Verhelle.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 217, for the relief of Ruby Campbell Matts.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 218, for the relief of Dorothy Kathleen Morrison Germain.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 219, for the relief of Sophie Radwolsky Closner.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 220, for the relief of Muriel Emma Wood Durrell.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 221, for the relief of William John Carmichael.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 222, for the relief of Guido Verdoni.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 223, for the relief of Ronald John Park.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 224, for the relief of Gloria Avon Roland.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 225, for the relief of Gilberto (Albert) Belmonte.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 226, for the relief of Mildred Lillian Flude.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 227, for the relief of Pauline Joan Hyde Murphy.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 228, for the relief of Alsye Mae Lissemore Lawrence.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 229, for the relief of Jessie Leonard Simpson Clunie.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 230, for the relief of Fern Catherine Kerr Ekins.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 231, for the relief of Lilly Elizabeth Ingborg Lindfors Crowhurst.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 232, for the relief of Romeo Richard.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 233, for the relief of Charles Augustus Dolling.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 234, for the relief of Charles Frederick McDowall.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 235, for the relief of Woolf (Robert) Cook.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 236, for the relief of Adele Brown Kerkofsky.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 237, for the relief of Eileen Heathcote Taschereau.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 238, for the relief of Molly Marcovitch Schwartz.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 239, for the relief of Betty Gertrude Bernstein Schreiber.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 242, for the relief of Margaret Joan Anstey Steven Hyslop.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 243, for the relief of Elly Zahn Kaminsky.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 244, for the relief of Naomi Joan Williamson Cantlie.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 245, for the relief of Matilda Jane Cumming.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 246, for the relief of Agnes Dowd Brown.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 247, for the relief of Ursula Catherine Tetreau Black.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 248, for the relief of Eleanor Edith McKecknie Martineau.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 249, for the relief of Jack Wallis. —Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 250, for the relief of Evelyn Margaret Morrison Cryer.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 251, for the relief of Frances Eileen Scribner Mackay.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 252, for the relief of Irene Laflamme Kattas.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 273, for the relief of Eileen Maude Gardner Richards.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 274, for the relief of Frances Audrey Gray Lacaille.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 275, for the relief of Aline Theoret Larose.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 276, for the relief of Margaret Betty Rollings Burman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 277, for the relief of Beatrice Dorothy Pountney Alker.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 278, for the relief of Margaret Jean Duff Dorval.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 279, for the relief of George Somerville Blackie Begg.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 280, for the relief of Lillian Guerasio Galardo.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 281, for the relief of Stewart Davidson Myles.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 282, for the relief of Dorothy Bradford Hurley.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 283, for the relief of Elsie McCormick Albers.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 284, for the relief of George Wilson Dyce.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 285, for the relief of Rita Johnson Cherrier.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 286, for the relief of Esther Cole Zeesman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 287, for the relief of Celia Yaffe Dubinsky.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 288, for the relief of Elsie Marlyn Garayt Johnson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 289, for the relief of Leone Rhea Leduc Metcalf.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 290, for the relief of James Arthur Ablett.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 291, for the relief of Goldie Slovinsky Tkatch.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 292, for the relief of Harold Fassett Staniforth.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 293, for the relief of Claire Morgan Lockner Middleton-Hope.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 295, for the relief of Rose Nemerofsky Silverstein.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 296, for the relief of James Albert Carruthers, otherwise known as James Albert Fell.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 297, for the relief of Ronald Edwin George.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 298, for the relief of Margaret Lena Bertha Dasen Scheffer.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 299, for the relief of Ethel Mary McKenzie Cramp.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 300, for the relief of Evelyn Alice Howard Smart.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 301, for the relief of Mary Margaret Tibbins Gogo.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 302, for the relief of Alfred Nelson Nickle.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 303, for the relief of Arthur Haigh MacGill.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 304, for the relief of Clinton Leslie Dobson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 305, for the relief of Bernard Stanley Bailey.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 306, for the relief of Archie William Young.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 307, for the relief of Olive Lever Sanborn Lead.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 308, for the relief of John Mackie.— Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 309, for the relief of Isabel Mercer Leboeuf.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 310, for the relief of Hilda Irene Gordon Lazarus.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 311, for the relief of Mary Margaret Bernice Walker Kennedy.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 312, for the relief of Gertie Rabin Bard.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 313, for the relief of Ruth Morrison Henderson Sidders.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 314, for the relief of Philip Berger. —Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 315, for the relief of Harold Swann. —Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 316, for the relief of Margaret Isabelle Curry.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 317, for the relief of Rosamond Edith Bean Crease.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 318, for the relief of Alma Mary Hanway Eccles.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 319, for the relief of Alberta Dorothy Olson Colby.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 320, for the relief of Clair Reginald McLaughlin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 321, for the relief of Eugene Klein. —Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 322, for the relief of Daniel Hudson. —Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 323, for the relief of Eileen Edna Paget Bray Dundas.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 324, for the relief of Jessie Goodis Markis.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 325, for the relief of Julia Luella Audrey Cleroux Babbage.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 326, for the relief of Mile Kristo Yoja, otherwise known as Stanley Vadic.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 327, for the relief of Anthony Wavroch.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 328, for the relief of Mary Magee Glasheen.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 329, for the relief of Mary Ann Clorenda Archer Richardson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 330, for the relief of Gladys May Kay Oliver.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 331, for the relief of Henry Thomas Matthews.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 332, for the relief of Ivy Stapleton Brown.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 333, for the relief of John William Sydney Jordan.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 334, for the relief of Pamela Mary Gottschalk Muckell.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 335, for the relief of Winnifred Doris Cleaver Wooley.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 341, for the relief of Eileen Francis Murphy Kerson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 342, for the relief of Joyce Kathleen Reynolds Swards.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 343, for the relief of Annie Fishman Minsk.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 344, for the relief of Muriel Alice Goddard Perkins.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 345, for the relief of Irene Elizabeth Burke Robinson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 346, for the relief of Gardner Hinckley Prescott.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 347, for the relief of Joseph Amedee Alexis Cousineau.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 348, for the relief of Mildred Verna Ruth Schnaufer Case.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 349, for the relief of Robert Ralph Tripp.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 350, for the relief of Charles James Langevin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 351, for the relief of Edward Frank Fulton.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 352, for the relief of Pauline Bertha Marwick Dallison.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 353, for the relief of Evelyn May McNaught Grandison.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 354, for the relief of Margaret Turner Shaw Ward.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 355, for the relief of Oliver Pierre Bernard Lagueux.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 356, for the relief of Hazel Mair Grant Rubin—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 357, for the relief of Doris Louise Dickson McMurray.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 358, for the relief of Ethel Florence Barr Shiells.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 359, for the relief of Gabrielle Augustine Gilberte Desmarais Creelman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 360, for the relief of Christos C. Koukouvelis.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 361, for the relief of Aime Bibeau.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 367, for the relief of Henry Eaton.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 368, for the relief of Lodie Kadei Nakel.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 369, for the relief of Margaret Sophie Bolenski Dubeau.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 370, for the relief of Marion Mapes Harvey Allinson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 371, for the relief of Frances Alice Egg Johnston, otherwise known as Frances Alice Egg Willey Johnston.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 372, for the relief of Selden Grant Stoddard.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 373, for the relief of Elmon Parker Law.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 374, for the relief of James Dewey, junior.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 375, for the relief of Peggy Alicia Stilwell Kneeland.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 376, for the relief of Alexander Monteith.—Mr. Croll.

Bill No. 379, for the relief of Evelyn Clara Woods Cross.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 380, for the relief of Minnie Braimaster Kazarensky.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 381, for the relief of Peter Moroz, otherwise known as Peter Morris.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 382, for the relief of Lorne Earl Barth.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 383, for the relief of Thomas Wynn Hayes, junior.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 384, for the relief of Claire Black Wolfe.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 385, for the relief of Anna Lovannah Theoret Wilson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 386, for the relief of Norma Lorraine Desrosiers.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 387, for the relief of Rose Jacobson Greenberg.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 388, for the relief of Guido Corbo.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 389, for the relief of Harold Ashton Hugh Roberts.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 390, for the relief of Mary Kalichman Pulver.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 391, for the relief of Gaston Dorval Lachance.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 392, for the relief of Donat St. Jean.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 393, for the relief of Sheila Sydney Doner Gordon.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 394, for the relief of Thomas Walter John Moon.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 397, for the relief of Edward Charles Barron.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 398, for the relief of Violet Eileen Lepine Tickner.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 399, for the relief of Jean Lawrence Ritchie.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 400, for the relief of Livio Quintino Fantacci.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 401, for the relief of Bertha Bercovici Hamer.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 402, for the relief of Ann Bogdanof Millichamp.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 403, for the relief of Beatrice Elman Perlman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 404, for the relief of Grace Emily Dawes Matheson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 405, for the relief of Gabriel Burszan.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 406, for the relief of Doris Phoebe Potter Potts.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 407, for the relief of Richard Andrew Frame.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 408, for the relief of William Page.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 409, for the relief of Louis Gertsman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 418, for the relief of Maud Mary Rose Denton.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 419, for the relief of Judith Bychowsky Sanders.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 420, for the relief of Marie Irene Joly Martineau.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 421, for the relief of Sam Pronman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 422, for the relief of Eva Greenblatt Thow.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 423, for the relief of Edith Norma Isaac Davidson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 424, for the relief of Ida Lottie Stubina Pollack.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 425, for the relief of Minnie Black Herman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 426, for the relief of Clifford Gilbert Adams.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 427, for the relief of Dallas Sara Barnes Millington.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 428, for the relief of Madeleine Agnes Joly de Lotbiniere Doucet.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 429, for the relief of Adeline Charlotte Simone Desjardins Teakle.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 430, for the relief of Margaret Blane Bowen Adair.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 431, for the relief of Mary Hrab Navrotzki.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 432, for the relief of Pierre-Ben-Danais Warren.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 433, for the relief of Ethel Florence Rhodes Pompetti, otherwise known as Ethel Florence Crowdy Pompetti.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 434, for the relief of Elisa Jamoul Hull.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 435, for the relief of Ernest Stanley Rundell.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 436, for the relief of Thelma Lillian Dalton Hilger, otherwise known as Thelma Lillian Dalton Goernert.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 437, for the relief of Mary Alice Berrigan Hamelin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 438, for the relief of Dorothy Mary Boyce Jackson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 439, for the relief of Edith Oberfeld Mintz.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 440, for the relief of Roger Lebeau.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 441, for the relief of Sheila Marcus Issenman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 442, for the relief of Zenobia Perrow Broadbent Emond.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 444, for the relief of Joseph Edmond Gerard Santoire.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 445, for the relief of Alderic Gemme.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 447, for the relief of Joseph Rose-alphee Oderic Dussault.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 448, for the relief of Dan Alonzo Dwight Wright.—Mr. Maybank.

Mr. KNOWLES: This is all-time high, is it not—348 at one crack.

HALIFAX

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RESULT OF BY-ELECTION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to the next order of business might I mention that I have a bulletin from Canadian Press which I believe the house will be interested in receiving, and which may serve to set at rest the minds of at least some hon. members. It is dated Halifax, July 14, and states:

The election of John Dickey, Liberal, in the Halifax federal by-election was conceded at 7.52 p.m. ADT tonight by the Canadian Press. With 100 polls out of 359 polls reporting the 32-year-old barrister had a total of 6,997 votes compared with 4,351 for A. A. McDonald, Progressive Conservative, his nearest opponent. C.C.F. candidate H. L. MacIntosh with 3,928.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR CREDITING TO C.B.C. GROSS AMOUNT OF MONEYS RECEIVED FROM LICENCE FEES

The house resumed from Saturday, July 12, consideration of the motion of Mr. McCann for the second reading of Bill No. 453, to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the bill before us

is an amendment to the Canadian Broadcasting Act. It is that paragraph (a) of section 1 of section 14 be amended to read:

The gross amount of the moneys received in each year from licence fees in respect of private receiving licences and private station broadcasting licences without deducting therefrom any costs of collection or administration.

The original paragraph read as follows:

(a) the moneys received from licence fees in respect of private receiving licences and private station broadcasting licences, after deducting from the gross receipts the cost of collection and administration, such costs being determined by the minister from time to time.

I am not rising now to deal with the merits of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Having listened to the debate so far, were I speaking on the merits of that organization I would say that the Canadian people are behind it, but are critical of it in connection with certain aspects of its administration. I am rising to oppose this bill on other grounds, chiefly the procedure of the government in getting financial assistance for this organization. I base my criticism on six grounds.

First, this is an appropriation bill on a wholesale scale. It is an appropriation bill for all the years this legislation will be in effect. Instead of the government coming forward and asking for financial assistance for this organization each year, as should be done, this measure is, in effect, a supply bill, a money bill, an appropriation bill, making available to this organization each year an amount equal to the cost of collecting the licence fees. The explanatory note states that that figure is $544,000 for the last year. My criticism is that if the government wishes to give financial aid to this organization it should present it in an appropriation bill each year, the same as is done with other items of expenditure which are not statutory.

My second criticism of the bill is that it changes the principle upon which the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was based. That principle was that the organization should carry its own weight, should pay its own expenses. In the past, a department of government has collected the licence fees and, after deducting the cost of collection, has remitted the remainder to the organization. What is proposed in the bill is that the whole amount collected shall go to the organization, and the cost of collecting becoming a burden upon the taxpayers of Canada. Up to now this burden has been borne by those who use the radio institution, the advertisers and those who have receiving sets. In this bill that principle is to be changed. Part of the burden is now being placed upon the Canadian people—the taxpayers. At the moment I am not saying that some money should not be given; I am simply stating that this is an appropriation bill, something which should come before this house each year, instead of being presented as the wholesale appropriation bill that this is.

My third criticism is that this action is in the nature of a hidden subsidy. This and other public organizations should not only stand on their own feet, but their record of costs should be clearly known to the Canadian people. If the government wishes to give half a million dollars a year to this organization, let it do so with an appropriation each year in the estimates, instead of passing a measure which will make this charge upon the taxpayers of Canada for all time to come or until there is some change in the act.

My fourth criticism is that practices of this kind tend to deceive parliament, tend to deceive the public and tend to encourage inefficiency. They deceive parliament in that each year we are not to be required to vote the yearly subsidy or grant to the C.B.C., an institution which up to now we have felt should carry its own weight. In the same manner it tends to deceive the public because each year this appropriation will not be brought so forcefully to our attention. It encourages inefficiency because the organization will get in the habit of leaning upon the government, upon the taxpayers for financial aid.

My fifth criticism is that this is an attempt to get more money for the C.B.C. by avoiding the passage of an annual vote of parliament. That observation overlaps on the others I have made, but it emphasizes what is being done by this procedure.

My sixth criticism is that this bill will increase the tax burden upon the Canadian people. Up to now the listening public and the advertisers have carried this institution. The government is now changing that policy. The government is now putting part of this burden on the taxpayers of Canada, all of whom may not be users of this institution.

My criticism is a criticism of government procedure. My criticism is of the government policy in changing this basis. My criticism is of a policy which does not keep clearly the exact business side of this organization before the Canadian people from year to year. It is my intention to support the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church). The criticism I have is one of a procedure which I consider to be unsound. I shall therefore oppose the motion and support the amendment.

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish at the outset to advert to certain remarks made in the chamber this afternoon by the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton). The hon. member made reference to a certain brief. He said it had been stated in the committee that the individual in question had not filed a brief before the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation when, in fact, he had. I have no comment to make one way or another upon his estimate of the value of the evidence given in the committee in answer to his questions, any more than to say that it is very easy to wait until a witness who has given evidence, which you do not like, is gone, and then charge him in his absence, at a time when he cannot defend himself, with endeavouring to withhold information from the committee. There was plenty of opportunity in the committee for that to be done if such was the intention of the hon. member. My only reason for drawing the attention of the house to that matter is that I consider it very cheap business to attack people who cannot defend themselves. What is quite different is the attempted charge made by the hon. member for Kamloops against an individual who can defend himself, and I shall speak of that for just a few moments.

I speaking about this brief, the hon. member read a letter. He gave the date of the letter; he did not actually say that I had received that letter and that brief in time to present it to the committee. But, up to the moment that I rose to ask him a question, I think it was clear in the mind of every person in this house that what he was endeavouring to convey was, that I had received this document in time to have presented it to the committee, and, that I had not done so. Whether he intended that or whether he did not intend that, I am sure it was clear to every person in the house. The manner in which he described the incident was such as to imply that the chairman of the committee had deliberately refrained from allowing the committee to consider that particular brief. I do not wish to say any more about that except what I indicated this afternoon, that there is utterly no truth in that suggestion.

Mr. FRASER: He never mentioned the chairman. He said the brief was not there.

Mr. MAYBANK: The hon. member probably has not been listening very closely.

Mr. FRASER: I listened to every bit of it.

Mr. MAYBANK: I have made the statement that until I rose this afternoon the implication was that the chairman had withheld the information, but for the purpose of making it all the more certain—

Mr. FULTON: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MAYBANK: There is no question of privilege. I submit it is not right that I should be continually interrupted.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has said there was the implication that he had suppressed the evidence. Since his charge is directed against myself, I say that there was no such implication, and there was no intention of making any such implication, as the record shows.

Mr. MAYBANK: I thank the hon. member for saying there was no such intention. My statement was that, after having read the letter with its date of July 9 and continuing to speak about the evidence not having been presented and remarking that the letter had been given to the chairman, without specifying the date on which it had been given to the chairman—

Mr. FULTON: I read the date, July 9.

Mr. MAYBANK: That was the last date mentioned. My statement was—and I think it was clear to the house at the time—that there was, whether intentionally or not, the implication in the hon. member's words that the chairman had withheld the information. Now the hon. member says that he did not so intend and I accept his statement of the denial of such intention.

Mr. FULTON: I have said there was no such implication and I repeat that statement.

Mr. MAYBANK: I do not agree with the hon. member about that. His manner of presenting the whole case was pretty clear at the time until he was caught out. If I had not risen at the time there never would have been any partial clearance.

I only wish to add this about that matter. This document was given to me after the committee's labours had ended. That was when I first saw it. There was nothing I could do about it. So far as giving a statement about it privately, as the hon. member suggested several times I might have done—

Mr. FULTON: Or publicly.

Mr. MAYBANK: Publicly or privately, and several times he emphasized "privately." In the first place, I do not suppose that anyone could spend his time running around these halls and hunting up the members of the committee privately and telling them what letters had been put in his hands. The

committee's labours had ended; and, so far as telling the members privately about the letter is concerned, I had not had time to read it, and even if I had tried to tell the members privately, I could not have caught up with the hon. member because he was absent from parliament at the time.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Where was he?

An hon. MEMBER: In Halifax.

Mr. FULTON: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Maybank) sought to convey that impression this morning and I did not contradict him. At the time the letter was given to him I was here in parliament and have been on every sitting day since. I had been in Halifax but had returned.

Mr. MAYBANK: I am glad that on the day the letter was delivered to me he was not in Halifax, but I do not suppose he knew where he was.

Mr. FULTON: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. member to withdraw those words. I have said I was here in Ottawa at the time the letter was delivered; I have been here ever since that time, and I repeat that statement.

Mr. MAYBANK: I do not think the statement which the hon. member has made just now means anything, because he has suggested he has been here since "that time", with no indication of what he means by "that time"; furthermore, he does not know when the letter was delivered to me. So it is, after all, just a bundle of words that is quite meaningless.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the hon. member who has the floor that he proceed with his speech. I think he should be satisfied with the statement of the hon. member for Kamloops.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member has stated his question of privilege and I think he should be satisfied.

Mr. FULTON: I must ask the hon. member to withdraw. I was here when the letter was delivered and I have been here every sitting day since. That is the plain truth and I ask the hon. member to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would ask hon. members not to act like children. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre stated that the hon. member for Kamloops was absent on such a day. There is nothing unparliamentary in that. It was the privilege of the hon. member for Kamloops to say that he was here in the house at the time, and I think he should be satisfied with having said that. I would ask the hon. member who has the floor not to argue the point further but to proceed.

Mr. MAYBANK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you will readily understand, I was not arguing at all. I was just being interrupted frequently with meaningless expressions. I merely wish to make it clear that no document was placed in my hands at any time when it was possible for it to be brought before the committee, and then, not given to the committee.

Having disposed of that, I want to turn to something else which has come up in the course of this debate. A great many detail items have been dealt with, and perhaps it might be well to mention one or two of them in passing, but I submit that the main idea in connection with the radio report and underlying this bill has not been touched on at all as yet, although from time to time members of the house on all sides profess to be agreed on this particular point.

Before dealing with that, I wish to refer to something that was said by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) in the course of his remarks. He made reference to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation going "in the red", losing money, and I think similar remarks were made by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore). We ought to remember, Mr. Speaker, that the financial record of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is not a bad one but rather that it is a very good one. It will be recalled that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation started out in the 1930's. It had no money to start with and borrowed money for capital improvements. The corporation paid all that money back with interest before payment was due. The record of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in a financial way is a very good one. We should remember that during the war there was a period when licence fees fell off. We should remember that licences did not increase year by year but became fewer, owing to the fact that radios could not be bought. It was in these circumstances that the corporation came to the point where there was a deficit in income. To any person who wants to be fair about the record—and I am not suggesting that the hon. members for Eglinton or Lethbridge did not desire to be fair; I say that they did not present quite comprehensive enough a picture in just making a few remarks about the corporation being "in the red"—the main point to keep in mind with reference to the financial record of the corporation is that it is good, not bad.

While I am on the subject, I wish to refer to what the hon. member for Lethbridge had to say.

Mr. LOW: It is the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell).

Mr. MAYBANK: I am sorry. I sometimes remember people coming from the places they mention and I keep on thinking of the hon. member for Macleod as coming from the fine city of Lethbridge, but I am sure he will not take offence. I shall try to be more accurate in the future. He made references to the financial record of the C.B.C. and at the same time spoke about the amount of money the private companies made. He spoke as if he thought what was in the report was a charge against the private companies for making so much money, and suggested, I think, that it was surely no crime to make money. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that to look at the report that way is to miss the whole point of that part of the report which deals with the financial records of the private companies. The report in that regard points out only that these companies would appear to be making a good deal of money and not paying a very large licence fee. After all, that is all it states. The report says there is a possibility the companies are making as many millions as are there disclosed, and making such profits by reason of the fact that they are granted a piece of a monopoly, and that it is quite possible private broadcasters are not paying as much as they ought to pay for the privilege of monopolistically giving out news and other forms of broadcasting over the air. I do not know what the position of the socialists may be, but I believe no person on this side objects to the private broadcasters making a good living, making a good return on their capital. As far as I am concerned, I am only too happy to see them doing well. However, if these companies are making a great deal of money by carrying on their particular type of radio broadcasting, and at the same time are getting certain benefits which come from the broadcast operations of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which is paid for largely by public money, it is not unreasonable to suggest that they should pay a higher licence fee. That is all there is to that part of the report. Certainly, for any person to cavil about it, seems to me, with all respect, to be rather unreasonable. Indeed, if the report, on insufficient evidence, said these men are not paying enough for their privilege; if it said that on insufficient evidence, of course the right of criticism would be there—I think the duty of criticism would be there—and I should hope that I would never set my name to a report that said any such thing as that. But it is quite clear that what the report does in fact say. It says what I have already indicated, namely, that it is quite possible these people ought to be paying more money. That is as far as it goes.

In view of the fact that some of the proceedings of the committee were called in question, I think I should say something on the matter. The hon. member for Macleod said that things moved too fast for him at a certain time. It is only fair to tell the house that what happened in that respect was this. When the committee's hearings came to an end, when it finished with what we jocularly called "the live talent" and went into executive session for discussion we met together with a view to discussing various questions—with a view to giving the drafting committee guidance as to the lines along which the report would be made. When that was finished the drafting committee went to work and drafted the report. We met and went over it clause by clause. I believe the hon. member for Eglinton was there at that time. I am not sure of that. I rather think the hon. member for Macleod was. He certainly was at nearly every meeting. He was seldom absent. I might just tell the house in an aside that there was a long time one day when he was the only person in the Tory-Socred opposition who was present; and, despite what one might call, if one can use the expression with respect to a committee, an immense majority against him, the advocacy that he made was so good that several important changes were made in the report. He was always there, and he was always fighting. I am sure he gained the respect of every person on the committee for the way in which he carried on the fight.

After the steering committee had passed the report on to the main committee we found this position. The hon. member for Kamloops was not there. The hon. member for Eglinton was there for a very short time, if he was there at all. I am told he was there for a short time but absented himself quite early. The hon. members for each of the constituencies represented by a Tory member were all absent. There was one exception. The Tory absentees apparently sent as their guard the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Ross), and he stayed there throughout the meetings. The hon. member for Kamloops was represented by the hon. member for St. Paul's. If there was anything about the report that he did not like he was silent about it, silent because he was either at a great distance or at some distance. I do not know how far away he was, but he was far enough away that we might be able to say his voice was silent.

Mr. MITCHELL: Wherever he was he did not do much good.

Mr. MAYBANK: That is true. The hon. member for Macleod said that one day things moved too fast for him. He asked whether I thought he had time to get a sandwich. I gave him the reply which he said I gave, "I suppose so," and he went away. But on that day the hon. member's idea of time was a little awry. I said to some person at the time that his idea of time was a great deal like the idea of distance which was harboured by the man who invented near beer. You recall that he was a poor judge of distance. I am reminded of my mentioning at the time to some of my colleagues that the hon. member for Macleod seemed to have lost track of time, because, while he may not think so today, he really was absent for most of the meeting, and this was most unusual for him. I suppose he fell into conversation while he was having that sandwich.

Mr. KNOWLES: It must have been a Dagwood sandwich.

Mr. MAYBANK: And he had a rather long session.

Mr. HANSELL: Nobody offered me any near beer with the sandwich.

Mr. MAYBANK: Many other statements have been made in the course of the debate. To mention many of them would take up too much time. I come to what I consider to be the real point at issue in all these radio debates. But first, I should like to say that I consider this committee has been acting as a policy committee instead of as a budgeting committee in the last couple of years. I submit, sir, that the real purpose of this committee is to examine the financial affairs of the corporation in just the way another committee examines the affairs of the Canadian National Railways. In the Canadian National Railways committee we never undertake to declare policy. Last year and this year we have been going much farther afield than I submit the committee should, and for this reason, if no other, that we are not as well equipped as a cabinet to determine the policy, and we have not at our hands the great deal of technical information that we ought to have. I have no complaint about the work that has been put upon us, but I believe people are likely to get the wrong idea about the nature of this committee's work. It does seem to me that if the committee is to make policy we shall be changing the whole legislative structure of the parliament of Canada and we shall have government by committee instead of by council. I submit that is not wise.

But whether we have the right to make policy or not, as members of parliament we certainly have the right to discuss it, and the question that has to be settled in all our minds here is this very simple one which came up in 1932 and earlier: "Is the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to be the favoured instrument of broadcasting in this country? Is the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to be the supreme chain broadcaster, or is it not? Are private stations to be allowed to exist and fulfil a community need, or are they to be allowed to expand into networks of national broadcasting?"

That is the thing that was basic when this institution was set up, and it still is. There is the consideration which has determined the committee, as to whether it would or would not recommend in favour of a regulatory body. Believing that for the reason that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is robust in the service of Canada, and that that is the main point at issue, the committee concluded that the easiest way of effecting that was to have the C.B.C. continue to exercise the functions it is exercising today.

I personally would have no objection to a regulatory board. I am not so strongly for it, but I would have no objections to it. If, however, I were writing a law establishing a regulatory body I would write it in such a way that it would be entrammeled about so that it could not do anything to injure the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. That is the crux. For example, I would entrammel it in the same way as the transport board is hindered from touching grain rates in western Canada. But of course what we had put before us was nothing of that sort. What we had put before us, and what the Tories promptly espoused, was the creation of a board which would be appointed by parliament and could be touched only by parliament, a board whose affairs could be reviewed only by parliament, subject to both houses of parliament, a body which should have all the powers possessed by the transport department and those possessed by the broadcasting corporation. In fact, they wanted to set up another body as strong as parliament, and when I learned that, I considered it would create a fascist organization.

Some persons, I believe the member for Macleod in particular, have made the statement that some members have their minds made up for them. The hon. member never spoke a truer word. Some people appeared

to have their minds made up for them right from the beginning. In fact, from the very second that the private broadcasters' brief was laid on the table, every Tory on the committee, and those associated with them, advocated that particular thing which was claimed in the brief. Their minds were made up for them all right. There is no question in the world about that. They came to the committee every day with prepared leading questions. If they were not briefed every evening they acted as if they were, and it shows how quick they were to pick up the point of view of those who desire to obtain private monopoly over radio. That is the position they took, and we might as well have this issue between the Tories and us cleared up now. The case is not one of socialism; it is not a case of government ownership of some industry which is usually run by private persons. This is a question as to whether or not we should control a monopoly, and on that I feel there should not be any doubt, any more than Mr. Bennett had doubt at the time he originally proposed the national set-up.

We have kept a monopoly over broadcasting, what I call country-wide broadcasting —that is, the network—and if the Tories now want to turn back and eat their own child, as some animals do, all right. Let us have the proposition clear, that the real issue in this matter is whether we shall have a private monopolistic network broadcasting or whether we shall not. All other matters fall into pale insignificance compared with that.

We can have a regulatory body as long as it is understood that the robustness of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation continues. We can have anything as long as we are first of all agreed upon something upon which we were at one time all agreed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while there are numerous subjects which are germane to the motion before us and which might be discussed, I know it is the desire to get on with other legislation. I am probably like the fellow who proposed to his girl and when she asked him why he did not say something more he replied that he had probably said too darned much already.

Mr. RODNEY ADAMSON (York West): If one may judge the remarks about the radio committee, it must be rather fun to be on the radio committee; it seems to be so full of prima donnas. The question which I propose to discuss for a few minutes was raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Maybank): Is the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to be the supreme broadcasting authority?

[Mr. Maybank.]

When the C.B.C. was set up it was supposed that, by the imposition of a licence fee, a tax on the private owner of a radio set, superior service would be provided to that of private stations. The radio fee was to enable this national instrument to provide better radio service. Now what is better radio service? I think Mr. Speaker, that better radio service must, in the final analysis, boil down to this—the service that is most acceptable to the Canadian radio listener.

I do not think we can say what is better theatre, what is better opera, what is better painting. The public must be the judge of what is better theatre, what are better methods, what is better public entertainment.

Let us see what we find in the Toronto district. The Toronto district is the best market in Canada; but, more than that, it is the most competitive and the most concentrated.

What do we find in the central Ontario district or Toronto district which comprises something over a million people concentrated within a twenty-mile radius? I want to quote the results of the Elliott-Haynes survey of Toronto stations. The figures I propose to give are the percentages of sets in use, turned to the stations in Canada. They are for the three months of January, February and March, 1947, published in April by the Elliott-Haynes Limited research organization which did work for the Department of Finance during the war. I should like to put these on *Hansard* in tabular form, but I shall read for the time being:

Elliott-Haynes Limited

Percentage of sets in use: Tuned to the stations indicated.

These figures taken for the three months of January, February, March, 1947, published in April by Elliott-Haynes Limited, research organization which did work for Department of Finance during war (survey on what induced people to buy bonds) and now takes surveys for C.B.C. and independent stations.

Name of Station	Percentage of Sets on Morning per cent	Afternoon per cent	Evening per cent
CBL	19·1	22·6	13·9
CFRB	25·9	20·3	35·0
CHUM	5·5	6·6	(not on air)
CJBC	10·0	4·3	4·6
CKEY	24·8	27·5	23·0
WBEN Buffalo	5·5	8·6	11·3
Others	9·2	10·1	12·2

Morning is 9 a.m. to 12 noon. Afternoon: 12 noon to 6 p.m. Evening is 6 to 10 p.m.

Morning and afternoon surveys were taken Monday through Saturday. Evening surveys were taken Sunday through Saturday.

Others include CHML, Hamilton; CKOC, Hamilton; WGR, Buffalo; WKBW, Buffalo; plus some New York and short-wave stations.

First four mentioned take 10 per cent of listeners in Toronto average over the period; with various of the "plus some . . . etc." . . .taking a quarter of one per cent, etc.

Figures are over-all averages for first three months of this year.

First, CBL: in the morning, 19·1 per cent; afternoon, 22·6 per cent; evening, 13·9 per cent. That is the listening audience on the percentage of radio sets in use.

CFRB, the private station, in the morning, 25·9 per cent; in the afternoon, 20·3 per cent, and in the evening, 35 per cent; nearly three times the drawing power in the evening of the key station CBL, in the Toronto district.

We now come to CHUM, a daylight station only: in the morning, 5·5 per cent; in the afternoon, 6·6 per cent; in the evening, not on the air.

Then we come to CJBC, the key station of the dominion network: in the morning 10 per cent; in the afternoon, 4·3 per cent, and in the evening, 4·6 per cent. I think it is significant that here is the key station of the C.B.C. in Toronto which does not have the drawing power of CHUM, a purely daylight subsidiary station.

Then we come to CKEY, a comparatively new station operating on a comparatively low power. Here we get the figures as follows: in the morning, 24·8 per cent; in the afternoon, 27·5 per cent, and in the evening, 23 per cent. Here we have two privately owned stations, according to an independent survey, out-listening and out-selling the C.B.C. stations; here we have them providing, on the basis of an independent survey, better service, and service of interest to the listening public, than the C.B.C. stations in the Toronto area, both of which are key stations for networks.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, who is providing the service? Are the private stations providing the service, or are the C.B.C. stations providing the service? Those who want to listen to CBL in the evening were 13·9 per cent; to CJBC, 4·6 per cent; to CFRB, 35 per cent; and to CKEY, 23 per cent. Those are the figures for the independent stations. But we come to another factor which is significant. We come to the fact that in Toronto, as in many other places, there is competition from the United States stations. I would just mention one, WBEN in Buffalo: in the morning, 5·5 per cent; in the afternoon, 8·6 per cent, and in the evening, 11·3 per cent. There you have an American station from Buffalo—a station on the N.B.C., I think, although it may be on C.B.S.; it does not matter which it is; it is on one of the chains—out-selling and out-drawing, almost by three to one, the key station of the dominion network. Here is a situation which surely shows that something is wrong with the C.B.C. This air is free. There is a preference of the people who are listening to the United States station, three to one, over the key stations of the dominion network. I have not said what is good and what is bad. Surely what is good must be based on what people want to listen to. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that before these extra powers are given to the C.B.C., considerable searching should be done, on the part of the C.B.C. and the government, into the service which is being provided by this government emanation. It may be that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation programmes are more intellectual, with higher quality music; but the question is, do they draw the listeners? I do not think there can be any other yardstick. From people who listen to the radio I understand that there are just as many soap operas and just as much, to use a better word, ballyhoo, on the C.B.C. emanation as there is on the private stations, particularly the United States private stations. I suggest that, before these powers are given to the C.B.C., considerable searching should be done.

If, as is asked, the wave lengths are changed, and if the dominion network takes over the wave length of CFRB, the most popular station in the whole area, by three to one, what will happen? There are a number of questions I should like to ask the minister responsible. First of all, if you change the wave length of CFRB and give it to CJBC, are you not running the danger of having an even greater number of your Toronto and southern Ontario listeners forced, by choice, to listen to the United States stations? Are you not driving the Canadian listener out of the Canadian air by changing these wave lengths? I suggest that you are running a terrible risk in doing this. In that connection I should like to ask the minister four questions: 1. Has the United States given its official consent to using the 860 kilocycle band in Ontario at a power of 50,000 watts or more? If so, has it demanded in return any other concessions; and, if so, what are those concessions? If not, what is the use of taking this frequency, since with it CJBC could not then increase its power as planned?

2. Is there a clause in the North American regional broadcasting agreement which would force Canada under certain circumstances to vacate the very favourable channel of 540 kilocycles now occupied by CBK, Watrous? Are there any secret agreements to this effect with the United States or Mexico? If so, why were these written?

3. What secret agreements, if any, exist, with either the United States, Mexico or Cuba in connection with any other Canadian channels?

4. Why are negotiations concerning wave lengths not considered public property in Canada, as they are in the United States, Mexico and Cuba?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that we have to judge this question on its merits. If the C.B.C. is, by test, providing a service, your Canadian listener will listen; he will demand it. If the C.B.C. is not providing that service, Mr. Speaker, wild horses will not get the Canadian public to listen to C.B.C. stations. The proof? An independent survey. That is true, not only in the Toronto area, but, I believe, right through Canada.

Mr. McCANN: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: I would point out that when the minister speaks he will close the debate.

Mr. KNOWLES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment.

Mr. McCANN: In closing this debate—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry, but I must draw to the minister's attention that there is an amendment before the house which I shall now put.

Amendment (Mr. Church) negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on second reading; when the minister speaks he will close the debate.

Hon. J. J. McCANN (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate I should like to make a few brief remarks about some of the things which have already been said in this discussion. It is generally known and understood that radio in this country and elsewhere is one of the big prizes in the current struggle for power by reactionary private enterprise. An agitation has been carried on in Canada as it has been carried on in the United States. Here an unscrupulous campaign has been carried on in an attempt to discredit the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and at the same time to expand commercialism.

During the debate I have been struck by the short memories of some hon. members opposite. For instance, several members of the Progressive Conservative party have said that they thought some new and separate board should be set up to regulate and license broadcasting. They are forgetting a basic principle to which their party long held, and which is that all broadcasting should be coordinated under a national system, for which purpose we must have some regulating power.

Let me say that there is nothing new about that principle. It was first established by parliament when the last Conservative government was in power. It was embodied in the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act of 1932. A commission was set up under that act, a commission which had even broader powers than the present corporation.

The main change in the act of 1936 was to set up a corporation to be independent of the government in carrying out the functions laid down, instead of the old commission set up by the Conservative government under the act of 1932, which had been right under the thumb of the government of that day.

In the following years, successive parliamentary committees reaffirmed the principle, and with the concurrence of Conservative members who were on the committees. I well remember that, because I had the honour of being chairman for several years of the committee investigating radio broadcasting.

In the last two years, certain private radio interests have been campaigning for a change in radio laws which they think would give them more freedom to make profit and to exploit the public through channels which they have been allowed to use. Some of my hon. friends seem to have decided to forget the principles of their party, have repudiated them, and have allowed themselves to become the champions of private interests. I presume that members of the Progressive Conservative party have been speaking for themselves, because neither this year nor last year, when a similar debate took place, have I heard the leader of that party declare as to what was the policy of the Progressive Conservative party.

Tonight when he spoke he referred to the fee. I believe that his criticism was entirely unfounded and that he has not the right idea with reference to how the matter will be handled. He said, as is correct, that there should be an appropriation bill for this amount of money. There will be. Each year there will be; and it will be in the estimates in order to cover the costs of administration. Probably this year, since it is too late for that estimate to come in the supplementary estimates it will appear in the further supplementary estimates which will be brought down at the end of the fiscal year. Each year there will have to be voted by parliament, and it will go into the appropriation bill, an amount of money to cover the costs of administration and of collection. So that I submit there will be an opportunity for discussion in parliament yearly with respect to matters pertaining to costs of collection and administration.

I want to reassert that the Liberal party has a distinct and clear policy with respect to

radio in Canada. We believe in a nationally owned, nationally controlled and nationally operated system of radio for all the people of this country. It will be nationally operated by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and nationally controlled by them, a corporation responsible not to the government but to parliament. That is a clear-cut definition of the policy of the Liberal party with respect to national radio; and I have yet to hear from the leader of the Progressive Conservative party what the policy of his party is on this matter. Every man in the party has a policy of his own as it suits his own interests or the interests of those for whom he is speaking.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: You have three ministers over there tinkering with radio.

Mr. McCANN: No, you cannot count correctly. There are two. It is not hard to count to three—one, two, three; the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) has nothing to do with radio. That has been told and it has been explained. I cannot understand the persistence with which hon. members opposite try to carry on arguments on something which they know is absolutely false.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): And I can give another one; the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) pays for it.

Mr. McCANN: Yes, and you pay for it too. This year the special committee, after hearing full evidence, decided to recommend against any basic change in radio law, and that consideration was much more thorough than has been suggested by any members of the opposition. I do not understand, however, why some had so little to say at the time of the final deliberations of the committee when there was plenty of opportunity to do so. Apparently they preferred to speak in the house, so that the Canadian Association of Broadcasters would know they were discharging their full duty toward that organization.

On the development of C.B.C. facilities, members of the Progressive Conservative party also seem to have very short memories. During the Havana treaty negotiations before the war, we obtained the use of certain class 1-A clear channels. When I say "we" I mean the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation or the people of Canada. These channels were expressly for high-powered stations already built or to be built into the national system. Plans for further high-powered stations to use these channels were stated publicly and were approved by parliamentary committees in the reports of which Progressive Conservative members have concurred.

During the war, naturally the corporation was unable to continue development of its technical facilities. It was absolutely impossible to get the transmitters and other technical equipment which would have been necessary in those years to carry on the expansion we had in view. Certain private stations, under the circumstances, were allowed to use these wave lengths provisionally at low power. Now some members of the opposition call it legalized robbery when the C.B.C. goes ahead with the original plans to make use of these wave lengths at high power.

I submit that it would be legalized betrayal of the Canadian people who own the national radio system if we did not proceed with the programme which we had in view prior to the war, and which was interrupted because of the war. It would be a legalized selling out of the public interest to certain private organizations if they were allowed to develop these clear channels at high power, instead of the national system, as was originally intended.

I must take strong exception to the allegations made by the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Jaques), who cast about charges of communism against certain individuals in a manner which, I submit, was quite unnecessary on the part of a member of the house. He spoke about Raymond Arthur Davies, who went to Russia as a free-lance journalist. At the time he was the only Canadian journalist there. The C.B.C., together with a number of leading publications in the United States and in Canada, accepted some material from him submitted by him. No material from him had been used by the C.B.C. for over a year and half.

Allegations relating to Mr. R. S. Lambert, a member of the C.B.C. staff, were brought before the special committee on broadcasting in 1944, and were thoroughly disproven. I think it is highly unfair for such allegations to be made again in this house at this time.

Matthew Halton, resident in Great Britain, is employed regularly by the C.B.C. Anyone without a completely distorted mind who has listened to his broadcasts and heard his critical remarks and analyses of Russian policy would know that he is far from being a communist.

Elmore Philpott is not a C.B.C. employee, but a well known Canadian commentator. I think he can take care of himself.

But I must again object to slurs being cast on individuals, especially employees of a public body, when there is no chance for them to be heard or to reply to such allegations.

The hon. member for Kamloops said that someone had suppressed a portion of the documents asked for in the committee relating to the application of Mr. Charles Shearer for a radio station in Ottawa. The chairman of the C.B.C. has asked me to deny this on his behalf. He has advised me what written material presented by Mr. Shearer to the board of governors was given to the committee just as it was in the files of the corporation; and that no statement was taken out of a folder in the corporation's possession, as the hon. member for Kamloops suggested. I think the hon. member is man enough to accept that denial by the chairman of the C.B.C.

Mr. FULTON: The letter from Mr. Shearer is on the record and will speak for itself in that regard.

Mr. McCANN: Several opposition speakers have admitted that the national radio system needs further funds to carry on its service. Even the leader of the opposition admitted that tonight, but he went a lot farther in the election of 1945. His policy at that time and that of his party was that there should be no fee at all, that it should be paid entirely out of the moneys of the state. I submit that this bill is a sensible way of providing extra funds in the face of rising costs. There is no particular reason why licence fee revenue going to the C.B.C. should be diminished, as at present, by certain costs of administration of a government department. Any members voting against this bill will be simply voting against the continuation of good service by the national broadcasting system.

Motion agreed to on division, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Moneys received to be deposited in bank.

Mr. HANSELL: There is just a question or two I should like to ask the minister. What we are doing virtually by this bill is to call upon the public treasury for a sum in the neighbourhood of half a million dollars. That being so, I think we have a right to expect an answer to one or two questions. The other day the minister said that the cost of talent in the way of artists and writers had increased by about sixty per cent. He did not point out that artists' fees are, in the main, borne by the sponsors and not necessarily by the radio stations. I would not want him to leave the impression that, because artists' fees have risen sixty per cent, the artists appearing on C.B.C. programmes are therefore taking sixty per cent more money out of the C.B.C. That is hardly right. If the minister has the figure, would he tell us the total amount paid by the corporation to artists and writers?

While the minister is looking up the answer, may I say that I listened to his closing remarks with some interest. He proceeded to take apart the hon. member for Eglinton; he then attempted to take apart the hon. member for Kamloops; he also attempted to take apart the hon. member for Wetaskiwin, but he has left me standing here perfectly whole. I feel slighted. I can come to only two conclusions. Either my speech was of such a character and the facts were there that he could not take it apart or else—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I dislike to interrupt—

Mr. HANSELL: I was just waiting for the minister.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We had a long discussion on second reading of the bill, and now I think hon. members should confine their remarks to the section before the committee.

Mr. HANSELL: That is all right; I was kind of filling in time. I thought I saw the minister indicate to his officials to come into the chamber as they usually do.

Mr. McCANN: Artists' fees for programmes for 1946-47 were $2,966,000. What the hon. member says is quite correct; a lot of fees are paid for commercial programmes, but these are the amounts paid for sustaining programmes. The statement which I made is correct, that fees to artists have gone up by sixty per cent.

Mr. HANSELL: We are being asked virtually to vote half a million dollars by this bill, and I do not feel like casting my vote for another half million dollars until I am satisfied with the present arrangement. There is one thing I have not been able to discuss. I want to ask him, in what way would the effectiveness of the broadcasting corporation be decreased by having a separate regulatory body?

Mr. McCANN: I do not personally see any need for any more regulation than there is at the present time. The suggestion is worth while canvassing that within the corporation itself there might be an operating division and an executive division, and probably at some future time that system might be worked out. But this stage of development of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation when it is attempting to carry out a long-range programme that was interrupted by the war is, I submit, no time for change.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I do not understand what the minister has just stated. I ask this simple question: Why does he not consider it fair to have an independent body?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question of an independent body has been thoroughly discussed and the committee must now confine itself to the amendment, which provides that the licence fees go direct to the corporation.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): The minister himself just mentioned that as part of his answer.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot permit this discussion to go on after the lengthy discussion we had on second reading.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): It is not a discussion; it is just a question I am asking, a very simple one. I ask the minister why it would not be fair to have an independent body just as there is for the railways. Why should the C.B.C. be both an operating and a regulatory body when it is regulating its competitors?

Mr. McCANN: I have heard that question discussed of having a board something like the board of transport commissioners, but the cases are not comparable at all. There are not two sets of broadcasting in this country. The people who have the frequencies for commercial broadcasting have them on a yearly basis. They belong to all the people of this country and, according to the present legislation, any of those frequencies can, if required, be taken over at any time by the national system. That is an entirely different thing from what obtains in connection with the railways. The board of transport commissioners would not dare to say that the Canadian National should take over the Canadian Pacific. If the hon. member will recall, the Canadian National system was absorbed because it was bankrupt and somebody had to take it over.

Mr. FULTON: If I might reply to one statement made by the minister with reference to the chairman of the board of governors—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is finished.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I would ask the minister a question. By how much would the commercial programmes have to be increased in amount so that the C.B.C., after paying depreciation and other charges, would be able to carry on without a licence fee?

Mr. McCANN: Where would the hon. member suggest the money should come from?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I asked the question, by how much would the commercial programmes have to be increased?

Mr. McCANN: Nobody can tell you that.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The clause we have before us reads:

> . . . The gross amount of the moneys received in each year from licence fees in respect of private receiving licences and private station broadcasting licences without deducting therefrom any costs of collection or administration.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: How are we to find out whether or not this law should be passed unless the minister is in a position to answer a question regarding revenue?

Mr. McCANN: I will give you an answer immediately.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: A moment ago the minister said he could not answer.

Mr. McCANN: The hon. member knows the figures as well as I do.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: He is getting help now.

Mr. McCANN: The total operating expense of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation last year was $5,878,000. There was a deficit of $70,000. The hon. member can add those two figures for himself.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Was depreciation allowed for?

Mr. McCANN: No. Add those two figures and you get the revenue required for the corporation to come out even. The revenue from commercial broadcasting was $1,786,000. The answer would be the difference between $5,948,000 and $1,786,000, plus depreciation, and the depreciation on equipment is at a very high rate, as high as twenty per cent on costly technical equipment. It would probably run in the neighbourhood of eight or nine million dollars.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The minister, after he had the assistance of the chairman of the committee, was able to answer that question, which brings me to one subject which has not been discussed and which I consider pertinent, namely, the degree to which the commercial side of the operation of C.B.C. is in effect today. Here is the surprising thing. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar asked a question with a view to finding out how much CFRB had been devoting to commercial advertising and the like and took that as a yardstick for the other private stations. He

also asked for a break-down showing C.B.C.'s figures regarding commercial broadcasting. The strange thing about it is this, that forty-five per cent of the schedule of CFRB is commercial and, according to rumour, it is a very profitable station.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member is not going to discuss private stations now. This amendment has nothing to do with private stations.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is my fault, Mr. Chairman, if I did not make myself clear.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is a wonderful thing when you can get a word of approval from the other side for anything said on this side.

Mr. MAYBANK: On a point of order, may I say that if the hon. member is always as frank we shall always be glad to applaud.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am not going to get into an argument over that because, after all, the chairman of the special committee had his day today. I was saying that forty-five per cent of CFRB's schedule is commercial, and that private station is entirely dependent on commercial revenue.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would hope that the hon. member will not discuss the private stations on this clause.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am just trying to show that with three tinkers among the ministry looking after radio, C.B.C. does not fare very well, and I was just pointing out the difference between C.B.C. and a private station having forty-five per cent of its entire schedule commercial and thereby making a profit, whereas C.B.C. has only thirty-one per cent of its programme commercial and it requires more money from parliament.

Mr. McCANN: You know the reason.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Certainly I know the reason—the fact that there are three ministers concerned with radio.

Mr. McCANN: That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The minister asked the chairman of the special committee, and then he asks me.

Mr. McCANN: I did not know he was there. We are not as wise as you are.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is one thing the minister can say.

Mr. McCANN: We will admit that immediately.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is fine. The situation is this. We had it in connection with the statement made before the committee by one of the officials of the Department of Transport. He gave an *ex parte* statement setting out the views of the government. He must have set them out, since he is the controller of radio, and yet the Minister of National Revenue repudiated that statement.

Mr. McCANN: I did?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. McCANN: I never made any comment on it, one way or the other.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Did you accept it?

Mr. McCANN: I am answering your statement.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. We are not dealing with the report of the radio committee; we are simply dealing with the amendment. The report has been discussed and I hope we do not get into it at this time.

Mr. HACKETT: Mr. Chairman, please do not shut off the discussion until I have a chance to ask a question. I want to ask the minister what he meant when he said that an appropriation bill would be brought in each year. I think a fair interpretation of what he meant was that an appropriation bill would be brought in for the amount of the cost of collecting the four or five million dollars.

Mr. McCANN: That is exactly what I said.

Mr. HACKETT: Is the corporation to receive the amount twice? Under the amendment it is to receive it directly from the Minister of Finance. As the law now is, the corporation receives the amount collected, after there has been deducted from the gross receipts the cost of collection and administration. If the amendment carries the C.B.C. will receive the gross amount.

Mr. McCANN: That is right.

Mr. HACKETT: Therefore the corporation will receive direct from the Minister of Finance $500,000 odd or whatever it would cost to collect these fees. If an appropriation bill is to be brought in for another amount it seems to me that the corporation will be receiving two amounts. I ask the minister if he will be good enough to explain.

Mr. McCANN: It is not very hard to explain; if the hon. member will pay attention I think even he can understand.

Mr. HACKETT: If the minister is in that mood we may have a little fun yet. I have asked him a simple question.

Mr. MACKENZIE: You have had lots of fun all day today.

Mr. McCANN: The money that is collected from the private licensees and from commercial licences is collected by the Department of Transport, radio division, which comes under the supervision of the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply. By an order in council these duties were transferred to him.

Mr. HACKETT: From the Minister of Finance?

Mr. McCANN: No, the Minister of Finance has nothing to do with it at this stage. When the fees are collected there is deducted the equivalent of thirty-five cents for the commission which is paid to those people throughout the country who sell the radio licences. In addition to that, there are certain administrative costs. If this bill passes, all that fee of $2.50, or $2 as the case may be, because there is a difference in the amount that is charged, will go to the credit of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. A battery set owner pays only $2 and the owner of an electric set pays $2.50. All of that will be put by the Minister of Finance to the credit of the broadcasting corporation, and according to the Canadian Broadcasting Act these moneys are paid by the Minister of Finance to the broadcasting corporation as they are collected. Yearly there will be an item in the costs of the Department of Transport, radio division, which will cover the amount of money which they have to pay in commission to private individuals who collect the fee and for the administration costs. That will be passed as an appropriation every year as we pass the estimates, and it will be incorporated in the money bill which comes before parliament and is passed when all the estimates have been passed.

Mr. HACKETT: Will the minister say whether the amendment which is now occupying the attention of the committee is not sufficient justification for the payment for all time of the total fees, whether it be $2 or $2.50 collected from the users of radio.

Mr. McCANN: Certainly it will.

Mr. HACKETT: In that event, why should there be any appropriation bill for that particular amount? As I understand it, there may be an appropriation bill for other amounts, but for the specific amounts need there be any appropriation bill?

Mr. McCANN: How would parliament vote the money to pay the commission which goes to private individuals who sell radio licences, or to the costs of administration of that particular department, if it were not brought up as an item in the estimates to cover that particular expense?

Mr. HACKETT: I thought we would have a statutory appropriation which would avail for all time and which would not come up each year in the estimates.

Mr. McCANN: One of the reasons why you could not have a statutory appropriation is, in my opinion, that the amount is not constant.

Mr. HACKETT: Not constant?

Mr. McCANN: It would vary from year to year, depending on the number of radio licences which are issued and other cost factors which enter into the administration of that particular branch.

Mr. BRACKEN: I do not think the minister is making the position clear if this measure passes, then the government may, in its details of expenditure for next year and later years, have an item for an amount comparable with this, but that will have been passed by this law as a statutory proposal—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BRACKEN: —and being such, it does not have to be passed by the house. It is there and cannot be discussed but does not need to be. That is what I was trying to say earlier this evening. This is an appropriation measure, the same as the act requiring the payment of interest on the debt. It is indicated in the estimates as having been provided by statute. You may put it in the estimates; it may receive some consideration, but it does not have to be passed by the house at that time.

Mr. McCANN: The item in the estimates will have to be passed.

Mr. BRACKEN: The item is there simply because, while it may have cost you $540,000 this year, it may cost you $1 million next year, but still the statutory appropriation may be—

Mr. McCANN: Statutory to the extent that that money goes to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, but it is not statutory to the extent that the Department of Transport are reimbursed for their expenditure in connection with the collection of the fees.

Mr. BRACKEN: It is statutory to this extent, that it does not have to be passed by the house each year. That is the point I made

this afternoon and the point the hon. member for Stanstead is now making.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I think there is some slight confusion there. It is statutory to the extent that it concerns the broadcasting corporation; it will not have to come before parliament to get it; it will have it by virtue of the statute, but the Department of Transport will have to have in its estimates votes to provide it with the money which it will be required to spend to do the collecting. It will not be an item to be voted to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, but it will be an item to be voted to some department to enable that department to do the work.

Mr. BRACKEN: The only important point is whether, later on, the house can alter the amount when voting supply. With this statute before it, this house cannot alter the amount that may be in the estimates next year or any later year. That is my point. This is an appropriation bill for all time as long as this amendment is in force.

Mr. McCANN: To the corporation.

Mr. HACKETT: May I ask the minister this question. If, as he contends, there must be an appropriation each year, then what is the purpose of amending the act? If each year there must be brought in an appropriation in aid of the broadcasting corporation, why not do it each year? Why do we go about it in this roundabout way? I would suggest that, if the minister's interpretation be correct, the purpose of the act has been defeated, because we shall have to bring in an appropriation act each year for the amount that is to be saved the broadcasting corporation by not having to pay the cost of these fees.

Mr. McCANN: Section 14 of the act provides:

> The Minister of Finance shall deposit from time to time in the Bank of Canada or in a chartered bank to be designated by him, to the credit of the corporation: (a) the moneys received from licence fees in respect of private receiving licences and private station broadcasting licences, after deducting from the gross receipts the cost of collection and administration, such costs being determined by the minister from time to time.

The full amount of the fee, as long as it is $2.50, will go to the corporation. There will be no change there. But it is easy to understand that the amount of commission which is paid may be smaller or greater and that the administrative expenses of that part of the department that deals with it may fluctuate. That will be a varying amount from year to year and will occur as an item in the estimates to be voted by parliament when the estimates of the radio division of the Department of Transport are brought up.

[Mr. Bracken.]

Mr. HACKETT: That being so, what is the purpose of this amendment?

Mr. McCANN: So that, instead of receiving $2.15 out of every $2.50 paid, the corporation will receive the full amount of $2.50 and such other licence fees as are paid by private stations.

Mr. TIMMINS: As regards the thirty-five cents payable to the Department of Transport, is that amount payable year after year, from every licence fee, or only where the collector goes around to make collections? Do we all have to pay?

Mr. McCANN: You pay $2.50; the fellow who sells you the licence gets twenty-five cents, and the other ten cents represents administrative expenses.

Mr. TIMMINS: When you go to the post office or where the government agency is, is there a 35-cent deduction there too?

Mr. McCANN: No.

Mr. HANSELL: There is one point under discussion where I do not quite agree with my Conservative friends. It may appear that we are close together on matters of radio, but this is one thing where I do not agree with them. I do not know that I want to see that item, which yearly will be included in the estimates, made statutory. I would rather have it come before parliament every year and have the appropriation voted on, giving us an opportunity to scrutinize the matter here. If it is statutory it is only by common consent that we can get to discuss that particular item. Does the minister agree with the statement made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar on second reading when he said that the privilege afforded independent stations over the years have endangered the whole future of the C.B.C.?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. McCANN: I will agree with that statement.

Mr. HANSELL: Will the minister say in what way the future of the corporation is endangered?

Mr. McCANN: Because it defeats the very objects for which the C.B.C. was set up. It was distinctly indicated what the particular job of the private stations would be.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. This discussion is out of order.

Mr. HANSELL: On a point of order, may I make this suggestion. We could have asked these questions on the resolution stage; but to accommodate the minister and the house

we agreed that the resolution might go through without discussion, on the understanding that we should be allowed to fulfil our duty. We cannot ask questions while Mr. Speaker is in the chair. We cannot ask questions until the bill is in committee, and therefore I would suggest that these questions are in order.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I appreciate the position the hon. member finds himself in; but, after all, we are dealing with a specific amendment to the act, and in committee members must confine their remarks to the amendment. This amendment has nothing whatever to do with private stations. Hon. members were given full opportunity to discuss the report of the committee and also the amendment.

Mr. HACKETT: The hon. member for Macleod has misinterpreted the attitude of the official opposition. They do not favour the statutory method, as he seems to think.

Mr. JACKMAN: Why does the minister resort to this method of collection, which is about fourteen per cent on $2.50, or thirty-five cents? Surely the cost of collecting the revenue of the dominion through the minister's department does not approach anywhere near fourteen per cent.

Mr. McCANN: I do not resort to anything. I have nothing to do with collecting it at all, nor has the C.B.C. The licensing authority, which is the radio division of the transport department, has adopted this method and if someone could suggest a better method it would be welcomed. In the old country the collection is made through the post office department. I have canvassed the situation myself and I do not know that there is any better method. If anyone were ingenious enough to invent some sort of lock that could be turned on when people paid their licence fee and turned off otherwise, that person would make a fortune. If the hon. gentleman could suggest a better method we would be glad to have it.

Mr. JACKMAN: What is the cost of collection in the United Kingdom?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. That has nothing to do with the bill.

Mr. HANSELL: I am not going to hold up the committee; but, for the purpose of knowing where we stand in the future, we are going to ask questions on the resolution stage, because we agreed to let it go on the understanding that we would be able to get the information later.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member wishes to have a discussion of that sort he will have to do it on third reading.

Mr. HANSELL: I am giving warning now that I am not creating a filibuster when I stand to speak on third reading. I want that understood.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It will not do any good.

Mr. BLACKMORE: What do they mean when they say we cannot ask questions?

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. McCANN moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): I do not intend to make a forty minute speech, but before this bill passes I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have not had an adequate opportunity in this house of questioning the government on the radio policy in Canada. We have had an opportunity of speaking to a bill, but we have not had an opportunity of questioning the government. When this bill was in the resolution stage, we thought we should like to accommodate the government and the house by letting the resolution go through without questioning. When we reached second reading of the bill, we had an opportunity of speaking tonight without questions being asked or answered. When the bill came into committee stage we could not ask the questions we wanted to ask there. So I do not know where on earth we are to ask the questions and still have them on record. The minister in the debate on the bill said that an opportunity of weighing evidence in respect of radio was given in the last sittings of the radio committee. While that is partly true, the minister knows very well that in those sittings no record was kept. So that the only place we have in which to ask questions and draw out from the government the answers we want on radio policy, and at the same time get them on the record, is in this house; and, as I say, we have not had an opportunity to do that. Some of us, Mr. Speaker, will have to remember that, and put it in the book of remembrance. When these matters come before another session of parliament, we may not be quite so liberal in accommodating the government or the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

An hon. MEMBER: On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

87. To provide for transportation, dressing and dyeing, and other expenses incidental to receiving and disposing of fur seal skins accruing to Canada pursuant to provisional fur seal agreement between Canada and the United States by exchange of notes dated December 8 and 19, 1942, $400,000.

Mr. McLURE: I think the minister might give the committee a little information with regard to this item. It is a revenue-producing item and it would be worth while for the committee to hear about it.

Hon. H. F. G. BRIDGES (Minister of Fisheries): This item has already been mentioned in previous years. As a matter of fact, it is the only branch of the fisheries department which makes a profit of any kind, and it arises out of the pelagic sealing treaty between Canada and the United States. Under the agreement, in the wording of this appropriation, Canada receives twenty per cent of the fur seal skins taken annually at the Pribilof islands. In 1946 the total take was 64,523 skins, of which Canada's share was 12,905. Of this number, 3,230 have been sent to London and 9,675 to St. Louis for processing and dyeing. This appropriation provides for the expense of transportation to and from processing plants, for processing and dyeing, for customs duty and taxes, for auctioneer's fees, and miscellaneous items such as Canada's share of blubbering costs, packing barrels, et cetera. In 1946-47 the net revenue to the Department of Fisheries was $446,835.93. In addition to that, there was the revenue to the Department of National Revenue.

Item agreed to.

88. To provide for the destruction of harbour seals, $30,000.

Mr. McLURE: What is the amount of bounty paid for the destruction of harbour seals?

Mr. BRIDGES: It is now $5 per seal.

Item agreed to.

Special—

89. To provide for the extension of educational work in cooperative producing and selling among fishermen, $56,000.

Mr. STUART (Charlotte): I think this is the only item under which I can speak about supervision. During the past few years, particularly during the war—

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. BRIDGES: On what point is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. STUART (Charlotte): The supervision of canneries.

Mr. BRIDGES: I think the hon. member can find an item in the supplementary estimates under which he can speak on that subject.

Mr. STUART (Charlotte): Is there one there?

Mr. BRIDGES: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Special—

90. To provide for the administrative expenses of the Fisheries Prices Support Act, 1944, $60,000.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: What amounts have been paid out under the Fisheries Prices Support Act, 1944, and to whom have they been paid?

Mr. BRIDGES: Nothing has been paid out to date.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Has the act been put into operation?

Mr. BRIDGES: As yet the act has not been put into operation. It will be put into operation in the course of a day or two.

Mr. COLDWELL: Has the board been appointed?

Mr. BRIDGES: The board will be appointed in the course of a day or two. No doubt it would have been appointed before, but I must confess I was a little bit tired of hearing of anything we did alleged as being done in connection with the Halifax by-election. The appointments will be announced in a day or so.

Mr. KNOWLES: What are the latest results in that by-election?

Mr. BRIDGES: I cannot tell the hon. member that.

Item agreed to.

733. Departmental administration — further amount required, $48,087.

Mr. BRIDGES: Under this item the hon. member for Charlotte can raise the matter to which he referred.

Mr. STUART (Charlotte): During the war, when the demand for canned fish and other foods was great, it was noticeable on the Atlantic coast that, to a certain extent, quality was neglected for the sake of quantity. At the present time the mode of inspection of the fisheries department is to take samples of canned goods from all parts of the mari-

time provinces. They are sent to Halifax where they are examined and the report comes back to the canners. I fail to understand why this practice is followed because, while the county of Charlotte is not great in size, during the war there were more canned fish packed in that county than in all the rest of the maritime provinces put together. Still we had to go through the same old formula of sending the fish from the different canneries in Charlotte county to Halifax, where they were examined and then brought back. It would be more beneficial to the canners in that section if some way could be devised of examining the fish on the spot.

My suggestion would be that inspection should take place before the fish are put into the cans. I think it is a wrong idea to wait until they are processed or canned, and then taken for inspection. If anything happens, and particularly in respect of the small canners, a total loss is suffered; whereas, if examinations were made before the fish were canned, the canner would have some protection.

Then, another matter: A short time ago a man in the maritime provinces received an order for canned sardines from a country to which we had never shipped sardines before. Samples were sent overseas, and immediately the order came back for several thousand cases. Because of haste in getting the shipment overseas, the canner took sardines which were canned in other sections of the province and shipped them overseas. The result was that those who received them were dissatisfied with the type of goods they received, and there was no repeat order. My suggestion is that we should be much more careful with our inspection in canneries. During the war every man who could get into the canning business wanted to can sardines or other fish. But it has come to the time when, with the competition we shall have to meet in years to come, we shall have to be much more careful with our quality if we wish to compete with other countries of the world.

Item agreed to.

735. Educational extension service, including grant of $1,200 to the Lunenburg fisheries exhibition, additional to the amount provided for in item 78 of the main estimates—further amount required, $1,200.

Mr. McLURE: Is the educational work to be continued as it was last year? What results were obtained last year? How many men were appointed to do the job of inspection?

Mr. BRIDGES: My hon. friend must be referring to the wrong item. This is a vote of $1,200 to the Lunenburg fisheries exhibition, in addition to the amount provided in the main estimates. It has to do with item 78, which is already passed.

Item agreed to.

736. Fish culture—further amount required, $28,000.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Is this for the construction of a building, or for some particular project?

Mr. BRIDGES: For the erection of a hatchery which was destroyed by fire in New Brunswick in 1934, and until this year had not been replaced.

Mr. MacNICOL: What programme of fish culture is carried out for the great lakes?

Mr. BRIDGES: The Ontario government administers its own fisheries. We take no active part in fish culture there.

Item agreed to.

Fisheries research board of Canada—
737. Operation and maintenance — further amount required, $20,000.

Mr. HAZEN: I am puzzled by one item in the details at page 28 of the further supplementary estimates—"other pay-list items, $50". What is that for?

Mr. BRIDGES: This is in connection with work being done by the fisheries research board at the request of the Department of Mines and Resources in what is known as the eastern Arctic expedition, whereby we are trying to make inquiries and studies for that department in connection with the conservation of fish in that area so that the Eskimos may use the fish as food for themselves.

Mr. STUART (Charlotte): I should like some information with respect to living allowances and salaries for those in the employ of the fisheries research board.

Mr. BRIDGES: They are paid the prevailing rates of wages.

Mr. STUART (Charlotte): Why is there a distinction between employees of the research board and those of the fisheries department? I know of men down there who have been in the employ of the Department of Fisheries for many years. They are obliged to be away from home as much as or more than the employees of the research board. At the same time, one is allowed a living allowance and the other is not. What is the explanation?

Mr. BRIDGES: Those who are in the employ of the Department of Fisheries are permanent employees and their salaries are supposed to be in line with what permanent

employees are paid, whereas those in the employ of the fisheries research board are temporary employees.

Mr. STUART (Charlotte): Why is it that employees of the Department of Fisheries who operate on the British Columbia coast are paid a living allowance, while those on the Atlantic coast are not? Why is there discrimination?

Mr. BRIDGES: It depends upon the size of the boat. They are paid the same on both coasts.

Mr. WINTERS: I should like to ask whether men who are employed by the fisheries department are eligible for superannuation, and whether men who work on the fisheries patrol boats are eligible for the same sort of payments.

Mr. BRIDGES: Employees of the fisheries research board do not as yet come under the Civil Service Superannuation Act, but I hope they will in the not too distant future.

Mr. WINTERS: Will the men on the fisheries patrol boats be given the same consideration with respect to superannuation?

Mr. BRIDGES: All one can say is that consideration might be given to it, but it is a difficult question to work out by virtue of the length of time they may have been working for the department in that area.

Mr. STUART (Charlotte): On another occasion I brought to the minister's attention the case of a veteran of the first great war who is now employed by the fisheries department. I know that in 1946 his take-home pay as one of the crew on the boat was $55 a month. At the same time I know of young men in the employ of the research board who are making more money the first year than is this man, who has been there for twelve years. It seems unfair that older employees of the department should not receive the same consideration as newer employees are getting. These newer employees not only get better wages; they get living allowances as well.

Mr. BRIDGES: There is not an employee on one of our boats whose remuneration is only $55.

Mr. STUART (Charlotte): I said his take-home pay was that, but he gets less than $100 a month. This man is a good seaman; he has been on the boat for a long time, but he is getting less than $100 a month. Younger men with practically no experience on the water have been employed by the research board in the last twelve to fifteen months and are receiving more money than this man who has been employed for ten or twelve years.

Mr. BRIDGES: We are endeavouring to adjust a lot of those rates.

Item agreed to.

738. Construction and improvements and to authorize commitments against future years in the amount of $75,000—further amount required, $100,000.

Mr. MacINNIS: Would the minister explain this item?

Mr. BRIDGES: This item is to provide for the construction of the main building for the research board's biological station at Nanaimo, British Columbia, the total cost of which was estimated to be $175,000. At this date it would not be possible to build this in the present fiscal year. There was provision for this construction in the 1946-47 appropriations in the amount of $100,000. However, on calling for tenders that amount proved to be inadequate and no action was taken. In other words, an amount of $100,000 is being asked for this year, but it is not anticipated that, even though tenders are called for, we can possibly go beyond an expenditure of $100,000 in the present fiscal year. As I said, the estimated full cost of the building is $175,000.

Mr. MacINNIS: Then this $75,000 should be $175,000?

Mr. BRIDGES: I am told by the officials that this is all that it is estimated can be spent within the present year. We cannot possibly spend $175,000.

Mr. MacINNIS: I cannot find an item of $175,000, although I see mention of $75,000.

Mr. BRIDGES: That is for commitments which will probably be made the following year in order that the construction may be completed.

Special—

741. To provide for the extension of educational work in cooperative producing and selling among fishermen—further amount required, $15,000.

Mr. McLURE: Is anything provided in these special items for scallop fishing? That type of fishing is carried on in our province, and some of the fishermen have applied for assistance.

Mr. BRIDGES: These three items do not refer to scallop fishing; that would come under item 81 in the general estimates.

Mr. MacINNIS: How will this amount be allocated as between the east and west coasts?

Mr. BRIDGES: This is an extra amount of $15,000 to provide for the extension of

educational work in cooperative producing and selling among the fishermen. There was voted in the main estimates an amount of $56,000, which, if I remember correctly, was to provide $5,000 to the university of British Columbia, $15,000 to Ste. Anne de la Pocatière in Quebec and $37,000 to St. Francis Xavier at Antigonish. This extra $15,000 is to provide $5,000 additional to the university of British Columbia, which is just what they asked for, and $10,000 additional to the school of fisheries at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière.

Item agreed to.

Special—

742. To provide for the construction of a vessel of particular design for experimental fishing for herring and mackerel, $16,000.

Mr. McLURE: Where will this vessel operate from when completed?

Mr. BRIDGES: This vessel will operate in the maritime provinces along the Atlantic coast. It is under charter to the Atlantic herring and mackerel investigation committee, which is composed of members from Newfoundland, the maritime provinces, the province of Quebec and the federal government.

Item agreed to.

Special—

743. To provide for assistance in the construction of bait freezing and storage facilities, subject to the approval of the governor in council, $50,000.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): This appears to be a new departure, and I should like to ask the minister where these facilities are being constructed.

Mr. BRIDGES: The availability of supplies of bait at convenient centres has long been one of the difficulties facing the fishing industry, and different plans to overcome it have been tried. There is a growing interest on the part of the provinces for creating a greater development of the industry, which includes fishing, and the providing of bait freezing and storage facilities is a first necessity if the fishing industry is to be expanded. A plan whereby both the provincial government concerned and the federal government would contribute to assistance in providing bait facilities is being developed. It is estimated that the federal government's contribution in such a plan would be $50,000 for 1947-48.

Item agreed to.

Mr. ILSLEY: I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Progress reported.

83166—359

CRIMINAL CODE

FREE CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE IN VIEW OF INSISTENCE ON AMENDMENTS MADE TO BILL NO. 364

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate informing this house that the Senate doth insist upon its second and fifteenth amendments made to Bill No. 364, to amend the criminal code, with which the House of Commons has disagreed.

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice): I move:

That a message be sent to the Senate respectfully requesting a free conference with their honours to consider certain amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 364 entitled: "An Act to amend the criminal code," to two of the amendments to which this house has not agreed and upon which the Senate insists, and any amendment which at such conference it may be considered desirable to make to the said bill or amendments thereto.

Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Speaker, it will be clear to the members what the procedure would be if the conference comes to an agreement, but if they should not come to an agreement what would the procedure be?

Mr. ILSLEY: I speak subject to correction, but I think we lose our bill if there is no agreement.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Absolutely.

Motion agreed to.

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice) moved:

That Messrs. Benidickson, Marquis and Ilsley be appointed managers on behalf of this house of the free conference with the Senate with respect to the amendments made to Bill No. 364, intituled: "An Act to amend the criminal code"; and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

108. Departmental administration, $701,576.

Mr. MacNICOL: May I ask the minister what is the exact programme now being followed in connection with averting industrial disputes, and in settling them where such take place, in view of the new bill that is to be brought in next year?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The provinces have assumed their jurisdiction. British Columbia, Alberta

and Saskatchewan have passed legislation of their own; Manitoba, Ontario and New Brunswick are operating under P.C. 1003; Quebec is operating under its own legislation; Nova Scotia has recently passed its own legislation, and the dominion is operating under P.C. 1003.

Mr. MacNICOL: What is the difference in procedure between P.C. 1003 and what is being followed, say in British Columbia which has its own act?

Mr. MITCHELL: The British Columbia act follows closely the fundamental principles of P.C. 1003, with some minor changes, but in the main the right of men to organize and negotiate is recognized by law.

Mr. MacNICOL: Does it recognize collective bargaining too?

Mr. MITCHELL: Absolutely.

Mr. KNOWLES: I should like to ask the minister whether he has given any further consideration to implementing the recommendation made to him by Mr. Harris Johnstone on December 7, 1945, with respect to the dispute over certain Canadian Pacific railway pension rates. It is not my intention, Mr. Chairman, to speak at length on this matter as I have done on previous occasions, because the house and the government are fully aware of the situation. I notice there was a little bit of applause—but very little—when I said I was not going to speak at length, but actually, Mr. Chairman, I regard this matter as a great deal more important than some of the matters this house has found time to devote its attention to in the dying days of this session.

The minister knows that, following representations to the government on this matter from the trade unions affected and representations made on the floor of this house, he appointed one of his officials to make a thorough investigation of the whole question. That official Mr. H. S. Johnstone, made a report to the minister in December, 1945. That report, including its appendices, runs to some sixty-six pages and the concluding paragraph of the report is a definite and specific recommendation to the minister that a royal commission be appointed.

I may point out to the minister and to the members who are following me that this question differs from the subject matter of Bill No. 24, which has been before the house on another occasion; that bill has to do with an attempt to prevent this kind of thing from happening in the future. The royal commission asked for in Mr. Johnstone's report has to do with the actual dispute that still obtains over the pension rights lost by Canadian Pacific railway employees in 1918 and 1919. For these men there has been expressed on the floor of this house time and again a great deal of sympathy. The minister expresses his sympathy, the Prime Minister expresses his sympathy for these men, and it is a sympathy borne out of an experience he had with a similar situation some years ago. But the fact of the matter is that that sympathy has not proven of a great deal of assistance to these men. Their case, to my way of thinking, is air-tight. They were able to convince Mr. Johnstone that they had a case and I do feel that the government should proceed to implement the recommendation made to them by Mr. Johnstone.

On previous occasions the minister, as well as indicating his sympathy, has made various comments. For one thing he said that the money in question was that of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and in reply to that I have called his attention to one paragraph in Mr. Johnstone's report which deals with that very point and suggests that the men had an equity and that their contention on that score was well founded.

The minister has also said that on previous occasions he has consulted the Department of Justice to determine whether or not there would be any advantage in appointing a royal commission; he has given us the opinion of the Department of Justice that there would not be any advantage, and on the basis of that opinion he has declined thus far to appoint the royal commission. I submit that the responsibility in this matter rests with the minister himself and that he should not crawl out from under that responsibility by quoting the Department of Justice. The fact of the matter is that it might help to solve the problem if a royal commission were to go into this matter and to make a specific recommendation, even though that royal commission had not the authority to compel the implementing of that recommendation. But if a royal commission were appointed and went into this matter, I am satisfied that its finding would be on the side of the men and that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would find that public support would be such as to compel them to pay some attention to the report of the royal commission. I know that the Minister of Labour has had to think of this matter a good many times, because I have drawn it to his attention repeatedly and he has had a great deal of correspondence about it from men representing the unions concerned.

When the Prime Minister made the promise back in 1945 to have the question investi-

gated so as to determine whether or not a royal commission should be appointed, an obligation was thereby incurred to carry out the result of the preliminary investigation. I point out again that that preliminary investigation was made, not by a person prejudiced in favour of the men or prejudiced in favour of the company; it was carried out by an appointee of the Department of Labour. That appointee interviewed the employees' organizations. He interviewed all the companies concerned, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Express Company, the Canadian Pacific Steamships. He also interviewed other employers who had been involved in the 1919 strike and had subsequently reinstated the pension rights of their employees, such as the Canadian National Railways, the police department of the city of Winnipeg, the Manitoba telephone system, the post office and other similar large employers. Thus his finding was in the nature of an objective finding about the situation. As I say, he not only answers the usual arguments put up against the case of the men, but concludes with a specific recommendation to the minister that a royal commission be appointed.

That specific recommendation which is contained in the concluding paragraph should be read, of course, in conjunction with the opening paragraph in which Mr. Johnstone says to the minister, "You appointed me to do this task for the specific purpose of concluding with a recommendation one way or the other as to whether or not there should be this royal commission; my recommendation is in the affirmative." I make my appeal once more to the Minister of Labour on behalf of these men to take this step and have this royal commission established.

The only opportunity there has been in this house for a debate coming close to this question was on the bill to which I referred previously when there was wide support for the purpose and the intent of that bill. That bill went to the standing committee on industrial relations. That committee studied it with representations from both sides, and made a report back to this house which was concurred in a few days ago. I admit it was a rather pious statement, but at least it was pious on the right side. It said that the purpose of the bill commended itself to the committee but that further study should be gone into. To my way of thinking, it is clear that people who have any humanitarian interest at all, any interest in justice, feel that these men have a case. We are not asking the government to pour out money; we are not asking the government to do anything out of the way. We are simply asking that they carry out the recommendation of one of their own officials and appoint a royal commission to look into this whole matter.

Mr. MITCHELL: In reply to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar—

Mr. KNOWLES: Thank you very much, but it is Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is right. I thought it was Rosetown-Biggar for the moment.

Mr. KNOWLES: I appreciate the compliment.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am sure you would. I do not think it is fair to say that the minister is trying to crawl out from under anything. I have never been accused of that before. I have been accused of many things, but not running away from responsibility. As I said before, this thing has been gone into by the justice department. By the very nature of things I take the advice of the legal officers of the crown. I am not going to speak at length on the subject; I did so last year. My hon. friend knows the background, and he knows I do not think there is any hon. member in the house who would not be fair to anybody, irrespective of whether they were employees or employers, in a matter similar to this. As I say, the law officers of the crown have advised against it. We have accepted their advice and that is how the matter stands.

Mr. KNOWLES: I should like to know what the minister means by his sympathy for these men if he is prepared to do nothing for them.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not know whether I should say what I was going to say. I was fighting for the working class before you ever knew there was a working class in this country. I do not think it is necessary to say these things to an individual like myself.

Mr. KNOWLES: It seems to be.

Mr. MITCHELL: I was in the labour movement before you knew anybody interested in them. I am talking about trade unions. I do not think it is fair for my hon. friend to say things like that. When he searches his conscience he will know it is not fair himself, at least if he has any conscience.

Mr. MacINNIS: I should like to say one word on this point. Perhaps what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said did not seem fair to the minister, but certainly it has not been improved by what the minister has said. To refer to the fact that you were

in the labour movement before the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was born does not mean anything except that you were born before he was.

Mr. MITCHELL: I did not say that.

Mr. MacINNIS: That is something neither one of you had anything to do with.

Mr. MITCHELL: Thank goodness.

Mr. MacINNIS: You just arrived when you arrived. What I wish to point out to the minister is this. I do not know exactly what recommendation the Department of Justice made with respect to the appointment of a royal commission; but the appointment of a royal commission is not a matter that has legal implications any more than the appointment of a commissioner by the Minister of Labour. Therefore it seems to me that the minister is falling back on the fact that the Department of Justice said that perhaps something could not be done even if a royal commission was appointed. But here is a case where the minister can take the responsibility of appointing a royal commission. If the royal commission made a decision in one way, then the employees concerned would have their case strengthened. If it made it the other way, I suppose the employees concerned will have no further basis to carry on their agitation to have their grievance rectified. In my opinion it is really too bad that the Minister of Labour did not exercise his rights and ask that a royal commission be appointed.

Mr. KNOWLES: Has the minister either before him or in his mind the exact details of the opinion that he got from the Department of Justice?

Mr. MITCHELL: The answer is no.

Mr. KNOWLES: I remember very well what the minister told me last year when he had just got the ruling from the Department of Justice. It was to the effect that in the opinion of the department it would not serve any useful purpose. That is quite a different thing from the Department of Justice saying that there is no legal basis for establishing the royal commission. Bearing in mind his responsibility to these men, I contend that the minister has no right to fall back on an opinion of that kind of the Department of Justice. I contend that it is his responsibility to face up to the question as to whether or not a royal commission would do some good. I submit that my colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver East, has put the case pointedly. The royal commission would do one or the other of two things. It would either take the negative side of it and say that these men have no case, and that would be the end of it, or it would say that these men have a case and then it would be up to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to consider the effect of public opinion on their failure to carry out the recommendation of the royal commission.

The minister gets a little bit worried about the statements which he thinks are a bit unfair to him, which are made on the floor of this house. I wonder what he would think about the statements that some of the men affected make outside this house about his attitude. They feel that he is completely unfair to them; that he is taking the side of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, talking sympathy but failing to express it at all so far as the rights of these men are concerned. It has been a long long battle, but these men who are still living do not feel like giving up yet; they will continue their strugggle for their rights until they win.

I have referred before, but I refer again, to a similar battle that was carried on in this country years ago when the present Prime Minister took up the cudgels on behalf of men who were similarly deprived of their pension rights in 1910. I submit that this is on all fours with that and that the government of the day, being still under the same Prime Minister, should be consistent with the stand it took before and take up the cudgels on behalf of these men by at least appointing this royal commission.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend talks about experts, and he and his associates lean on experts. Whatever an expert is I do not know, but I will say, on a question of law, every man to his own last.

Mr. KNOWLES: But this is not a question of law. This is a question of opinion on a labour matter, and I submit that even you are more of an expert than the Department of Justice on that.

Mr. MITCHELL: If my hon. friend wants my frank opinion, he is leading these men up a blind alley and sand-bagging them for political reasons.

Mr. KNOWLES: I will answer that.

Mr. MACKENZIE: And we will answer you back too.

Mr. MITCHELL: The hon. member knows as well as I do that you cannot pass a law to spend other people's money—and that is what it amounts to—and I do not think it is fair to these men to try to fool them along and to say that by the appointment of some commission you can make this organization do that which they are not legally bound to do.

I think it is unfair. I know the old story of accusing everybody who stands up in this house and tries to take an impartial view of things and to be fair, and to say that such people are fighting on the side of big interests. That is not the correct approach, and I say to my hon. friend, the member for Winnipeg North Centre, that if I want advice I shall take it from those who know what they are talking about.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am afraid the minister let the cat out of the bag. He made the statement a moment ago that I was leading these people up a blind alley and that I was doing it for political purposes. May I point out that it was on April 24, 1945, that Mr. M. M. MacLean, director of industrial relations, on behalf of the Minister of Labour, appointed Mr. Johnstone to make this investigation to determine whether or not a royal commission should be established.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What for?

Mr. KNOWLES: There was an election on June 11, 1945. These men are getting the impression now that the appointment of Mr. Johnstone was just leading them up a blind alley in the period of the two months before the election of that year; and they are asking me, time and time again, if that is why this report, so favourable to them, is being shelved. There is a strange coincidence in that the appointment of the commissioner was made just before the election, but when the report comes down a few months after the election we find it difficult to get any action. Does that mean that when the next election comes along maybe we shall get some other device like this, leading these men up another blind alley?

Mr. MacNICOL: In the event of unemployment increasing to any extent, will the labour department itself have any programme, or would it be allowed to have one, having regard to the functioning of the Department of Reconstruction and Supply? The workers generally would look to the labour department, and the minister remembers very well that, in the days of the late Hon. Norman Rogers, that gentleman did have a very good programme. Will the present labour department have any authority to initiate any programme to take care of unemployment?

Mr. MITCHELL: That comes under reconstruction and supply. I am one of those optimistic individuals who do not look for serious unemployment in the near future. At the moment we have the highest peacetime employment in our history, and with good sense and good management it should continue. I know that some people are predicting hundreds of thousands out of work—

Mr. COLDWELL: Wait a year and see.

Mr. MITCHELL: —and they take a Satanic delight in it.

Mr. COLDWELL: No satanic delight at all. You have no policy and are making no preparations.

Mr. MITCHELL: You don't know the half of it.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is right.

Mr. MacNICOL: Let the minister answer my question.

Mr. MITCHELL: That comes under reconstruction and supply. The labour department is merely a placement organization.

Mr. MacNICOL: It has nothing to do with initiating? That will be left with reconstruction?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE: One word, sir, as one who was born in poverty and adversity and whose whole life has been identified with the cause of labour in its truest sense, I am sick and tired of the perpetual yapping of the hon. member for Winnipeg North—

Mr. KNOWLES: North Centre.

Mr. MACKENZIE: —who arrived in this country by accident years after this hon. gentleman to my right was battling for the cause, the real cause, of labour in Canada, and I was fighting for the cause of labour in my own province of British Columbia. This perpetual yapping, yapping, yapping gets the hon. member nowhere. It just wearies the house and tires the house to its very bones. He is doing no service to the cause of labour. We do more for labour than he, and we have proved so all our lives. Just look at the legislation I personally placed on the statute books of British Columbia in the interests of labour and tell me that I have not the interests of labour at heart. Let them say so, these pulsating pulpiteers who come to this free and unfettered parliament. The members here, I do not care to what party they belong, have the cause of the working man as much at heart as my hon. friend, and probably more than this pulpiteer from Winnipeg North—

Mr. KNOWLES: North Centre.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am getting tired of all this interference with the progress of the session by the silly, inconsequential and nonsensical speeches of the hon. member for Winnipeg North.

Mr. KNOWLES: North Centre.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is time we got down to the business of the country as sensible Canadians. Everyone over there is a friend of labour; every single one there is a friend of labour. Everyone around me is a friend of labour. Everyone who comes from the glorious free air of Alberta is a friend of labour, and I sometimes think that the only enemies of labour in this house are the pulpiteers who try to interfere with real reforms when real reforms are before the house. And my hon. friend is the chief sinner among a band of sinners.

Mr. BENTLEY: Pass the hat.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): You are a pretty fair pulpiteer yourself.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I was supposed to be. Now, in my jovial, good-natured way I tell my hon. friend that he should seek to cultivate what seems for him to be the almost impossible quality of reticence in this house.

Mr. KNOWLES: And I am supposed to learn it from you?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not only would it be a gift to himself, but it would be a supreme gift to the parliament of Canada. It would be greatly welcomed and the house would greatly rejoice thereat, in the language of the scriptures, which he has evidently forgotten. Mr. Chairman, may I say this. We are wasting time—

Mr. KNOWLES: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE: —yes, over there, and no one is wasting more time than the hon. member for Winnipeg North, not one single soul in this house.

Mr. KNOWLES: North Centre. Have it right for once.

Mr. MACKENZIE: North Centre. It makes no difference.

Mr. KNOWLES: You are always wrong anyway.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Let me say this to my hon. friend. We have only a short time now to work together. Let us cooperate. Let us get the work done. It has been done well, and all hon. members, except those who have talked too much, have worked hard during this session. I think hon. members have worked harder this session than in any other in my experience. I want to pay a tribute, if I may—and I hope he will not resent it—to the leader of the C.C.F. group in this house. I think he has one of the most brilliant intellects of anyone in this house, and during this session he has made one of the finest contributions which have been made. I must also say something about my old political antagonist from Vancouver East. He knows that we on this side have for him the highest and most profound regard, because he makes some of the most constructive suggestions which are made in the debates in this house. But let us all cooperate. Let us get on with the work. Let us stop yapping. Let us finish this session and let hon. members go to homes which I trust will be full of happiness, health and peace.

Mr. MacINNIS: I had not intended to say anything further on this subject, although something more could be said on it; but I think it is time that someone said something to the Minister of Veterans Affairs for the sort of exhibition he has put on this evening. It does not do credit to himself or to the house. Whatever faults my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has, that of yapping is not one of them. I do not believe that it is becoming a minister to refer to what another hon. member says in this house, as yapping; and not only to do it once but several times.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Mr. MacINNIS: All right. We all have human rights and fundamental freedoms. Wise men know how to use them correctly, but fools misuse them. One thing which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre can do is to state what he wants to state in terms which everyone can understand. That is more than the hon. member for Vancouver Centre has done during the past few weeks. Every time he has spoken here he has been more muddled than he was the time before, and I think it is just about time that we were released from such yapping as he does. If that is a term he can use, then certainly others can use it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Let the hon. member come out and fight me in Vancouver Centre and see what happens.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MacINNIS: A question was raised, and it was a reasonable one. It must have been a reasonable one, because two years ago, just before an election, the Minister of Labour appointed a commissioner to investigate whether it would be desirable to appoint a royal commission. The investigator he appointed recommended that a royal commission be appointed.

Mr. KNOWLES: Was that yapping?

Mr. MacINNIS: Is it wrong to ask or to insist that if there was sincerity behind the

appointment of that commissioner, his recommendations regarding the appointment of a royal commission should be carried out. If the minister is disinclined to spend other people's money, he should have refused to spend other people's money by the appointment of this commissioner. When we are dealing with these matters, it is better to deal with them on the basis of facts and not, when we have a weak case, to begin flinging innuendoes around the house. That does not get us anywhere. It does not add to the dignity and decorum of this house. Neither does it hasten the end of this session.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. KNOWLES: There is just one other word I wish to say, because there is a little bit of nonsense about me which is frequently trotted out in this house, and I think it is time that it was stopped. I refer to the kind of reference which both ministers have made tonight about their activities in this country before I came here.

Mr. MITCHELL: I did not say that.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister has stated it often. I take it that the ministers have looked up the "Parliamentary Guide" and have found that I was born in Los Angeles, California, which is in another country. It just happens that I came to this country at the age of sixteen, which is a younger age than that of either of the ministers when they came to this country. When they came here, they were coming for the first time, as immigrants. When I came I was coming back to the land of my forefathers.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. KNOWLES: I have four generations of Canadian ancestors born in this country. I am conscious, Mr. Chairman, that what I am saying about myself has no bearing at all; it is really unimportant, and I would not raise it at all but for the ministers' nonsense. We are all Canadians in this house. But in view of our various backgrounds, I suggest that this kind of nonsense should stop.

I also suggest, Mr. Chairman, that any talk about this group interfering with real reform when we ask for the kind of thing which I am asking the Minister of Labour to do now, is something which those who speak in that way should be ashamed of. The so-called reforms that we have tried to interfere with this year are well known to hon. members opposite. We have had some real battles over non-essential bills these last two weeks. They have been over the barrel, and hon. members opposite know it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have been trying to keep order.

Mr. KNOWLES: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, and you had considerable difficulty with the last minister. This is something the government can carry out and show whether or not they are really the friends of labour. All this talk does not go down with the men affected. What they want is action; and the action these men are looking for is the appointment of this royal commission.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I would suggest to hon. members that we get on with the business. Shall item 108 carry?

Mr. McLURE: I should like to draw the minister's attention to this particular item. Is there any possible way of having more permanent employees and not so many temporary employees? I notice an amount of about $132,000 for permanent employees, which is almost four times as much as the amount for temporary employees, which is $464,000. Why not make some of those employees permanent, instead of having so many temporary employees?

Mr. MITCHELL: I can give the answer in a sentence. The matter is now under study by the civil service commission. During the war a good many temporary employees came into the various departments. I would say that the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Labour were affected in that respect probably more than any other department.

Item agreed to.

109. Annuities Act, $568,195.

Mr. TIMMINS: Do the people of Canada pay for the administration of the Annuities Act? If this is a service given to those who take out and pay for annuities, why should the people of Canada have to pay commission to agents of $313,000 as shown on page 130 of the estimates? I was always under the impression that annuities were something one could invest in if he felt so inclined. But why should we pay commissions of $313,000 in respect of something which goes to the benefit of only those who take out annuities.

Mr. MITCHELL: I find it is the same as the ordinary sort of insurance company, where the commissions are for selling policies.

Mr. TIMMINS: Is there any reason why the government should wish to expand this

service, and pay in order to expand it? Is it not up to the people themselves to take out annuities, if they wish to, instead of, in a sense, our advertising this service and soliciting it?

Mr. MITCHELL: As I said before, the back-bone of the nation are the thrifty people. I think the same will be true when most of the people who are advocating certain reforms have gone. I do not think it will change a great deal. The whole basis of the annuities plan was to have people prepare for old age at their own expense and by their own labour. It is not on a scale followed by the straight line insurance companies. I believe the maximum is $1,200 a year. However I think it is all to the good, and is a sound policy.

Mr. JACKMAN: In days gone by, the government has seen fit to set the maximum at $1,200. The cost of living has increased so much that $1,200 no longer does anything like what it did in 1939. In comparison today we would find that it probably takes $2,000 or $2,400 for the same purposes.

I am a great believer in annuities, and I should like the minister to see whether or not his department would give consideration to raising the maximum to at least $2,000 instead of $1,200.

While there is a certain expense involved in the administration of these annuities, nevertheless they do keep people off the old age pensions, and the amount which otherwise would have to be paid for that purpose is lowered. Although I do not expect the minister would have the information at hand, it would be interesting if he could tell the committee the amount saved yearly by reason of the fact that some old people have an income of $1,200, because of government annuities, and therefore do not have to take the old age pensions.

Would the minister give consideration to raising the maximum from $1,200 to $2,000 under the dominion government annuities plan?

Mr. MITCHELL: I should be glad to give that consideration.

Mr. MACKENZIE: On a question of privilege, I was questioned a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in regard to dates of arrival in Canada. I find here that he arrived in Canada in 1924; my colleague the Minister of Labour arrived here in 1912, and the Minister of Veterans Affairs arrived here before the war in 1914.

Mr. KNOWLES: Let us keep the record straight. I said I arrived at the age of sixteen; the Minister of Labour arrived at the age of eighteen, and the Minister of Veterans Affairs arrived at the age of twenty-four.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. SKEY: Let us have a birthday party.

Mr. JACKMAN: May I draw the attention of the committee to what was said by the hon. member for Parkdale about temporary assistance. Would the minister undertake that the next time these estimates are before us the amount for temporary assistance will not be more than $173,000, as it is this year for the annuities branch alone? Total salaries paid amount to only a little more than $228,000. In other words, almost the entire amount is for temporary assistance, rather than permanent assistance. Surely the department must be in a state of flux where many of the employees do not know exactly what their status is. I should think that from the point of view of fair administration the minister should not again bring down figures of that kind.

Mr. MITCHELL: The organization becomes swollen during the war.

Mr. JACKMAN: But annuities do not change.

Mr. MITCHELL: I thought the hon. member was speaking generally.

Mr. JACKMAN: No, I was following up on the point raised by my colleague.

Mr. MITCHELL: I shall look into it.

Mr. JACKMAN: It must be a peculiar situation in the department.

Item agreed to.

110. Fair wages, conciliation, industrial relations, industrial disputes investigations, including the administration of legislation relating thereto, and for activities re promotion of co-operation in industry between labour and management, $257,200.

Mr. MacINNIS: I notice that this item is larger than it was last year by more than $64,000. In view of the fact that the provinces are now taking over services which the Department of Labour performed during the war, would the minister explain why the item is larger this year.

Mr. MITCHELL: Last year there were two separate votes, one for the operation of the industrial production committees and one for the conciliation service. They have been put into one item. Actually there is a reduction of more than $83,000 from the expenditures of the two organizations last year.

Mr. MacINNIS: What activities are being carried on now in industry between manage-

ment and labour? Is there any committee or any project which can be considered?

Mr. MITCHELL: I can have the number of committees looked up. I believe it is well over five hundred. I can say, however, that the policy is going ahead with as much expedition as it did during the war, and I think it is a sound policy.

Mr. MacINNIS: I think so, too.

Mr. MITCHELL: In Great Britain they have more or less let it go, but in this country we have had very good results from these industrial committees, of which I find the exact number is 526. There are forty-five in Nova Scotia, twenty in New Brunswick, 127 in Quebec, 240 in Ontario, forty-three in Manitoba, seventeen in Saskatchewan, ten in Alberta, forty-two in British Columbia and two in Prince Edward Island.

Item agreed to.

111. International labour conference, $42,000.

Mr. SKEY: Would the minister explain this conference to us? Was he chairman of it in Montreal, and is it connected with the united nations? Did this international conference recommend that delegates of the international labour movement be empowered to investigate labour conditions in various countries which they considered needed investigation?

Mr. MITCHELL: The international labour organization was founded in 1919 as part of the organization of the league of nations, and was the only part of the league which operated during the war. Last year I was president of the annual gathering of the international labour organization at Montreal where fifty-two nations were represented. It is a long story, but if the hon. member would like to have literature with respect to it I should be glad to let him have it tomorrow.

Mr. SKEY: Did the conference of which the minister was chairman recommend that these delegates have the power to conduct free investigations in any country of the world?

Mr. MITCHELL: It split up into four committees, and they meet about once every three months. The one at which I presided was the annual gathering.

Mr. SKEY: What about this investigation?

Mr. MITCHELL: I shall come to that. At the annual meeting you have representatives of all nations. Canada, as one of the eight major industrial nations of the world, is represented on the governing body. Meetings are held once a year. It is a tripartite arrangement between industry, labour and government. They sit in all parts of the world and study industrial and social conditions and make recommendations through conventions which are forwarded to the respective governments for adoption. Considering this organization purely from a research point of view, I think it is the best of its kind that has ever existed.

The other question had to do with the united nations. The constitution was amended last year in Montreal, which amendment was adopted by this house. That amendment provides that they are to be an affiliate of the united nations dealing specifically with labour and social conditions.

Item agreed to.

112. Labour Gazette and other publications authorized by Labour Department Act, $72,034.

Mr. ADAMSON: Can the minister explain the policy behind the *Labour Gazette?* When an industrial dispute occurs is it discussed in the *Labour Gazette?*

Mr. MITCHELL: It is a journal of record founded when the present Prime Minister was deputy minister of labour. If my hon. friends want to read an unbiased journal; if they want to know what is going on in the world in connection with labour matters, I do not know of a better publication.

Mr. MacINNIS: I agree entirely with the Minister of Labour. Anyone who wants to become conversant with labour matters could not do better than to take the monthly issues of the *Labour Gazette* and read them carefully.

Mr. ADAMSON: What is the circulation?

Mr. MITCHELL: About 20,000 a month.

Mr. ADAMSON: Who is the editor?

Mr. MITCHELL: Mr. Harry J. Walker.

Mr. ADAMSON: Who composes the editorial board?

Mr. MITCHELL: There is no editorial board; it is the minister's sole responsibility.

Item agreed to.

Vocational Training Coordination Act, 1942—

113. Payments to the provinces under agreements, including undischarged commitments of previous years, $825,000.

Mr. MacNICOL: I notice the details on page 131 of the estimates show $525,000 as undischarged commitments of previous years. How much would go to each province? Then the second figure of $300,000 also appears to be undischarged commitments of previous years. How much of that went to each province?

Mr. JACKMAN: As I understand it, this is a partnership arrangement, and I believe there was a time when some of the provinces

did not take their full share. What is the picture today? Are they using it to the fullest extent?

Mr. MITCHELL: I am informed the answer is no.

Mr. MacNICOL: They are not using the appropriations?

Mr. MITCHELL: Not to the fullest extent. Here are the figures asked for by the hon. member:

Province	Dominion Allotment	Claims paid up to April 30, 1947 For previous years	For 1946-47
Prince Edward Island	$13,000	$2,925.00	$10,662.33
Nova Scotia	35,000	825.89	22,024.00
New Brunswick	47,500	839.24	26,956.95
Quebec	150,000	54,108.82	76,189.97
Ontario	60,000	16,757.50	50,000.00
Manitoba	20,000	120.57	3,167.59
Saskatchewan	35,000	4,858.84	23,227.25
Alberta	50,000	2,595.52	13,207.06
British Columbia	55,000	56.08	36,387.18
Totals	$465,000	$83,087.46	$261,822.33

Mr. KNOWLES: Can the minister say anything with respect to the situation in Manitoba? He has had correspondence from Winnipeg and the Winnipeg members have spoken to him about this matter.

Mr. MITCHELL: The agreements were for three years and were to expire at the end of this year, but at the request of certain provinces they were extended for another year, to the end of 1949, by order in council. I received a letter from a municipality asking that it be extended, I think until 1951.

Mr. KNOWLES: That was from the Winnipeg school board.

Mr. MITCHELL: As my hon. friend knows, the dominion does not deal directly with the municipalities and has not under any government that has been in power up to now. The channel of communication is to the provinces. They deal with the municipalities because, after all, the municipalities are the children of provincial statutes. I think I signed the letter yesterday or the day before to the school board in question, suggesting that they get in touch with the provincial government, and we shall consider it after we have heard from them.

Mr. ADAMSON: With respect to the next item, can the minister state how long this will run and what type of apprenticeship training is being given?

Mr. MITCHELL: This is to run for ten years.

Mr. ADAMSON: Does not Ontario have an apprenticeship act?

Mr. MITCHELL: Ontario pioneered with this type of legislation. I had a good friend in Hamilton, Mr. Joseph Pigott, who fostered apprentice training by provincial governments. During the war, the government on my recommendation decided that in order to conclude the war rapidly it would be necessary to provide apprenticeship training for young people in the dominion. I am happy to say that the policy is expanding. The other provinces are taking it up in like manner.

Mr. TIMMINS: Does the dominion government stipulate what trades the money shall be used in? When does the ten-year period end?

Mr. MITCHELL: It has eight more years to run. We do not stipulate what trades the money shall be used in.

Mr. McKAY: On what basis are these payments made to the provinces? Is it on a student basis, or a percentage of the total expenditure by individual provinces on vocational training or a lump sum grant?

Mr. MITCHELL: It is on a fifty-fifty basis by the dominion and the provinces, on an estimate of their requirements.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: What was the total expenditure last year? The estimate was over $1,000,000 and less than one-quarter of that was spent.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is easily understandable when you have a high level of employment. It has been our experience, particularly with the returned men that they want to go straight into industry. There is not the urge to learn a trade, I am sorry to say, under conditions existing at the moment when we have an expanding economy. I do not know that you can do much about the

matter. Every province, without exception, has cooperated magnificently with the dominion in all these training plans.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: None was refused a grant?

Mr. MITCHELL: The relationship between my department and the different provinces is 100 per cent cooperation.

Mr. McKAY: With regard to these payments to the provinces, I believe there is a grant for building purposes as well. Is that only for technical education as well?

Mr. MITCHELL: That is another appropriation.

Mr. McKAY: That has nothing to do with this?

Mr. MITCHELL: No. I know what my hon. friend has in mind. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was speaking of the same thing.

Mr. McKAY: The grant for building purposes applies to technical education?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes.

Mr. JACKMAN: The minister has mentioned that there is relatively full employment at the present time and that young men do not want to serve apprenticeships. I would ask whether during the operation of this provision there had been any reluctance on the part of labour unions to allow apprentices to be trained in the various fields. I could not help but feel in the bad days of depression that vocational training of this kind would be a most wonderful thing, because many young lads could not find work and were simply idling away their time. I hope the department is in a position to extend this vocational training should a time come upon us again when there is not full employment.

Mr. MITCHELL: The trade unions have cooperated to the fullest extent.

Mr. JACKMAN: As much as you could wish?

Mr. MITCHELL: I would say they have gone all out. I know Ontario because I live here, and I know the people who were associated with the establishment of the apprenticeship plan. I mention Mr. Joseph Pigott of Hamilton and Ernest Ingles of London and the late James Marsh, former deputy minister of labour of Ontario. They all cooperated with the government in the establishment of these plans in Ontario.

Item agreed to.

Vocational Training Coordination Act, 1942—

114. Expenses of vocational training advisory council, $4,000.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: This is just for travelling expenses?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Where did the council meet last year?

Mr. MITCHELL: It met in Ottawa about six weeks ago. I cannot say just when they met last year. I have a reputation for having a good memory, but I do not remember everything.

Mr. JACKMAN: Am I right in understanding that the total appropriation under the previous item last year was not used? Would the minister also answer my question, if we run into a time when employment is not as high as it is today, is adequate provision being made for the training of young men who may not find jobs available?

Mr. MITCHELL: That is a pretty difficult question to answer. I have my own personal views about expenditures by governments. I could not tell you what is going to happen this time next year. My own guess would be that we shall still have a high level of employment, but in these days, with international conditions as they are, he is a pretty wise man who would predict too far ahead.

Mr. JACKMAN: You did not use the whole appropriation last year, only $264,000 out of $1,000,000?

Mr. MITCHELL: That is right.

Item agreed to.

Unemployment Insurance Act, 1940—

115. Administration, including expenditures incurred in connection with the activities of the national employment service as delegated by the Minister of Labour in accordance with section 88 of the act, $19,160,280.

Mr. MacNICOL: There has been an increase of 521 employees on the staff of this branch and the salaries have gone up proportionately, by about $600,000. I should like to ascertain why such a large amount is required for temporary assistance; $13,517,930 is a lot of money for temporary assistance.

Mr. MITCHELL: This scheme was established in 1941 during the war when, as my hon. friend knows, the percentage of permanent employees being taken on was low for obvious reasons. It was to give the men returning from overseas priority in civil service positions. The whole question of temporary employees is under study at the moment by the civil service commission.

Mr. MacNICOL: The returned soldiers should certainly have priority in employment in the civil service, but $13,000,000 must cover a lot of employees and what is to become of the displacees?

Mr. MITCHELL: Out of 7,985 employees, 6,889 were temporary.

Mr. MacNICOL: And they are being released?

Mr. MITCHELL: Not necessarily. There has not been the drive by the returned men to get into the civil service such as there was after the last war.

Mr. MacNICOL: It is the right place to be. It is the softest place I know.

Mr. MITCHELL: I never take a negative position on anything.

Mr. KNOWLES: You must be on safe ground now, you are smiling.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have been on safe ground all my life, particularly during the war years.

Mr. KNOWLES: Not when you lose your temper.

Mr. MITCHELL: I was not like some people who predicted for their own reasons that there would be half a million people out of employment six months after the war was over. I am not suggesting who they might have been, but I was convinced in my own judgment, and that judgment was vindicated, that we would have full employment after the war was over and for a long time to come if the world kept its feet on the ground and had the good sense to manage its affairs.

Mr. MacINNIS: Can the minister tell the committee the number of persons covered by the Unemployment Insurance Act in 1946 and the number of persons covered now?

Mr. MITCHELL: In 1946?

Mr. MacINNIS: Say in June, 1946, and June, 1947, or the nearest months.

Mr. MITCHELL: There are, in round figures, 2,600,000 now covered. We have not the 1946 figures, but I shall get them for my hon. friend.

Mr. TIMMINS: This item would appear to indicate an increase of $11,278,000 for the year 1947-48; yet at the end of the estimates on page 133 in respect of demobilization and reconversion for the year 1946-47 there is an item for national unemployment service. Will the minister straighten me out with respect to this? What is the difference here?

[Mr. Mitchell.]

Mr. MITCHELL: The answer is this. Last year there were two votes, one in the demobilization vote and the other in the general administration vote for the unemployment insurance commission. This year both votes have been added together. That is the reason for the apparent increase. Actually there was a reduction of $259,720 in the expenditure for this year.

Mr. KNOWLES: I should like to ask the minister a question or two with respect to the position of married women, particularly here in Ottawa, and their relationship to unemployment insurance. I think I know something about the basis of unemployment insurance and appreciate the difficulty relating to their question; nevertheless I feel that they have a just complaint. As I say, I have in mind married women in Ottawa who were asked to take on temporary jobs during the war. Very soon after they found themselves in these jobs, they were asked to pay unemployment insurance. They asked to be exempted on the ground that their jobs were only temporary and that, when the war ended, they would be unemployed, even though, in part, by choice. They were told by the authorities that it would be necessary for them to pay unemployment insurance and that it would be to their advantage to do so. I am told that during 1945 and part of 1946 some of these women whose jobs came to an end were granted unemployment insurance when they met the usual conditions; that is, they had to be available for other work similar in character, and that work had to be unavailable for them. But I am told that this year, 1947, women who are being let out, when they apply for their unemployment insurance, are not treated in the same way that similar women were in the last two years. I am told that they are offered jobs not at all similar in character to the ones they had been in, and that when they are unwilling to take these dissimilar jobs at much lower rates of pay they are told that they are thereby disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance.

I know that there is an actuarial basis to unemployment insurance, and that it is similar to fire insurance. You pay in, and if you are not so unfortunate as to have to collect, well, you really are fortunate. But these women feel that there is discrimination against them on two counts. On the one hand, because of what they were told when they were compelled to pay insurance, and, on the other, because of the more favourable treatment accorded women in similar circumstances who were let out of their jobs in 1945 and 1946. I should like the minister to make some comment on that. I have no doubt that this

matter has been brought to the attention of his officials, and they know the answers that have been given and the dissatisfaction that these women have felt with the answers. I shall be glad if he will also say something about the situation in general at the present time.

Mr. MITCHELL: May I answer the first question first? In the first place, of course the insurance is administered by the unemployment insurance commission with an impartial chairman and representatives of labour and of the employer. That is the insurance end of it. Then the act definitely stipulates that before you can draw insurance you must be available for employment. This is elementary in an insurance scheme of this description. With respect to the control that we have, there have been set up across the dominion courts of referees, composed of a chairman, a representative of labour and a representative of the employer. If any person considers that he has been unsatisfactorily dealt with or that the officials have not complied with the legislation he has the right to appeal to the court of referees in his locality; and, if he is not satisfied with that, the appeal can go to the umpire. As I said previously, it is generally known that both labour and the employers are represented on these courts of referees.

Mr. KNOWLES: The difficulty seems to revolve around those words we discussed a year or two ago, "suitable employment", and also the way in which the matter is handled in the offices, in the replies that are made by the people in these offices to the women themselves. For example, I have before me a number of cases about which information has been given to me. In the main they are the stories of married women who had become grade 2 or grade 3 stenographers and who were offered such positions as charwomen, assistants in laundries, ironers, work at slicing bread, icing cakes, baby sitting, housekeeping and so on. When they report that they are unwilling to take positions of this kind and feel that they should not be asked to take them within the meaning of the words "suitable employment", they are simply told by the people in the offices to whom they appeal that nothing can be done about the matter. They have also been told at times that the staff is inadequate to cope with the situation; that they are just now catching up with the married women. I pointed out to the minister previously that part of this problem is created by the more favourable treatment which some of the women got in 1945 and 1946. It is on that basis that the women being let out now consider they are suffering discrimination.

There is another point in connection with that. Can the minister table for the information of the committee the last directives to unemployment insurance offices with respect to the phrase "suitable employment"? We had a considerable discussion over this matter the session before last and, I believe, last session too. I am still receiving complaints, particularly from Winnipeg, to the effect that, on the basis of directives sent out to the unemployment offices, men who apply for unemployment insurance are being told that, after a short period, they must be prepared to accept employment at a five cent cut in salary and, after a further three weeks, they must be willing to accept a ten cent cut, and so on. Back in the fall of 1945 when we first had a discussion about this matter the minister's argument was that you had to realize that peacetime rates of pay would be different from wartime rates. We are in a peacetime situation now; this practice seems to be going on, and it gives to many labour men the feeling that it is being used to depress wages. I should like to hear the minister's comments and I would also appreciate it if he would table the latest directives regarding terms of suitable employment.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not think any member of a board of referees, or any man in his senses in an administrative position would deliberately lay himself open to the charge of depressing wages. I know many of these men who are on boards of referees. They were appointed under my jurisdiction and are well known from one end of Canada to the other. There is absolutely no intention, to my knowledge, of seeking to put such a policy into effect. This is an unemployment scheme and, while there is nearly $400 million in the fund, unless there is a proper administration you can soon wreck the fund.

Mr. MacNICOL: It did not take long to do it in England after the last war.

Mr. MITCHELL: Of course it did not; it went bankrupt. I would imagine there has been some difficulty in the demobilization of married women who entered commerce, agriculture and industry during the war. Many such women wish to go back home. In the great majority of cases they have found that home is better than industry. There has to be some regard to a condition of that kind in administering a policy such as this. My hon. friend referred to a directive. As a matter of fact, it is in the mail now on the way to his office. If he wants it put on the record I could put it on.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am glad to know that it is on the way. I wrote and asked the

deputy for it. Seeing that it has been laid on the table in previous sessions, I think it should be made a matter of public record.

Mr. TIMMINS: The minister refers to married women employed in industry who never hoped to collect unemployment insurance. Why should they be charged the same as those who remain in industry?

Mr. MITCHELL: It is a simple principle. In life insurance you do not want to die in order to win. In fire insurance you do not want your house to burn down in order to win; at least honest people do not.

Mr. KNOWLES: With government annuities you live to win.

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes. There must be tens of thousands of people who will never draw a cent of unemployment insurance in their lifetime.

Mr. TIMMINS: They know it now.

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes. If I had my way I would provide that everyone should carry unemployment insurance, particularly members of parliament. The life expectancy of this job is rather short. Many people think that members are men of destiny, instead of ships that pass in the night. I have met ex-members of this house who have rendered yeoman service to the country and have gone the way of all members of parliament, often in destitute circumstances. You hear a great deal of talk about politicians, but I have never met a so-called politician who was not poorer at the end of the road for having been in the House of Commons.

Mr. MacINNIS: This is a question that has given a good deal of trouble and I imagine it is a difficult one. Perhaps when the unemployment insurance scheme has been longer in operation we shall not have so many complaints. In a directive sent to me last year it is stated that in an occupation an offer at a wage rate of five cents an hour lower than the former rate might be considered suitable after three weeks of unemployment, and an offer at a wage rate of ten cents lower might be considered suitable after four weeks of unemployment. Much would depend on the employment as well as on the rate of wages, but I have a case that was brought to my attention where a woman who had been earning $160 a month was disqualified because she refused to accept a job at $100. She appealed to the board of referees and they sustained the disqualification, not because she refused the position, but because she had placed a restriction of $125 a month on her services. The employment officer who gave evidence swore that no positions for girls had been listed at the office carrying a salary of $125 a month. I do not know what can be done. Here again it is a question of the kind of employment and whether a person should be kept indefinitely on unemployment insurance, or until the insurance is exhausted, before being disqualified for not taking employment at a lower rate of pay. Here is a large discrepancy of $60 a month. If it is the same kind of employment, it seems to me that there is too much of a difference to justify the disqualification.

Mr. HERRIDGE: There are some rural postmasters who are not civil servants. They run post offices in small communities, and I know some who get a total income of $3,000 or possibly slightly more a year. In some cases, after appointment these postmasters get a girl to do the work while they carry on some other substantial business running into thousands of dollars of income a year. That is all wrong. It should not occur, but it does happen. My first question is this. Do the employees of rural postmasters who are actually in contract with the government come under the Unemployment Insurance Act? Second, will these same employees, who are employees of federal contractors, one might say, come under the terms of the present labour bill now being studied by a committee of the house?

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not think the hon. member's second question comes under this vote. He is talking now about labour legislation. I do not know what this committee will do next year. You put a nickel in the slot and you do not know what is coming out. I could not answer that question. The hon. member would have to get some expert or some prognosticator to do that for him.

Mr. MacINNIS: The minister said he was a pretty good prophet.

Mr. MITCHELL: I imagine these other people would come under the act; that is, rural postal contractors. I could not say for certain, but I would imagine they came under the act.

Mr. JACKMAN: How many are now drawing benefits under the Unemployment Insurance Act?

Mr. MITCHELL: I will get that.

Mr. JACKMAN: Second, how many unfilled jobs are listed with the unemployment insurance commission? Third, how many unfilled applications are there for workers on farms? Will it be the policy of the unemployment insurance commission to require able-bodied

single men who cannot find work elsewhere to take farm employment this year, as was done in the previous year?

Mr. MITCHELL: There are a good number of questions there.

Mr. JACKMAN: How many are drawing benefits, as of a recent date?

Mr. MITCHELL: There are 39,966.

Mr. JACKMAN: As of what date?

Mr. MITCHELL: That is the last week of June. The other question was as to how many are registered.

Mr. JACKMAN: How many unfilled jobs are listed with the commission? How many employers have sent in applications for employees?

Mr. MITCHELL: I have that figure: 67,000 males; 40,000 females.

Mr. JACKMAN: The other question was, how many unfilled jobs have been listed for farm work, and will the commission require able-bodied single men who cannot find work elsewhere to take work on farms during the harvest season?

Mr. MITCHELL: I will make a note of that question, and if I can answer it, I will do so tomorrow. It looks as though I shall not get through these estimates tonight. Since a message has come from the senate, I move that the committee now rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. JACKMAN: If it would not be too much trouble for the minister, I would ask him to put on *Hansard* a list of the provinces where the unfilled jobs are and where those receiving unemployment insurance benefits are. I would ask him to give a break-down and put it on *Hansard*.

Mr. MITCHELL: I will do that tomorrow.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

CRIMINAL CODE

FREE CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE IN VIEW OF AMENDMENTS TO BILL NO. 364

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate agreeing to the free conference desired with the Senate for the purpose of communicating the reasons which induced the Commons not to concur in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill 364, intituled "An Act to amend the criminal code", and has appointed the hon. Senators Robertson, Haig and Beauregard, as managers on their part at the said free conference.

HALIFAX

ANNOUNCEMENT OF LATEST BULLETIN ON BY-ELECTION

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps the house will give me permission, seeing that I placed on record earlier in the evening the first bulletin that came in with regard to the by-election, to give hon. members the latest bulletin. For 334 polls out of 359, the figures given are: for Dickey, the Liberal candidate, 22,808; McDonald, Progressive Conservative, 12,897; and MacIntosh, C.C.F., 14,513.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: A fifty per cent gain.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

The house met at eleven o'clock.

(Translation):

PRIVILEGE

MR. LACOMBE—REFERENCE TO ITEM PUBLISHED IN "LE CANADA"

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two Mountains): On a question of privilege, I wish to refer to an item published in the Montreal newspaper *Le Canada*. It is entitled, "The R.C.M.P. Is Called". The newspaper continues:

Mr. Liguori Lacombe, Canadian party, Laval-Two Mountains, a good friend of Mr. Maurice Duplessis seems to have lost faith altogether in the provincial police.

Le Canada knows full well that I have, for the provincial police, as much admiration as for the R.C.M.P. Making up such a base false report is a proof of pitiably bad faith. *Le Canada* makes fun of the victims of Saint-Eustache-sur-le-Lac and surrounding district, where the owners of property on the shores of the lake of Two Mountains have lost more than a million dollars besides having their furniture, verandahs and other exterior furnishings stolen from their homes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I beg the hon. member to please note that according to the rules of the house, one must be brief on a question of privilege.

(Text):

Mr. LACOMBE: Will you kindly speak louder, Mr. Speaker? I cannot hear you.

(Translation):

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand, because I cannot hear you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I asked the hon. member to note that according to the rules of the house, a question of privilege must be presented as briefly as possible.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Speaker, I know of an hon. member to the right who spoke half an hour on a question of privilege. I know you for a fair and impartial man and . . .

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. LACOMBE: It was *Le Canada* itself who provoked this previous call on the police for the protection of the victims of the flood, who have had their properties pilfered by five or six hundred bandits coming from no one knows where. The lakes and navigable stream belong to the federal government who themselves authorize the raising of the water level when allowing firms to build dams under their benevolent supervision.

This is the reason why I asked the Right Hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ilsley) for help from the R.C.M.P., because the provincial police could not cope with the situation.

(Text):

PRIVILEGE

MR. COLDWELL—REFERENCE TO REPORT IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE"

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In today's Montreal *Gazette* there appears an article written by the *Gazette* staff correspondent which is headed:

C.C.F. said worst offenders in wholesale M.P. print-grab.

Utilization of the public printing bureau by M.P.'s—notably C.C.F.—as a means of churning out election and political propaganda at public expense, underlies recommendations for sweeping changes in procedure contained in a report tabled in the Commons today by the joint Senate-Commons committee on printing.

The brief report is framed in unsensational language and gives little hint that a number of flagrant breaches of the privileges accorded members of parliament of securing printed copies of their addresses were encountered.

I wish to say that members of parliament who order reprints pay for them at the rate laid down by the printing bureau and approved by this house. This is a libel on the whole parliament, although my own party is particularly mentioned. I wish to draw it to the attention of the house.

[Mr. Lacombe.]

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should like to say just one word. I agree with my hon. friend in what he says as to the privilege of hon. members having their speeches reprinted, but I hope he will agree with me that hon. members have gone much further than that in what they have expected the printing bureau to do and in what they have had the bureau do. They have not confined the reprinting to the reprinting of a speech but have arranged for a printed cover, for photographs, headings, and the like which have nothing whatever to do with reprinting the speech. May I also say this, that frequently speeches have been reprinted with parts of the speech altogether omitted without giving any indication that this has been done. That I think is entirely wrong and should not be permitted.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is a matter for the house to decide. May I say, sir, that if covers and photographs are permitted, members are entitled to ask for them if they pay for that privilege. As a matter of fact that has always been done by members who have ordered their reprints done in that way. It is merely to make them attractive. It seems to me that the attempt is being made to make reprinted speeches as unattractive and as unreadable as possible.

Mr. WARREN: I think hon. members are losing sight of the most important point in this connection. I do not think the privileges of this house allow or should allow a member of parliament to strike out parts of a speech that is reprinted from *Hansard*.

Mr. KNOWLES: We do not.

Mr. COLDWELL: I agree with that.

Mr. WARREN: Why should any member be allowed to take an extract from his own speech and another extract from another speech and have that published as the official *Hansard* report?

Mr. COLDWELL: I agree with that.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Seventh report of the standing committee on public accounts.—Mr. Picard.

Fourth report of the standing committee on agriculture and colonization.—Mr. McCubbin.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT—CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland) moved that the first report of the joint com-

mittee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the printing of parliament, presented on Monday, July 14, be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

REDISTRIBUTION

READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

The house resumed from Monday, July 14, consideration in committee of Bill No. 18, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons—Mr. Mackenzie King—Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. BRUNELLE: Mr. Chairman, may I first thank the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) who was kind enough to give me this opportunity to speak at this time, he having adjourned the debate yesterday. I promised him that I shall speak less than ten minutes.

I wish to say a few words in answer to the speech made yesterday by the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains. May I say first that in this matter of amalgamating the two constituencies of Laval-Two Mountains and Argenteuil, I spoke with the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains at his request and as a friend rather than as a member of the redistribution committee, and all I said and all I wrote to him was for the sole purpose of rendering a service to one who I then thought was an honourable friend, one who I then thought was a gentleman.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Chairman, I want that remark withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member to withdraw. He implied that another hon. member was not a gentleman.

Mr. BRUNELLE: Mr. Chairman, I said, and I am going to repeat it, that I was trying to render a service to one who I then thought was an honourable friend, one who I then thought was a gentleman.

Mr. LACOMBE: I want that remark withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member is implying that the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains is not a gentleman, he will have to withdraw that remark.

Mr. LACOMBE: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, in accordance with rule 41 of the House of Commons I insist on the hon. member for Champlain withdrawing that remark.

Mr. BRUNELLE: Mr. Chairman, his conduct and his way of speaking yesterday show that he is a gentleman. It is up to the house to judge.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Chairman, that is an insinuation worse than the other.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The rule is very clear. If the hon. member is making a statement that is offensive to the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains he must withdraw it.

Mr. BRUNELLE: I am not in the hon. member's class; I withdraw it completely.

Mr. LACOMBE: That is worse than the first statement and he must withdraw; otherwise I shall make a motion of censure against this man who has no right at this time to sit in this house because we are now discussing his case.

The CHAIRMAN: Order; the hon. member has withdrawn the remark. He may proceed.

Mr. BRUNELLE: In this connection, sir, let me make it plain that I was not moved by any sort of conviction that the hon. member sitting on the opposition side of the house was any danger to the Liberal party, or that sitting with us he would be an asset to the Liberal party. I was moved by kindness only. I never thought that one could be as ungrateful as the hon. gentleman is, but ungratefulness is not his worst fault or weakness. He now tries to give the impression, first, that I went to him and, second, that I tried to induce him to cross the floor of the house and, third, that I offered not to touch his county, to use his owns words. These three statements are false. He came to me—

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Chairman, I deny this statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. LACOMBE: He came to me privately. The hon. member knows that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Order.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. LACOMBE: The hon. member knows that privately and publicly by his letter he came to me—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may continue.

Mr. BRUNELLE: If the hon. gentleman is the gentleman that he wants me to call him he should keep quiet and sit down.

Mr. LACOMBE: I will never admit—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. When the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains was speaking yesterday he objected to interruptions and I sustained him. At this time I must ask him not to interrupt.

Mr. FLEMING: Can you keep hon. members opposite quiet, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MACKENZIE: A prophet in Israel.

Mr. BRUNELLE: Mr. Chairman, this is another example that the truth hurts. He came uninvited to my room and with tears in his eyes he begged me to help him.

Mr. LACOMBE: I deny this.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. BRUNELLE: He said that the amalgamation of Laval-Two Mountains and Argenteuil meant his political death; that he could not successfully fight Mr. Heon and that we were giving a constituency to the Tories.

Mr. LACOMBE: I deny that absolutely.

Mr. BRUNELLE: Second, he himself volunteered the statement that he was about to cross the floor of the house and that he was gradually preparing for it.

Mr. LACOMBE: I never said that; I deny this.

Mr. MACKENZIE: He is sitting with the C.C.F. now.

Mr. BRUNELLE: Third, I never promised not to touch his constituency. I could not carry out such a promise. No one who is reasonable will believe that I made such a promise. The hon. member knows or should know that I did not make such a promise, but he may not remember what took place.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LACOMBE: On a question of privilege, I do not know what the hon. member is about to say, but his insinuation is absolutely false.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. That is not a question of privilege.

Mr. LACOMBE: And he must withdraw.

Mr. BRUNELLE: I say that he may not remember what took place, but I do, and further, I am known as being temperate in my words and actions.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. LACOMBE: On a question of privilege—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. LACOMBE: According to standing order 41 the privilege of hon. members must be respected in this house. Standing order 41 reads:

No member shall speak disrespectfully of His Majesty,—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LACOMBE:

—nor of any of the royal family; nor of the governor or person administering the government of Canada; nor use offensive words against either house, or against any member thereof.

Some hon. MEMBERS: That is right.

Mr. LACOMBE:

No member may reflect upon any vote of the house, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

I ask the hon. member for Champlain, if he is an honourable man, to withdraw these words.

Mr. BRUNELLE: Mr. Chairman, I said that I am known as a temperate man in my words and actions. I was speaking of myself. I will admit, however, that I made a mistake by listening to him and by taking pity on him. That is the only mistake I made. The committee alone could decide. I do not wish to give the impression, however, that the hon. member has disturbed me much, but I must state the facts. The ravings of the hon. member yesterday would only be ridiculous if they did not reveal such a lack of respect for the truth and for one's word of honour.

During the two conversations I had with the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains it was made plain and it was emphasized by the hon. member himself that he was speaking off the record and in a confidential way.

Mr. LACOMBE: Never.

Mr. BRUNELLE: And when he tries to be sarcastic as to my diplomacy he again forgets that the contents of my letter are only the substance of what he himself said during these two conversations—

Mr. LACOMBE: Absolutely false.

Mr. BRUNELLE: —about the Tory party.

Mr. LACOMBE: Absolutely not.

Mr. BRUNELLE: But he goes farther. He tries to make that letter say or mean what it does not say and what it does not mean.

There is absolutely nothing in the letter to show I was offering him any favour for his coming to the Liberal side of the house, but he translates wrongly and wickedly the last paragraph of that letter so as to make a sort of case against one whose help he besought so ardently. Why did he not read the text of that letter, a copy of which I have in my hand? I am going to read it in French.

(Translation):

April 2, 1947.

Mr. Liguori Lacombe, M.P.,
Ste. Scholastique, P.Q.

My dear colleague:

After you left yesterday, I thought of suggesting to you that, after this recess, when Hartt is introduced in the chamber, this would be a proper occasion for you to cross the floor.

(Text):

This all follows what he was telling me during this conversation.

(Translation):

Mr. LACOMBE: I never said that.

(Text):

Mr. Chairman, I want the hon. member for Champlain to withdraw that statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must ask the hon. member not to interrupt.

Mr. LACOMBE: I never made that statement.

Mr. BRUNELLE: I quote:

(Translation):

May I suggest that you prepare for the newspapers a statement about Communism and the dangers of numerous parties, which can only benefit the Conservative party, which party the great majority of French Canadians do not want to see leading the government.

I should like every one to note the next paragraph, on which the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains bases his assertion that I offered him certain advantages. It reads as follows:

The more I think about this, the more I am convinced it will be to your future advantage.

Mr. LACOMBE: To your future advantage".

(Text):

Mr. BRUNELLE: I defy anyone who knows French to say that that sentence is an offer of some advantage or favour to the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains. It means this, and again I defy anyone who knows English and French to say that it means anything but this: "The more I think of it the more convinced I am you will later felicitate yourself." That is no offer, and that is all I said, and I think that for once he would have had occasion to felicitate himself if he had come on the floor of the house and pointed that out. He would have had occasion to congratulate himself. In his eagerness to hurt one who tried to help him he translates as follows: "The more I think about this, the more I am convinced it will be to your future advantage." That is the work of a man who wants to be called a gentleman.

Mr. LACOMBE: That is the right translation.

An hon. MEMBER: You cannot translate your own speeches.

Mr. BRUNELLE: There is no mention or implication of future advantage in my letter. In disfiguring a text in such an unscrupulous way, the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains has shown his true colours. He will some day come to regret the wrong he tried to do me for the good I tried to do him.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. LACOMBE: On a question of privilege, I want the hon. member for Champlain to withdraw that.

An hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. LACOMBE: The hon. member for Champlain says he tried to help me or to do good for me. I am not condemning him because he is Herve Brunelle but because he is the member for Champlain, and a member of the committee on redistribution. That is all.

Mr. BRUNELLE: He has been preparing and rehearsing this shameful attack for almost two months. The wrong meaning he has wilfully given to my letter was premeditated. It shows malice aforethought. Yesterday's speech of the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains was nothing but a crying display of lack of decency and of lack of honour.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: At the time of the adjournment last evening I was dealing with certain circumstances connected with the alterations in the boundaries of Lake Centre constituency, and in placing before the committee the situaton with regard to that constituency, I am following the course taken by the Prime Minister when he was leader of the opposition in 1933. The Prime Minister in 1933 pointed out that there were certain principles that should be followed and they were referred to yesterday afternoon by the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario. The Prime Minister also pointed out then that above all there should be fairness in the matter of redistribution.

I am not going to refer particularly to what the Prime Minister said, unless somebody wishes to have it on the record, but he said he thought the time had come when some means should be adopted whereby redistribution would cease to be a cause of recrimination or injustice, indeed of liquidation by a method that has been followed in the past on certain occasions. Certainly under Sir Robert Borden there was no question of unfairness.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The Secretary of State apparently has not read the debates, because Sir Wilfrid Laurier at that time agreed that it was not unfair and there was never any dispute in the house. That indicates only one thing, that my hon. friend has not read what took place at that time.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Oh, yes; I have.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: In 1933 the Prime Minister pointed out the unfairness of leaving a measure like this to the end of the session. Presumably there was a desire to have the session closed at the earliest possible date, and the debate continued for four or five days. The Prime Minister on that occasion used certain words which I wish to adopt now. He pointed out that coming in at the end of the session and introducing a measure such as this is unfair and indicates a desire to eliminate members of opposing parties without enabling them to place their position before the house and the country. What he said on that occasion was quoted in part yesterday by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart) and I wish to read now from page 5235:

Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I think it desirable to point out immediately the unfairness of the government having left consideration of this most important measure until the very end of the session. That fact of itself, it seems to me, is prima facie evidence of a desire on the part of the administration to exercise its power as a majority to press through this bill under circumstances which are most unfair to the minority in the house.

Then he quotes what Sir Wilfrid Laurier stated in 1892. In the second column, page 5236, he quotes the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

I protest against this system too long indulged in by this government, of delaying their most important legislation until the last days of the session when members are naturally anxious to get away to their own business.

Then the Prime Minister said:

I say there is an ominous parallel between what was said by Sir Wilfrid Laurier on that occasion and what we on this side of the house are compelled to say today. This government also has adopted the practice of waiting until the end of the session to bring in its most contentious measures. It has deferred until the very end the measure with respect to the salary of the chairman of the tariff board, the measure with respect to radio broadcasting—

Sir, history certainly has been repeated here.

—and the contentious measure concerning shipping, the debate in connection with which was concluded only a day or two ago.

The Prime Minister adopted then the attitude which I am trying to adopt today. He said, "I place before you the situation regarding Prince Albert." He spoke at great length. I think his speeches in connection with the matter covered some seven or eight pages. As reported at page 5238 of *Hansard*, he averred as a fact that the power of redistribution is a trust to be exercised in fairness. Then at page 5239—and I am epitomizing now instead of reading—he said if there was a desire to compromise unfairness and remove injustice, the opposition would cooperate; otherwise they would fight. He placed his situation before the house and the country. The voting strength of the house was much as it is today. We hear over the years that things are changing and that members do not take the interest today which they used to take in the great and grand old days. The debate started on May 16, 1933; it really commenced on May 22, and ended on Saturday, May 27. Of all the members in the House of Commons then, only sixty voted; twenty-seven were paired and the rest of them apparently were absent from the house. I suggest this, and I do so only in passing because the Prime Minister in 1933 indicated that some method must be found whereby fairness will be achieved and the liquidation of political opponents prevented or denied. I suggest consideration of the Redistribution Act of the United Kingdom. It is a matter which might well come up. It cannot come up at this session, but it might be considered. It is entitled the "House of Commons (Redistribution of Seats) Act, 1944". In the United Kingdom the matter of redistribution is under continuous review; a permanent boundary commission has been set up. There are several boundary commissions, one in England and one for the several other parts of the United Kingdom.

Mr. MacNICOL: There are four.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes. A report is made to the house from time to time. It is a continuing activity which, of course, would

be different from the procedure here in Canada. Provision is made that—and I read from the act:

A report of a boundary commission under this act showing the constituencies into which they recommend that any area should be divided shall state, as respects each constituency, the name by which they recommend that it should be known, and whether they recommend that it should be a parliamentary county or division of a parliamentary county or a parliamentary borough or division of a parliamentary borough.

Then the secretary of state lays the recommendation before parliament together with the statement of the reasons for the modifications which are indicated. Then the draft is approved by resolution of each house of parliament. That commission is one which is above partisanship. Parliament still rules; parliament still controls; but parliament would not act unfairly against a political opponent. If the recommendation of this committee were to the effect that a certain change should be made, it would adopt it even though it might be helpful to an opponent. The commission is composed of the Speaker of the House of Commons, who is chairman of all four commissions. The commission for England consists of the chairman, the registrar general, the director general of the ordnance survey and two other members, one appointed by the secretary of state and the other by the minister of health; and no member of the House of Commons or of either house of parliament of Northern Ireland is permitted to act on such committee. The purpose there is simply to do away with this decennial fight which takes place over the question of redistribution. Over and over again, as one reads the record, one can only be struck by the fact that there have been wrongs done in the past. But the Prime Minister, over and over again, when wrongs were done, was one who loudly protested and took a stand on behalf of those better things which I ask him on this occasion to carry into effect in connection with the present measure.

I do not intend, sir, to follow an acrimonious method. I shall place the facts before the Prime Minister, through you. The first fact I place before the committee is this. While in certain constituencies there is little or no interest on the part of the electors, by-elections take place such as the one yesterday and only a small proportion of the people entitled to vote cast their ballots.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): A greater proportion of Tories.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Let me tell my hon. friend this. I did not want to be acrimonious; I was dealing with the facts.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My hon. friend speaks about yesterday.

An hon. MEMBER: You spoke about it first.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I go back a few years, and in 1932 again the Prime Minister pointed out how unfair it was that minorities should represent constituencies in parliament. He dealt with the situation at length, and I refer particularly to what he said at that time. He said one thing which would have to be done would be to bring in a system whereby minority representation should be done away with. I am in this position, sir, of being a minority representative when I deal with this, as are, I believe, 146 other members of this house. When dealing with redistribution the Prime Minister dealt with this very question, and he said this, as reported at page 5422 of *Hansard*:

I believe that the only true method of securing a representative parliament is by a system of proportional representation properly worked out with regard to the dominion as a whole. The reform should commence with the cities and the larger municipalities in our country. When the Liberal government was in office we introduced into this house a measure of proportional representation in connection with city constituencies. It was fought for some little time, there was considerable opposition from the then opposition and the measure was not proceeded with.

Then he went on to give the reason why electoral reform, which is demanded today on every hand across this country, was not brought in by his government between 1921 and 1925:

It was not reintroduced because the government of the day had not a majority in the other chamber which would ensure its enactment, and there were more pressing matters requiring attention. I might add the late Liberal government did not have a majority in the senate all the time it was in office. If we had had a majority in the other house upon which we could have relied we would have proceeded with our proportional representation measure.

Then followed these prophetic words:

If we are ever returned to power a proportional representation measure will be a feature of the Liberal platform and programme of legislation.

Well, sir, that was merely carrying out what the Prime Minister himself said would be good for this country in 1919, when he achieved the leadership of the great Liberal party. At that time he introduced before the Liberal convention of that day certain poli-

cies that should be brought into effect, one of which was acceptance of the principle of proportional representation. I had not intended to digress on this, but I point out that the promise of electoral reform may not have been carried out because of the fact that if it had been carried out minority candidates would not have been elected in this country.

Returning to the subject from which I was diverted by the Secretary of State, I was dealing particularly with the numbers who vote. The constituency of Lake Centre was created in 1932, comprising two existing constituencies, one to the west of Last Mountain lake to which I shall make reference in a moment, which was known as Long lake, and the other east of Last Mountain lake which was known as Last Mountain. Of course the reason the name was chosen was that there was a dispute as to what should be the name and someone suggested that since there was a lake down the centre it should be called Lake Centre. In the last election ninety per cent of the electors of that constituency exercised their franchise.

I have said there is a lake down the centre, and I have told how very difficult it is to get around that constituency even without taking into consideration the knob which is placed along the top line of the riding by the addition of the three townships from Humboldt. In looking over the record I was interested to learn that this is not the first time the matter of the difficulties in connection with that constituency has been raised in this house, for in 1933 the then member, Mr. Totzke, dealt with the matter. He was the member of the redistribution committee of that year representing the then opposition, and at page 5256 of *Hansard* he said

> . . . before I take my seat I wish to bring to the attention of the committee the one constituency which I think is the worst of all in Saskatchewan, that is the constituency of Long Lake. This constituency has been a little low in population, it is the only constituency in the whole province where a decrease of population has been shown during the last ten years. But it is bounded on all sides by natural boundaries, on the one side the Saskatchewan river and the Qu'Appelle river. On the east side is Last Mountain lake. As I said before, the Saskatchewan river can be crossed at various points by ferry, but on the west side of this particular constituency is this Last Mountain lake, which is sixty or seventy miles long and there is no way of crossing except by rowboat or motorboat; there are no ferries on the lake. So if the member for the constituency lived on one side or the other of this lake he would have to go around the end of the lake to visit his constituents on the other side.

I point out the fact that in order to get from one point in that constituency to another perhaps eighteen miles distant one has to travel from 80 to 110 miles around either the top or the bottom of the lake. That was one of the reasons given as to why the population of this constituency should not be kept to the same level as that of the adjoining constituencies. That argument has no force now, however, because the population is greater than that of the constituencies adjoining it both east and west, even without taking into consideration the three townships to which I have referred. I have already dealt with the fact that these townships on the north side cannot be reached by any railroad passing through the constituency. One can go into Saskatoon or one can go up to Lanigan and travel a matter of seventy to eighty miles in one direction, and then come back practically over the same line of track in order to get into those townships. I have here the redistribution map of 1924, at which time the present Prime Minister was also Prime Minister. I point out the circumstance that these three townships were not included in either Long Lake or Last Mountain; they were in Humboldt, where they have continued to be over the years.

In regard to the southern part of the constituency I again point out that the area being removed from Lake Centre has been in either Long Lake or Last Mountain for over twenty-three years. The whole area has belonged to one or the other of those constituencies; and again I point out that the area amputated is the portion in which in fact there was a majority for the sitting member.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there may be some question raised in regard to the committee itself. I want to say, and I want to be fair in what I say, that as far as the committee was concerned we met for a total of possibly forty minutes. That is the entire period during which the committee met. There was no acrimony, but I did say before the committee —and I have my words here—that when this matter came before the house I would have my say. I said the matter would be brought up on the floor of the house, where it could be discussed and considered.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): That was before the main committee?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): Did the hon. member express any reservations in the subcommittee?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, yes. I said: "I can advance various arguments regarding the constituency of Lake Centre and the redistribution thereof. I reserve my right to discuss it when the bill comes before the house.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): That is in the main committee?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): But I asked if you had expressed any reservations in the subcommittee.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: If the hon. member for Rosthern were here I would say what was stated in the subcommittee. I am not introducing any acrimony—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My hon. friend the Secretary of State laughs. I can point out what was said to me under the original plan which was submitted. There would have been an adverse majority of five or six thousand as far as I was concerned.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): We are concerned about the bill which was reported by the committee.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is all right; I am answering the Secretary of State. After some argument a number of townships were removed from the constituency of Yorkton, and four or five townships were removed from Humboldt.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The hon. member took part in all that discussion; he was a member of the committee that made this report.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Isn't that interesting? In 1934 Mr. Totzke, a Liberal member on the committee, from Saskatchewan—if my hon. friend wants the page I can give it—agreed to the change in the boundaries of the Prince Albert constituency, but when it came before the house he pointed out one circumstance after another and finally the change was made after representations were made to the Prime Minister. Oh, yes; the same story was told in 1932 when Mr. Totzke made himself perfectly clear on that occasion as I do on this occasion.

I am not going into any further arguments at this time. I am asking the Prime Minister as the person who enunciated these great principles in 1932 to apply them, not only in Kamloops, not only in Muskoka-Ontario; I ask him particularly to apply them as far as his political opposite is concerned, my leader in this house, and I ask him to apply them in connection with Lake Centre constituency. He said in 1932 that the people can speak only through their member. The people in the southern part of that constituency have asked to be continued in Lake Centre. On behalf of those in the north end I ask first, that they be represented by someone who is fitted to represent them by reason of the geographical location. The addition gives the constituency the grotesque appearance of intentional manipulation.

There are other matters to which I shall not make reference now. There will be something said about population. I have the 1941 figures and I also have before me the 1945 figures. In 1941 Melville constituency, represented by the Minister of Agriculture, had a population of 43,847. By 1945, through the removal of people from that constituency, the population had been reduced to 43,568. According to the figures given by the hon. member for Rosthern, 5,000 from the constituency of the Minister of Agriculture are being tacked on to Lake Centre. Deducting 5,000 from the 1945 population of Melville leaves that constituency with 38,568. In 1941 Rosetown-Biggar had a population of 32,375, but by 1945 that had been reduced to 28,495. An addition is being made to the constituency of Rosetown-Biggar which will bring its population up to approximately 31,300. Lake Centre is now raised from approximately 34,175 to 43,300.

Mr. WRIGHT: What figures is the hon. member quoting? I understood that under the present arrangement Rosetown-Biggar has 40,100.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My hon. friend is perfectly correct. Those are the figures they gave us, but they based the populations on the 1941 figures.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is the law.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I appreciate that.

Mr. RINFRET: Stick to those figures.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, yes, stick to those figures. Many have left since 1941 and I am speaking about the populations today in these various constituencies.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The statute requires us to use the 1941 populations.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am sure I do not need the helpful interruption of my hon. friend to be aware of that. I am pointing out the situation today in so far as the populations of those three constituencies are concerned.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): If you had made that perfectly clear in the first place there would not have been these interruptions.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I can give knowledge but I cannot give intelligence. I am

pointing out the situation today in those three constituencies. I am not giving the situation based upon the 1941 census; I am giving the situation based upon the latest figures. They indicate that whereas the constituency of the Minister of Agriculture is substantially reduced, whereas a portion of that constituency which voted strongly against me is being added to Lake Centre, Lake Centre is now separated with a lake through its centre. In 1932 that argument was advanced as to why it should not be as large as the other constituencies. It is now increased in area very substantially on the east side and in addition three townships are added on the north side.

I do not want to be unfair. I do not want to lose those constituents on the south end. They have been there for years and years. They have no voice in this house and on their behalf I appeal to the Prime Minister. If you want to add on population, add it on, but above all remove the portion on the north end which has an appearance which I do not desire to designate at this time. This is a personal matter and I would not have brought it up had it not been that the Prime Minister who was in the same position in 1932 explained that it was the only way in which a member could properly represent his constituency. On that occasion he said that he spoke for the constituency of Prince Albert and, sir, he did. I speak on this occasion for the constituents of Lake Centre who are unable to present their views in any other way except through me.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, yesterday the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario said he did not regard me as Lord God Almighty. I am rather surprised that he found it necessary to make that confession in public. I did not think that anyone had ever suspected him of having strayed so far from the faith of his fathers as to imagine anything of the kind. I say to him and to my hon. friend who has just taken his seat: Please keep that thought in mind when references are made to me at this time as to what it may be possible to do in regard to the particular measure that is before the committee.

The hon. member for Lake Centre has said that he would make his appeal to Caesar. That was the line of appeal which he made yesterday and I understand that, according to him, it is an appeal to Caesar he is making this morning. May I say to my hon. friend that I do not regard myself as Caesar, nor have I ever attempted to take the role of a Caesar. I do not intend even to imitate Caesar, or to attempt his role at any time. If my hon. friends opposite wish to know my position it is this: I regard myself as a humble servant of this House of Commons. In all my dealing with hon. gentlemen opposite as well as with hon. members of my own party during the time that I have been leader of the government I have sought to keep that thought first and foremost in mind.

May I say that with much of what my hon. friend from Lake Centre has just said I am in most hearty accord and agreement. I think I made it very clear at the beginning of this session when I spoke on the question of redistribution that I myself would like to see the whole question of redistribution of the constituencies taken out of the hands of hon. members of the House of Commons and placed before a commission of judges. I have here the daily *Hansard* of February 3, 1947, and I read my words as spoken at that time:

> I believe I have covered all that I think it desirable to say at present, beyond giving my hon. friend an assurance that the redistribution measure will be brought in at an early date in this session. I still hold the view which I expressed before. I personally would prefer a commission of judges to make the redistribution of seats in this house, but I do not believe that the majority of hon. members take that view, and in that particular I am prepared to accept the will of the majority. I hope, however, the day will come when the House of Commons of Canada will see the wisdom of allowing its redistribution to be made by some impartial tribunal and not by the members of the house themselves dealing with the matter in committee as it has been dealt with in former years.

There I was referring to what I had said in 1933, which I think has already been quoted. I said in 1933:

> . . . My own view, and I have come to it after observing pretty carefully what has been taking place and what has been said in debate in this house as well as in the corridors, is that redistribution should be taken out of the hands of the House of Commons, where the parties are immediately interested, and should be put in the hands of a commission of judges. I would have that commission composed of judges selected in equal numbers by both sides of the house. The redistribution, if it is carried out in a fair way has not to do with party advantage at all. It ought to have solely to do with seeking to effect a fair and impartial division of the constituencies, and if three judges were named from one side of the house and three from the other, and if the choice were made, if you will, from among those who had been in politics and who therefore may be presumed to know something about conditions generally as they exist throughout the country, I think a redistribution which would be regarded as fair might be arrived at.

Mr. MacNICOL: If you fix on judges why not follow the practice in Great Britain, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand as it has been outlined in the house this morning—that

is, appoint men who are familiar with laying out constituencies? I am strongly behind the Prime Minister's proposal.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What I was reading from at the moment was the statement I made in 1933. I was going to go on to say that I agreed with my hon. friend from Lake Centre that we have an excellent precedent in the act which was passed by the United Kingdom in 1944. But what I was quoting was what I had said in 1933. The British Act was enacted subsequently. I myself would have welcomed this House of Commons adopting such a measure at this session, but this House of Commons did not share my view, and I am not a dictator in this House of Commons. I made that very clear at the time. I spoke to my own following both in the government and in this house. I was told that if my particular view were pressed it would be assumed that I was reflecting upon the integrity and the ability of hon. members of the House of Commons, which is the last thing in the world I would ever do or wish to do or be thought willing to do. It was for that reason I bowed to what I believed to be the view of the majority in this house, though I thought at the time and still think it was a mistaken view. I would hope that what has been said this morning and what has been observed in the course of the consideration of this redistribution will cause whatever government may be in office at the time of the next redistribution to adopt the reform which I have been advocating and which I believe is a very necessary and a very wise one. If the present debate has done nothing else except to help move that reform one step forward it will not have been in vain.

Mr. COLDWELL: In view of the Prime Minister's remarks would it not be possible to defer this redistribution and have the work done by a body outside of parliament?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I made very clear at the outset that there were two methods of procedure we could adopt. The house made its decision and I am abiding by the decision of the house. When the committee was appointed there was no appeal from the other side to any extent—

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the Prime Minister know—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I know my hon. friend took objection, as he does more or less to everything.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the Prime Minister know that the proposal for a commission was the subject of a motion voted on in the house?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I know as much about the proceedings of this house as any hon. member.

Mr. KNOWLES: There was a vote on it and the Prime Minister was not here for it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I know all about the vote and all the rest of it. My hon. friend interrupted me before I had finished my sentence. I said that I heard no one join in my appeal, and I was going on to say, from the official opposition in this house.

Mr. MacNICOL: I appealed. I have been in favour of a commission for redistribution for a long time. But the right hon. gentleman said that the house had voted for the present procedure.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I know that my hon. friend has always favoured this reform and he is quite right. But I was speaking of the official opposition as represented by its leader in the House of Commons, and I was not joined in that appeal which I was making to the house to have a commission deal with this question by the leader of the official opposition at that time. The house made its own decision. It decided that this year it preferred to have redistribution made by a committee of the house, as has been done in all the years past. The committee was appointed and I have yet to learn of any members of that committee to whose names exception has been taken by those serving on the committee. As far as I know, all members of that committee conducted their business as honourable members of this house and I have yet to hear exception taken in that particular to their proceedings.

The house having decided on the method which it wished to follow in having this redistribution made, and having acted upon it, the bill having been brought before the house, given first and second readings, sent to a committee to be dealt with; brought back from the committee and being before us at the present time, it is ridiculous to suggest that we should now conclude our proceedings and allow redistribution to stand over for another session. The only thing that can properly be done now is to continue with the measure and have it discussed on its merits as it is being discussed at this time.

May I add this further word. Thus far we have heard in this debate for the most part only from hon. gentlemen opposite. I imagine there will be something to be said from this side of the house as to the reasons why certain decisions were made with respect to particular constituencies, and I assume that those reasons are within the knowledge of all mem-

bers of the committee. They are not within my knowledge because I was very careful, as I have said, not to seek to influence any member of the committee in any way. I have gone out of my way to avoid seeking in any way to influence any member of the committee while the committee was at work, because I knew among other things that the constituency of Glengarry was one of the constituencies that would come up for discussion and that I was the member for Glengarry at the present time. I made it pretty clear I think at the time I was honoured by the electors of that constituency in its representation in the House of Commons, that I appreciated their kindness in allowing me to represent the constituency for this parliament, but I also made it clear to them at the same time that I did not intend to seek representation of that constituency in another parliament of Canada. So may I say to hon. gentlemen opposite, when they compare what was done in other constituencies with what was done in Glengarry, that so far as I am concerned my hands have been and are perfectly free from seeking to influence anyone to try to keep what has been called the Prime Minister's constituency in a preferred or particular position.

The house has made its own decision as to how it wishes to proceed in the matter of this year's distribution, and I would suggest that we do not at this time attempt to alter that procedure.

Mr. WHITMAN: I suppose this redistribution problem that comes up once every ten years after the census of those years ending in "1", is one of the most difficult and controversial problems that come before the house. Fortunately it comes only once in ten years. Governments are always criticized for whatever action is taken.

Before I begin my remarks I wish to explain to the hon. member for Peace River that my interjection of yesterday was not with the thought of being smart, or with the thought of sniping. My own division of Mount Royal, which I shall discuss later, is one that is affected by this redistribution, and I just wanted him to admit that as he went along.

Bill No. 18 which we are now discussing has a preamble which reads as follows:

Whereas the results of the census of 1941 necessitate a readjustment of the representation in the House of Commons, pursuant to the provisions of The British North America Acts, 1867 to 1946, and the other statutes in that behalf: Therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Then follows the bill. In the explanatory notes we find section 51 of the British North America Act which establishes rules for the present readjustment of members in the House of Commons and which reads as follows:

51. (1) The number of members of the House of Commons shall be two hundred and fifty-five and the representation of the provinces therein shall forthwith upon the coming into force of this section and thereafter on the completion of each decennial census be readjusted by such authority, in such manner, and from such time as the parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules:

It is worthy of mention that the old historic province of Quebec will be represented in the new House of Commons in a more equitable manner than it has been in the past. That may be the reason for such violent criticism as has manifested itself in this debate, although, Mr. Chairman, it is noticeable that the criticism today is not as violent as it was yesterday.

I was interested in the historical review which was given by the hon. member for Vancouver South with respect to that portion of British Columbia whence he came. I have always found the history of Canada interesting, and I was going to suggest to the hon. member that he sit down and peruse the historical background of the city of Montreal. If he does that he will find it interesting. When he told us about the gallant Quadra I was reminded of Maisonneuve, Champlain, Jeanne Mance, Dollard Desormeaux, and many others who have made the history of Canada so glorious.

Mr. MacNICOL: And La Vérendrye; do not forget him. He was famous.

Mr. WHITMAN: If these gentlemen are sitting upstairs today looking down on us they must be amused at the debate which is taking place in the House of Commons on redistribution.

I am pleased that we are to have representation according to the population of Canada. I hope the legal minds of all parts of Canada will not be turned toward interpreting this act to the detriment of any province. I want to compliment hon. members of the opposition who have so frequently and so well quoted our Prime Minister and Sir Wilfrid Laurier as authorities on redistribution. They have produced good authority. But let us remember that a committee of the house was set up to make recommendations to the government as to the changes that should be made in the divisions themselves. I was not a member of that committee, nor

did I make any representations to it until the report was brought in. The recommendations have been embodied in Bill No. 18, and whether we like it or not the new House of Commons that will be elected will be more truly representative of the people of Canada.

I have heard of the woes and the trials of those hon. members of the opposition whose constituencies have been changed and who feel that their chances of reelection are not as good as they previously were. However, I am not going to discuss them. I want to discuss for a very short period the changes which have taken place in my own division of Mount Royal and which have not been to my liking nor to my advantage. If we go back to the redistribution which took place after 1931, and of which the hon. member for Davenport was chairman, we find that many changes were made. These changes were not made in the interests of the Liberal party, and I think my hon. friend will be one of the first to admit that they were made with a view to assisting the government which was then in power.

Mr. MacNICOL: You are speaking of what province?

Mr. WHITMAN: I am speaking of the redistribution which took place in 1931.

Mr. MacNICOL: I had to do only with Ontario, and I will defend every seat that was laid out. It went through the house without change.

Mr. WHITMAN: Correct, as this will.

Mr. MacNICOL: I had nothing to do with the other provinces.

Mr. WHITMAN: This will go through without change as well. The constituency of Mount Royal as set up at that time was composed of that portion of Montreal known as Notre Dame de Grace, the municipality of Hampstead, the municipality of Montreal West, the municipality of Ville St. Pierre, and about half of the city of Lachine. One could speak at length on that redistribution, but it is sufficient to say that in 1935 the Conservative member, the late W. A. Walsh was elected with a majority of 4,226. Right here I want to pay a tribute to the memory of the late W. Allen Walsh. I do not believe there has ever been a member sitting in this house with higher ideals nor a higher regard for the principles of democracy.

In 1940 it was my privilege to win the division with a majority of 6,539. Even the Montreal Conservative sections showed general support of the government of the day and a sympathetic understanding of the problems we were facing. Again in 1945 I was elected with a majority of 3,549 and the municipality of Ville St. Pierre in that portion of Lachine which is in Mount Royal division gave me 2,500 or 2,600 of the majority. Imagine my feeling of loss when I find that Ville St. Pierre and that half of Lachine is being detached from Mount Royal and placed in another constituency. I do not accuse the committee of gerrymandering my division, since in 1941 it had a population of 84,295 persons, and I realize that redistribution must mean a changing of the division of Mount Royal. The main part of the old Mount Royal division is to be known as the division of Notre Dame de Grace and if the population of Notre Dame de Grace is substantially in accord with the policies of this government I feel they will elect a supporter of it.

I think I should refer to another aspect of this redistribution. When I saw the report of the committee I found the municipality of Montreal West had been transferred to the Jacques Cartier division. The traditions and the outlook of the people of Montreal West were more in keeping with the section known as Notre Dame de Grace or with the new Mount Royal division as it is being set up. After I had received representations from Montreal West residents, and after consultation with the Minister of Finance I suggested to the committee that Montreal West could legitimately become part of the new Mount Royal. This suggestion was adopted and Montreal West will, under the setup, become part of the new division of Mount Royal which is shown on this map of Montreal.

The subcommittee of the province of Quebec has, in my opinion, made a fair and just allocation of the electors of that province, and especially in the island of Montreal. It has been a difficult task, but I will accept the recommendations as embodied in Bill No. 18.

I was going to make an appeal to Caesar this morning, but since we have no Caesar and since we have no dictator I think I will make this appeal to the government itself. My appeal will be somewhat different from the appeal of the hon. member for Lake Centre. I appeal to the government to pass this redistribution act so that the province of Quebec will have fair and proportionate representation in the new House of Commons. I appeal to the government not to allow the small differences of opinion of a few members to influence the greater decision that will give fair and just representation to our province. I appeal to the government, in the words of St. Paul's epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 15, verse 58: "Be ye stead-

fast, unmovable." And I mean steadfast and unmovable in justice and in fairness to the electors of Canada. When an election is called, if I have the honour to contest the new seat of Notre Dame de Grace, I will contest it as a supporter of the government and will abide by the decision given by the electors of that division.

Mr. HACKETT: I have understood from the Prime Minister that it is not the intention of the government to yield to the suggestion that has been made to it that redistribution be done over by what it pleases some to call an impartial body. That being the case, it is probably futile to discuss the constitution of any such body. If that discussion ever becomes pertinent I shall place before the house my own reasons against the appointment of judges to such a commission. The right hon. gentleman who leads the house has indicated in no uncertain terms that he does not share my views as to the impropriety of appointing judges for the solution of quasi-political problems. I think he must concede that the appointment of judges to draw an electoral map of Canada, especially where three of the judges would be of one political stripe and three of another, would be a great misfortune and a great folly. It would be dragging these gentlemen back into the dust of an arena which they had long since escaped, and it would be possibly a reason—a reason at least in the minds of some evil minded people—for appointing a man to the bench, that he might at some later time be used for a task of this description.

I will satisfy myself by saying that if such a proposal ever comes before the house and I happen to be a member I shall resist it, as I know all lawyers and judges will resist it, and as I believe everyone who thinks well of our legal institutions, especially of our judiciary, will be bound to resist it.

The purpose of my few remarks this morning is to deal with a matter that is at least non-partisan and, I believe, non-political. In the schedule of the Quebec constituencies, the constituency of Wright has disappeared and is being replaced by the constituency of Gatineau. I said in the committee, and I repeat here—prompted by numerous protests received from people who hold this view—that it is unfortunate that a great historical name should be unnecessarily obliterated from the geography and from the official records of the dominion.

Philemon Wright was born in the year that Canada passed from the old allegiance to the new, in 1760. It is just 150 years ago this year that he established the community out of which Ottawa has grown. He and the group of 30 or 40 people whom he brought with him redeemed this section of country from the wilderness. For over three generations the area adjacent to Ottawa on the Quebec side of the Ottawa river has borne his name.

Wright came up the river as the head of a numerous company. I find in his own language, in an article which he contributed to the Canadian Magazine in 1824, a description of that epic journey. Here are a few lines:

> And in 1797 I came again to Canada and visited Quebec. I then viewed the country on both sides of the St. Lawrence, the whole of the distance from Quebec, until I arrived at the Ottawa or Grand river in the township of Hull, taking time to explore and examine the country, more particularly the parts bordering on both sides of the Ottawa or Grand river.

The next year he came with a large company of people, with horses and cattle. He cleared away the forest, he developed power on the rivers, he built mills and started the flourishing settlement of Hull and the settlement which, as I said a moment ago, later extended to this side of the river and became the nation's capital, Ottawa.

The name Gatineau is one that is well known. In fact, Mr. Wright was known in his day as the king of the Gatineau. Possibly it has another king today. Be that as it may, his was a great name, a name that should not ruthlessly be erased from our annals. Gatineau was a fur trader who, tradition says, was drowned in the river in 1680 something. His name is carried by that great river and is also borne by a provincial constituency in the province of Quebec, which however is not coextensive with the new constituency which, according to the bill, is also to bear the name of Gatineau.

I am going to make a motion, seconded by a great great grandson of Mr. Wright, the effect of which will be that the name of "Wright" will be rescued from quasi-oblivion. I would recall to the committee that Philemon Wright was a pathfinder, a pioneer, a Canadian whose story all should remember and whose example many should follow. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Percy Wright:

> That in the Quebec schedule the word "Gatineau" be deleted and the word "Wright" be put in its place opposite the figure "18" on page 21.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been the custom of the chair to receive the amendments and then to consider them when we reach the schedule.

Mr. HACKETT: That is true, Mr. Chairman, but possibly that rule applies to matters which are political. This is not a political

matter. It has to do with retaining a name which is historical. I had hoped that it was one which hon. gentlemen opposite might, in the circumstances, be willing to deal with a little differently than they would with a matter included with the acrimony of party.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sympathetic in many ways with the remarks the hon. member has made with regard to the name of the constituency. I think when we come to deal with these matters individually a certain latitude might well be allowed to hon. members in the expression of their views to any effect, but I think it would be a mistake to depart from the course which we have been following up to the present, namely, that of allowing hon. members to bring their motions to the attention of the committee, have them seconded and placed in the hands of the chairman, and not taken up until we come to deal with the bill section by section. Unless that procedure is followed, I am afraid it would be regarded as an injustice by those who have followed that course.

Mr. RAYMOND (Wright): I had not intended to speak on the present bill, but after the remarks made and the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Stanstead, I think it is my duty to say a few words and to give some explanation concerning the suggested change in the name of the county from "Wright" to "Gatineau".

If we look at this bill, there are two changes so far as my constituency is concerned. In the first place, the name of Gatineau replaces that of Wright. In the second place, some municipalities or parishes in the Lièvre valley, having a population totalling 4,000 to 4,500 people which are represented at the present time by the Minister of Public Works, have been added to my constituency.

If we look back we see that the constituency of Wright was established in 1892 and was then composed of the present constituency of Wright, of the city of Hull and what is also today the remainder of the constituency of Hull. In 1924 an amendment was adopted which had the effect of dividing the constituency of Wright and forming two constituencies out of it; one named Hull, comprising the city of Hull, and what is at the present time the remainder of the constituency of Hull, leaving to Wright its actual limits under the name of Wright, territory in which, I wish to state right now, nearly everything is known under the name of Gatineau.

In 1939, the municipal council of the county of Gatineau, which comprises exactly the same territory as the present constituency of Wright, and which is composed of all the mayors of such territory, with the exception of the mayor of Aylmer—because in the province of Quebec the mayor of a town is not a member of a county council—adopted a resolution. I think there are thirty or thirty-one members in this county council. The resolution was to the effect of requesting my predecessor in this house, Dr. Rodolphe Leduc, to ask this parliament to substitute the name Gatineau for that of Wright. I wish to mention here that this county council of Gatineau is composed of French-speaking Canadians and English-speaking Canadians. This motion was proposed by Mr. A. J. Earle, mayor of the town of Wakefield, an English-speaking and Conservative mayor, and was seconded by the mayor of Masham, who is a French-speaking Canadian and, I think, a Liberal. The mayors of my constituency had serious reasons to request such a change. As I said a moment ago, nearly everything is called "Gatineau" in my constituency of Wright. Those who have been in my constituency in the Gatineau district will have noted that. Wright is the same territory as the provincial county of Gatineau. It is also the same territory for land registration purposes and is named the registration division of Gatineau. For municipal purposes it is again the same limits, and the name is the corporation of the county of Gatineau. With the exception of the town of Aylmer, of part of the township of Hull comprising the village of Deschene and the township of Eardley, this district which is the constituency of Wright at the present time is a district and a region which by itself is known by everybody as the Gatineau valley. If I were trying to get publicity for my constituency, I would say that it is known as the wonderful Gatineau valley. This name "Gatineau" is so well known to designate my district that when a federal park was organized only a few steps from Ottawa and Hull, there was no question as to the name; it came naturally and it was named "Gatineau park".

While considering justly the late Philemon Wright, the founder of the city of Hull, which has not been in my constituency since 1924, as a prominent figure in our regional history, it seemed apropos to the mayors of my county—no matter to what racial group or political party they belonged—in order to avoid confusion to request that this constituency be given the name by which it is known. I then, as it was my duty to do, presented an official request that the name Wright be changed to that of Gatineau. Later on, only a few weeks ago, I was informed that some municipalities of the Lièvre valley, having a total population of 4,500 souls, were added to my constituency. It will be agreed that it is quite natural that I should wish to take

this opportunity to say that I am much honoured by this addition to my constituency.

Although my request for a change in the name from Wright to Gatineau was made at that time, I thought then to suggest the name Gatineau-Lièvre, but it would have been unfair to the remainder of the Lièvre valley, the population of which is much more important than that of the portion which has been added to my constituency, to use the name "Lièvre." And may I add that I did not ask to have the name changed in that way also because this part of the Lièvre valley which has been added to my constituency is quite similar to that of Gatineau, not only in regard to its industries, its natural resources and scenic beauty but also in regard to the character of its origin; and the name "Gatineau" does not apply only to those living in the valley of that name but applies also to the Lièvre valley, as it might apply also to many other districts, especially in the province of Quebec.

Not long ago Jean Paul Vanasse, one of our brilliant young journalists, wrote a fine article which appeared in the newspaper *Le Droit,* which very well expresses what the name Gatineau means to us. I should like to quote a few lines from that article, and I do so in the original French text:

(Translation):

Gatineau is a name which calls forth romantic recollections. This magic word conjures up in the minds of our grandfathers boundless and inexhaustible forests, long winters in lumber camps, the glorious era of brawny men whose axes, shining in the sun, sank into the hearts of vanquished trees. That name romantically evokes the life spent by successive generations in the Canadian forest, with its bitingly cold winters.

Mr. RAYMOND (Wright): The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett) stressed a few moments ago, the importance of cherishing past remembrances. I must point out to him that the name Wright will not completely disappear from my district because it deserves to be retained. In my constituency, near Gracefield, a municipality and a township bear that name, as also does a bridge at Ironside, near Hull.

While I dislike to voice the few remarks I am about to make, I deem it my duty to do so, and before resuming my seat, and on behalf of my electors, whatever their political feelings, their colour, their race or their religion may be, as well as in my own name, I wish to assure the house that in the Gatineau district we cherish the past just as much as does the hon. member for Stanstead. I may add in all fairness for the thirty-odd mayors who requested this change in name, that they have in that connection no lessons to take from the hon. member for Stanstead.

(Text):

Mr. WRIGHT: It is with considerable diffidence that I rise to take part in this debate today. The hon. member who has just spoken has told something of the history of the Gatineau. I remember hearing that history, when I was a very small boy, from my grandfather, who told me not only the early history of the Gatineau but also the story of the trek from Wotton, Massachusetts, up the St. Lawrence river, when they cut the original trail across from the Ottawa to the St. Lawrence, following roughly the route of the present canal, and the establishment of the settlement on the Quebec side of the river, when there was nothing at all where Ottawa now stands. I have heard the story of the origin of Ottawa, of the first settlers who came up the following year, crossing the river and beginning the settlement on this side. It is a long story, one I should like to tell but which I am sure hon. members are not anxious to hear at this time. Naturally I am interested in seeing the name "Wright" perpetuated, and I would ask that the committee give serious consideration to the perpetuation of a name which at one time meant a great deal in this section of the country because of its historical connections with the early days. As far as possible throughout Canada I believe we should try to retain some of these old historic connections which mean a great deal now and I am sure will mean more in the future.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Total number of members.

The CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment to this section. The hon. member for Yukon moves that section 2 be amended by striking out the words, "including that part of the Mackenzie district of the Northwest Territories lying west of the 109th meridian of west longitude". Shall the amendment carry? Those in favour of the amendment will say yea.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yea.

The CHAIRMAN: Those opposed will say nay.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Nay.

The CHAIRMAN: In my opinion the nays have it.

Mr. MacNICOL: You are going too fast, Mr. Chairman. It is one o'clock, and one or two of us would like to say a word on this section. There is not very much controversy about it.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not intend to go any faster than the committee desired me to go.

Mr. MacNICOL: The hon. member for Yukon is going to speak on this; I would like to speak on it, and it is one o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: We are on section 2, and I have put the amendment. If the hon. member would like to speak on it—

Mr. MacNICOL: What can I say in half a minute?

The CHAIRMAN: It is up to the committee.

Mr. MacNICOL: You cannot put it through that quickly; it is more important than that.

The CHAIRMAN: Then if the hon. member wishes to speak on the amendment it can stand.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes, I would like to say a word on it, but it is one o'clock.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at two o'clock.

(Translation):

Mr. CAOUETTE: Mr. Chairman, while the Halifax people were returning yesterday the Liberal candidate in a by-election, a municipal election was taking place at St. Isidore de Laverlochère, in the dominion constituency of Pontiac and the provincial electoral district of Témiscamingue.

With the support of the Union of Electors, Mr. A. Lafrenière, has won an outstanding victory over former mayor Aristide Ritchot, chief Liberal organizer for the Témiscamingue district.

(Text):

Mr. LESAGE: There is no question of privilege in what the hon. member is saying. It is only political propaganda as usual. They cannot do anything else.

Mr. CAOUETTE: What are the Liberals doing themselves?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose we were dealing with an amendment moved by the hon. member for Yukon to section 2.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am sorry that during the lunch hour I was so busy that I did not have time to get even two ideas together, but I am going to do the best I can with the amendment. This question whether Mackenzie should be put in with the Yukon was considered extensively by the committee. I can say that each member of the committee was quite fair and looked at the problem from the best point of view he could bring to bear on it. The recommendation which was made in the end, while not unanimous, was not acrimonious. I believe that if the committee could have found some way to achieve unanimity they would have done so.

I am going to confine my remarks to this section; I am not going to refer to anything else connected with the bill. I am one of the few members of the house who has been over this area from end to end, from north to south and from east to west.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I have been there too.

Mr. MacNICOL: I said that I was one of the few. I know something about what a member of parliament would have to do if he is called upon to represent approximately 750,000 square miles, an area reaching for a thousand miles from one end to the other and approximately 500 miles north and south. I am sure I am not overstating it when I give those figures and I may be understating it. When I was at Yellowknife I addressed a public meeting. I just forget the name of the club, whether it was the board of trade or the chamber of commerce. This was some two or three years ago before the problem of redistribution came up. I was one of those who advised them that they should ask for representation in this house. I am convinced that if it is possible to give it to them they should have it if they want it.

The area is growing quite rapidly. I presume that there are 5,000 people more or less in the Mackenzie district covering approximately 750,000 square miles. When one enters the Mackenzie area he does so at Fort Smith, a very pretty little village of about 150 population on Slave river. I do not think I am exaggerating. I do not want to either exaggerate or understate. From Fort Smith it is almost 200 miles to the next stop at Resolution, near the mouth of the Slave river. This is not right at the mouth, you go around the mouth of the river to the west until you come to Resolution. If you are going to Yellowknife you fly across the lake from Resolution, a distance of perhaps 100 miles.

The next community if you are going northwest towards the Mackenzie river from Resolution is Hay River. I hesitate to quote any figures, but there are only a handful of people there. Then from Hay River you go to Providence where you find another handful. It is just an airport. From Providence I believe the next stop is Simpson, and then

Wrigley and then Norman Wells. All these places are just Hudson Bay posts. Norman Wells was a thriving little centre, but I presume since the war has ended it has shut down. Normally there would not be more than fifteen people at Norman Wells. Then the next stop is Fort Good Hope, where there is a mere handful of people, it being just a Hudson Bay post; then Arctic Red River where I do not imagine there are more than two or three white people. At that time there was just one family, a very nice family by the name of Clarke. The next stop is Fort McPherson, a very small settlement, and the next stop is Aklavik itself.

I do not think I would be in error if I said that there are no more than 5,000 people in the Mackenzie district. I think that would be the outside limit on the number of white people in the whole area. There are a number of Eskimo and Indians and I presume those Indians who fought in the war would be entitled to vote. As I say, I think 5,000 would be the limit on the number of people in this area which the committee proposes to join with the Yukon.

It is impossible to reach the Yukon from the Mackenzie by a Canadian plane because there are no Canadian planes that attempt to fly from Norman Wells to Whitehorse. I went across in a large United States government plane and in crossing from Norman Wells to Whitehorse we passed over two mountain ranges which were perhaps 9,000 feet high. Unless you fly there is an impassable barrier between the Yukon and the Mackenzie.

The committee discussed the problem most carefully. I want to say a word about the subchairman, the hon. member for Grey-Bruce. I am glad to see he is sitting with the minister. In the hon. member the government has a very courteous, careful, thoughtful young man. I was greatly pleased with the work he did in the redistribution committee. I have always found him fair.

Through the chairman or by his direction communication was had with the labour unions of Yellowknife and with the council there—the government appointed at Yellowknife—and with business men in that community. The hon. member for Skeena and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre wanted, and very rightly so, as we all did, to ensure representation for any people who wanted to be represented. I am not sure whether the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre communicated direct but I believe the hon. member for Skeena did, and the wires he got back were of the same import as those sent to the chairman of the committee, that they would prefer to remain as they are until after the next census and redistribution, which will be only four or five years away, when the whole picture will be changed again. In my opinion the people of Mackenzie should be given representation of their own. The area is big enough for that, and by the time the next redistribution comes round the population may have grown to a size big enough for representation. That is what they want. All the communications I have seen, and I saw all that were received up to the time the committee finished its work, were opposed to representation if it meant being joined up with the Yukon, and I saw no communications to the contrary.

The communications from the Yukon also asked that there be no linking up of Mackenzie with the Yukon. I do not see why we should force representation upon them if they do not want it. Even if they did, where is the representation to come from, the Yukon or Mackenzie? If it comes from the one district the other will be displeased, and vice versa. To me it seems sound common sense to return to the present situation and not to put Mackenzie in with the Yukon; or else move the dividing line to the west. I looked at a map at noon. The bill says meridian 109, but if you insist on mentioning the name Mackenzie, just move the boundary from meridian 109 to meridian 135, as far as Mackenzie is concerned, and that will put a little bit of the Mackenzie area in, and that is all. I do not think that all Mackenzie should be put in. The whole proposal is silly. There is little sense to it. But if you have to do it move the boundary from meridian 109 to meridian 135. It is nothing but preposterous for this house to pass clause 2 hooking the Mackenzie area west of meridian 109 with what is now called the Yukon. It would mean that you would have an area 1,000 miles in length from east to west and 500 miles north and south. That does not make sense. There is not a member who would want such a constituency, and it would be impossible for him to visit it unless the government financed his visits to the area. I have been over it from end to end, both the Yukon and the Mackenzie area, right down to Aklavik and the Arctic ocean.

The committee divided three to two, and that is pretty close. It might just as well have gone three to two the other way, but it happened to be three to two for this proposal. I am going to support the amendment of the hon. member for Yukon. He has been a good and faithful member, and whether he runs again or not is neither here nor there; I hope he does, but whoever might succeed him would have to go through what he would

[Mr. MacNicol.]

have to go through. I am sure if he runs again he will be elected whether it be for the Yukon or for the larger area. But it is an impossible position to put any member in to ask him to represent an area of half a million square miles.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Yesterday I discussed the bill in general and gave what I thought were most convincing reasons why Mackenzie should not be added to Yukon. To me the most potent reason is that the people do not want it. By telegrams, by their representatives, by their trustees, and by their local council, which corresponds closely to a provincial legislature, they have sent in petitions against this proposal. They ask to be left as they are, even without representation, rather than have the Mackenzie district or any part of it attached to the Yukon. Why the house should insist on Mackenzie becoming part of the Yukon is something I simply cannot understand. It is not fair either to the people of Mackenzie or to the people of the Yukon. Why the house should put through such a monstrous piece of legislation I cannot understand. Will anyone who is in favour of this proposal please say why?

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, there were some general remarks I might address to my friends opposite but we had decided to wait until the particular item was before the house in order to make an explanation. Therefore at the moment I shall speak only to Yukon-Mackenzie. The petitions that came before the committee had approximately 916 signatures, and of these only 370 were from the Mackenzie district, and 546 from the Yukon represented by the hon. member. There may have been other petitions filed in the house which did not come to the attention of the committee. We only dealt with those we had before us. I agree that 370 is quite a considerable number, but when you consider the estimate given by the hon. member for Davenport and the estimate given by the department that in the Mackenzie district there are over 5,000 white people, 370 is a relatively low percentage. Your committee had to decide what to do in view of the fact that the house in sending the bill to the committee had included in it the whole of the Mackenzie district.

The hon. member for the Yukon has given figures so that the house will understand how big an area it is that he would have to represent if he were the new member for Yukon-Mackenzie. In fixing the easterly limit at meridian 109 we took in all of the occupied municipalities, if you want to call them that, in the Mackenzie river district. So far as we know there is no settlement east of that line. The purpose of the amendment is clear. It is to give the vote to some 5,400 white people in the Mackenzie district. If we carry the amendment now suggested by the hon. member these people will be prevented from voting in the next election. I agree that they have not a vote now; but the purpose of parliament should be to extend the franchise if it is at all possible, and that is why your committee recommends this to the house.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Has there been any indication from these 5,000 people of whom the hon. member speaks that they want this legislation? Nobody wants it.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): As the hon. member said in his speech yesterday, the demand for representation arose when the Yellowknife area began to increase in population in the last two or three years. These representations were made particularly last year to the minister who visited that area. On that basis we have been assuming that the people want representation. It is true that since that time the hon. member for Yukon has presented evidence, and good evidence, that they want a member for themselves; but in its wisdom the committee did not feel that it could grant that, yet it believes that these people should have representation.

Mr TUCKER: I should like to say a few words on this amendment. We expect some great developments in that district in the next two or three years. We expect to ask many young Canadians to go up there and develop that country. It is a strange suggestion that we should create a situation whereby if anyone leaves any of the provinces—and it is possible that within the next three or four years as many as 5,000 young Canadians will move into that area—he should not have a vote. If this amendment carries it means that if people from the other nine provinces of Canada go into that area they will become disfranchised. I suggest that this parliament should not put a premium upon disfranchising people who move into that area to develop it. If young Canadians go into that area in order to develop it I do suggest that the carrying of this amendment would mean that they would be disfranchising themselves. It seems to me that that is not the proper thing to do.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): That is what they asked parliament to do.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I find myself in unwonted antagonism with some of my best friends who are behind me and around me

today. I want to support the amendment of the hon. member for Yukon. The wrong way of effecting what is I think a desirable reform is to add a tremendous territory to the historic reaches of the old Yukon. They have a tradition in Canadian history which is unmatched possibly by any part of this broad dominion. I believe, sir, that the time is premature. I agree entirely with the hon. member for Rosthern that the young settlers arriving in the far reaches of the Mackenzie should have representation in this house. I believe that this house should give immediate study to the proper representation at a future date of the Mackenzie area, but I believe it is unfair at the present time, upon very short notice to the Yukon territory, to add a limitless territory to a territory already very large. Therefore on grounds of tradition, possibly on grounds of sentiment, and possibly on grounds of the necessities of this occasion I find myself inclined to disagree with some of my friends around me and to support my good and gallant friend, the hon. member for Yukon.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am surprised to hear the Minister of Veterans Affairs make the speech that he has just made. As a good Liberal and Scotsman I thought that he would want any person who paid taxes to be represented. However, I believe that a good deal of this difficulty could have been avoided had the house seen fit to adopt the suggestion which we made last year when the British North America Act was amended. At that time we suggested that there should be a member for the Mackenzie area and a member for the Yukon area. That move of this group was blocked at that time on technicalities, and the wisdom of our suggestion is now apparent.

I believe, as does the hon. member for Rosthern, that people should not live in Canada who cannot be represented in this house, and we shall continue that under the present section 2, because there is not only a Mackenzie area in the far north, but there are also the Keewatin and Franklin areas. It is true the population is very small in these areas; but there we have established weather posts and mounted police posts, and other scientific groups are going in there to secure data. There will be a number of young Canadians located in both the Keewatin and Franklin areas who will be entitled to representation. I agree that it is an impossibility for any one member to represent the area which we asking him to represent there unless the House of Commons is prepared to make several amendments to the election act, amendments which will permit transportation by air to be made available to the member representing such an area, amendments to the elections act which would make it possible for those young Canadians stationed in these outlying areas to vote by mail. It would be impossible to fly ballot boxes to every one of these individual posts, but if we are to have true representation we should at least give to these people an opportunity to vote. It is not enough simply to pass an act and let it go at that. That is not democracy. Democracy is carrying out the spirit of the act and making it possible for people whom we bring in to have representation. We are in an almost impossible position at the present time. Finally, I think we shall have to do what was suggested last year. We shall have to have two representatives for the north, at least two representatives for the area which is going to become of great importance in our Canadian economy as time goes on. These areas are entitled to representation even though the population may be small. The resources there are such that there should be someone in this house to represent that area.

Amendment (Mr. Black, Yukon) negatived: yeas, 20; nays, 61.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Division into electoral districts.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I would suggest that section 3 be held over until after the schedule has been approved.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Section 3 stands.

Mr. BRACKEN: Do I understand that the debate on section 3 is to be delayed?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Until we come to the schedule. When we pass the schedule we shall come back to section 3.

Mr. BRACKEN: I wish to say something on the whole question of the schedule, and I think perhaps I should say it now.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): If we can pass the other sections of the bill then we can come back to the schedule and have a further discussion on it. I think that is a more satisfactory way of dealing with it.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the committee did agree unanimously that on section 1 a general discussion would be permitted. Sections 1 and 2 have been carried. I think we should carry the sections as they appear and then deal with the schedule. I think that is the proper procedure.

Mr. BRACKEN: I want to understand what the procedure is, now that we have passed sections 1 and 2. We come now to section 3, which contains the whole substance of the bill. Is it the understanding that you will hold this in the meantime and deal with the other clauses in the bill and then come back to 3 and from that proceed to the details of the schedule?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is right.

Mr. BRACKEN: Then you are asking now that for the time being we pass over 3.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will deal with the other clauses and go on to the schedule and deal with 3 when the schedules are passed.

Mr. BRACKEN: I object to that procedure, going on to the schedules and leaving clause 3. I wish to speak on the general principle in clause 3. I can do so now or later, whenever you allow it, but it will be too late after we have dealt with the details of the schedule.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If it is the wish of hon. members to deal with 3 now, that is perfectly in order.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): The only reason for holding over section 3 is that it states that the provinces shall be represented as provided in the schedule to this act, and the schedule may be amended later. That is why I think it would be better to have the schedule agreed upon first.

Mr. GRAYDON: If the schedules were to be amended afterwards, then clause 3 would automatically carry the change.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): If that is understood.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think we could go on with section 3.

Mr. BRACKEN: There are two matters I should like to touch upon in connection with this clause. The clause reads:

> The said provinces respectively shall, for the purpose of the election of members to serve in the House of Commons, be divided into electoral districts, which shall be represented as provided in the schedule to this act.

The principle of this bill was approved when it was introduced into the house some months ago. The details of the boundaries of the constituencies were left to a committee of this house to determine. The recommendations of the committee now appear in the form of a schedule to this bill. I believe it is exactly the same as the committee reported, with the exception that the government has seen fit to change one of the recommendations respecting the representation of the city of Halifax. The committee recommended that the constituency have two single members. The government has seen fit to change that recommendation and to continue the constituency as it was before, a two-member seat.

With respect to the principle of the bill, the house has approved of it. I wish to commend the measure in one respect. It gives a measure of equity to the province of Quebec, which for some years has not had fair representation in this house. We need not go into the reasons for that. I am neither commending the failure to take action earlier, nor am I criticizing it. But this bill now accomplishes a measure of equity, and it accomplishes it by increasing the number of members in the house, particularly from Quebec. And so I commend the present bill for the achievement of that purpose.

But I criticize the bill on other grounds, and the objections all apply to clause 3. I criticize it for the unfairness it creates in many constituencies in Canada, particularly in a few. I want to deal with this feature of the bill.

Some hon. members have said that the boundaries determined for certain constituencies in Canada are the result of coincidence. The fact is that some prominent officials of this party find themselves in the position where they feel discriminated against. I feel myself that the committee is to be censured for the unfairness which has been created in certain seats, and I propose to mention them; and in certain cases I propose, when we come to deal with the details, to move amendments made to them.

The boundaries proposed of certain of these constituencies leave the impression that partisanship was apparent somewhere in the work of the committee. The seats I particularly refer to, commencing at the west, are, first, Kamloops in British Columbia; second, the Yukon, about which we have had some little discussion; third, Lake Centre in Saskatchewan; fourth, the two constituencies of Neepawa and Portage la Prairie in Manitoba, one represented by Mr. Miller and the other by myself; and, fifth, one in the province of Ontario, namely, Muskoka-Ontario, to which has been added a large section of the constituency of Parry Sound.

I want to deal with these very briefly, but before doing so I wish to discuss one question the Prime Minister raised this morning. In discussing the procedure followed in this house in order to achieve this measure of redistribution, the Prime Minister admitted that in days past he had favoured an independent commission or committee of judges to study the matter; but he left the impression that he had had little support from the house

in that idea, and he referred particularly to the leader of the opposition as not having supported that view. He thus excused himself from following the policy he had formerly advocated.

Let me say that in the early days of this session I did speak on this matter in the debate on the speech from the throne. Just in order that the record may be complete, I will read the words I used. I pointed out the position the Prime Minister had taken in earlier years and asked him to make a statement when he spoke as to how the matter would be approached this time. He did not see fit to do so. I am not suggesting that he deliberately avoided it; perhaps it was just an oversight. But later on the member for Winnipeg North Centre moved a motion that an independent committee should do this job and it was largely supported on this side of the house. I myself would have voted for that amendment, and the only reason I did not—I ask no commendation for this—was that during this session, through courtesy to the Prime Minister when he was away on many occasions, I have not voted. My own remarks may be found in *Hansard* of February 3, at page 54. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will be found in *Hansard* of February 21, 1947, and the vote on the amendment which was opposed by the government, appears in *Hansard* of February 24, at pages 737-38. I wish to quote what I did say in the debate on the speech from the throne. I know the Prime Minister did not recall that I had made these statements or he would not have made the comment he did this morning. But I said on that occasion:

Now I come to the question of redistribution. As anticipated, the speech from the throne forecasts the introduction of a measure to provide for the readjustment of representation in the House of Commons. It does not indicate, however, what method will be adopted to effect this redistribution, and I should like the Prime Minister to give this information to the house when he speaks. Hon. members may or may not remember that the redistribution effected in —many will not remember these early years— 1903, 1914, 1924 and 1933 was the result of the work of special committees of this house. I assume it is the intention of the government to adopt the same method at this time.

All the indications were that that was the intention of the government.

The Prime Minister will recall that in the debate on redistribution in 1933 he strongly advocated that the task should be taken out of the hands of the House of Commons. As reported at page 5425 of *Hansard* for that year he said:

I am now quoting from my own remarks in the House of Commons, in which I quoted a few lines from the statement made by the Prime Minister. This is what he said.

—"My own view . . . is that redistribution should be taken out of the hands of the House of Commons, where the parties are immediately interested, and should be put into the hands of a commission of judges. I would have that commission composed of judges selected in equal numbers by both sides of the house."

I continued as follows:

I imagine the fact that the Prime Minister, and not another party, commands a majority of the house, has led him to change his mind. There are only two comments I wish to make. I hope the bill will be presented and the committee established, if such is to be the technique followed, with the least possible delay. Hon. members will not wish to have this measure rushed through by the government majority in the dying days of the session.

Those remarks were made on February 3 of this year, and I continued:

In the next place, the opposition believes that the guiding principle must be the assurance of just and equitable representation, not partisan advantage. We sincerely hope there may be general agreement on the boundaries of all constituencies. I serve notice now that we will fight to the limit any attempt at manipulation of seats designed to give an advantage to the party in power.

I imagine that if the Prime Minister had been making a speech on this matter he would have used exactly the same words as I am using. In fact, they are only different words for expressing the same sentiments as he held in the past. I continue:

The people of Canada will not take kindly to any gerrymandering which would deny them the effective voice in government to which they are entitled.

The only other observation I wish to make on the matter is this. The Prime Minister left the impression that the procedure in this matter is determined by the members of the House of Commons. I suggest in all respect that the procedure is determined by the government—as it was in this case.

Mr. KNOWLES: A straight party vote.

Mr. BRACKEN: The government brought in this measure. They determined to send it to a committee. It could have been done in another way. And it is not a satisfactory explanation to say that this house determines these things. The government failed to carry out the policy which the Prime Minister on many occasions in recent years has said was a good policy; and it is not a justification of the present procedure to say that the House of Commons does it. The House of Commons did not have any opportunity to do it. The government brought in this measure as it is, and the government majority refused to make any changes.

I come now to the boundaries proposed for these particular constituencies. I have mentioned that they should be fair, just and equitable, as I am sure every member of the House of Commons would want to see them. Let us look at the first one I referred to—the one in the far western province of British Columbia, namely, Kamloops. The proposal in that constituency is to nearly double its size. It comprises now, in round figures, 35,000 square miles. It is proposed to increase it to 65,000 square miles. At a time when one constituency in Canada comprises only 500 square miles. Yet the proposal in the case of Kamloops is to increase its size. It now contains a population of some 35,000—that is the present estimated population; the so-called ration book population; not the population in 1941 but the actual, real population of today. It is proposed to increase it from 35,000 to 46,000. That is being done in a constituency which already contains twice as many people as the constituency which has been referred to, namely, Glengarry. It is proposed to increase the number in Kamloops to nearly three times the number in that constituency; and that in a territory which will comprise 65,000 square miles as compared with some 500 in Glengarry. One has only to present these facts for hon. members to question in their own minds whether a decision of that kind is just, fair and equitable.

Let us come to the next constituency coming east, or rather it is going north—the constituency of Yukon. This has just been deal with and in the opinion of the majority of this house the enlargement should not be altered. What happens there? It is proposed in this bill to add to the constituency of Yukon the large territory of Mackenzie. The constituency of Yukon contains some 200,000 square miles. The constituency which it is proposed to add to it contains 500,000 square miles.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. The constituency of Yukon has already been dealt with.

Mr. BRACKEN: All right, Mr. Chairman. I was only going to take another minute, but if you deny me the opportunity of referring to it, I will not refer to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Go ahead.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I can assure the hon. leader of the opposition that it is not the chairman who is making that decision; it is a matter of observing the rules of the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: An interruption is enough to enable the hon. gentleman to go on.

Mr. GREEN: Start over again.

Mr. BRACKEN: I am just showing the unfairness of some of these decisions, and I was using the Yukon as an example. I am not asking that we go back to reconsider it. As I said, Yukon contains 200,000 square miles and Mackenzie contains 500,000 square miles; together they make a total of 700,000 square miles. Glengarry contains 500 square miles. Yukon and Mackenzie combined are bigger than the province of British Columbia and Alberta combined; they are bigger than the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba combined; they are about as big as Ontario; they are nearly as big as Quebec with the maritime provinces added on. Here we are today, practical men, deciding that we shall increase this constituency so and still expect that one man will represent that vast territory. It is all right to have high ideals. We all want everybody in Canada, for whom it is practicable, to have the right to vote. But I suggest that we should approach a question of this sort as practical men. Who is there who could represent those people? Suppose a man becomes the member for that vast territory. Is it suggested that the people, scattered all over that area, with their right to vote, will have any real representation in this house? I suggest that they would have substantially none.

Then we come to the constituency of Lake Centre in Saskatchewan. The hon. member for that constituency has outlined the situation there better than anyone else could do it. He understands it. He has presented the history of it. He has presented the immediate situation. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, this is a most flagrant piece of political spite, because it is making it practically impossible for the hon. member for Lake Centre to come back to this house. That is the practical effect of the boundaries proposed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. BRACKEN: I do not say hon. members intended to do that, but if they did not so intend they can look at it again and see if it cannot be corrected. That is the practical effect of what has been done in this constituency, the one constituency in that province held by a member of this party, an hon. member who has been a severe and effective critic of the government. By this measure it is being made practically impossible for him to come back to this house if he runs for that seat. With all respect, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that hon. members on the other side of the house and on this might look again at the

boundaries of that constituency and see if some measure of justice cannot be done there.

With respect to the province of Manitoba there are two adjoining constituencies, that of Neepawa, which I have the honour to represent, and Portage la Prairie, which is represented by Mr. Miller, a member of this party. Those two seats were won by this party and were thus taken out of the Liberal column. In this readjustment it is proposed that these two constituencies be brought together, which means that one or other of these two members cannot be a candidate there.

Mr. MUTCH: How about Lisgar and Macdonald?

Mr. BRACKEN: You talk about Lisgar and Macdonald, if you wish, and perhaps I will support you. I am talking about Neepawa and Portage la Prairie, two of the three seats we hold in Manitoba. I am not now complaining about what has been done there. I just want the committee to understand what is being done in this and the other four or five seats. The constituency of Neepawa is much larger than Glengarry, which I take as an illustration because it is among the smallest in Canada. It happens that Glengarry is represented by the Prime Minister, who this morning as I understood him said in effect that he would not be representing it any longer.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What I said this morning was that I told the electors of Glengarry at the time they were kind enough to nominate me as their member that I would be proud to accept representation of Glengarry for this parliament, but that it would be for this parliament only.

Mr. BRACKEN: All right, Mr. Chairman, but that does not alter the fact that the constituency covers only 500 square miles and contains only 18,000 people. My criticism applies just as much as though the Prime Minister were going to be a candidate there. I was going on to say that the constituency of Neepawa is many times larger than Glengarry; the constituency of Portage la Prairie is also many times larger, while the combined constituencies as is proposed are a great many times larger. By combining them it is made clear that one of the two hon. members who represent these constituencies will not come back.

Then I come to the constituency of Muskoka-Ontario in this province, to which is being added the constituency of Parry Sound. The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario dealt with this matter very effectively. I need not go into the details of what has been done there. At this time it is perhaps sufficient to say that in the province of Ontario for the most part only minor changes have been made. But this is a major change. I do not suggest that the fact that the member representing that constituency is president of the Progressive Conservative Association of Canada would justify parliament in showing him any favours. I do suggest, however, that it does not justify parliament in putting more unfair handicaps in his way than are put in the way of most other members in this house.

In closing these remarks may I add that the Prime Minister once said he favoured a judicial body to deal with matters of this kind; yet that policy has not been brought forward. At other times the Prime Minister has favoured senate reform and nothing has been done about it; and, as someone said this morning, he favoured proportional representation and nothing has been done about that. I want to read one extract from his speech and ask hon. members if what is being done here now carries out the spirit of his words. In 1937 this house was asked to consider this problem, and a committee was appointed to deal with it. That committee brought in a report after holding eighteen meetings, and in that report stated:

> Owing to the shortness of the session your committee has been unable to complete its study of the methods used to effect redistribution of electoral districts in Canada and other countries, and the evidence at present before us does not warrant a final report thereon. Your committee therefore suggests that this subject be further considered during the next session of parliament.

That was in 1937. But the subject was not considered during the next session of parliament, and no action was ever taken on the recommendation of the committee in that respect. During debate on a similar measure in 1933 the present Prime Minister suggested a method previously turned down by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. At that time, as reported at page 5425 of *Hansard* for 1932-33, the Prime Minister said:

> My own view . . . is that redistribution should be taken out of the hands of the House of Commons, where the parties are immediately interested, and should be put into the hands of a commission of judges . . . selected in equal numbers by both sides of the house.

I believe the Prime Minister also read that statement this morning. I should like to quote one other brief statement by the same right hon. gentleman later on in the same debate:

> . . . I was careful to say that my suggestion did not apply to this redistribution . . .

He was speaking in 1933, and he said his words did not apply to that redistribution.

. . . when the House of Commons was again confronted with the question of redistribution . . . it would in my opinion be wise for it to adopt the plan of referring the whole matter to a commission of judges who would have the opportunity of viewing the situation impartially, not from the point of view of the self-interest of any individual member but rather from the point of view of the wider interests of the people of Canada as a whole . . .

I cannot think any Canadian would oppose sentiments of that kind. A little later the Prime Minister made this further comment:

What I proposed was a commission that would have represented on it in equal numbers judges nominated by both sides of parliament . . . Redistribution is a matter of legislation—

I want the committee to get these next words.

—but it is also one essentially of justice in the redistributing of the constituencies of Canada in accordance with principles which will be observed above all else as fair and just.

I only ask that those principles be kept in mind when we request the house to look again at what has been done in these particular constituencies: Kamloops, which is represented by the president of the Young Progressive Conservatives of Canada; Yukon, which as the Minister of Veterans Affairs so well said has been represented so honourably in this house for many years by a former Speaker; Lake Centre, represented by the only member we have from Saskatchewan. I will ask for nothing in the way of reconsideration for Neepawa and Portage la Prairie, the former of which I represent. If I am driven from that seat by this action I can get another somewhere else, and it will come from the ranks of the party opposite. But I do ask you to look at the situation in Muskoka-Ontario. I ask you also where is the justice in the way that Kamloops has been gerrymandered? Where is the justice in the way that Yukon has been expanded into one constituency as large as the whole of Ontario? Where is the justice in the way the representative for Lake Centre has been treated? Where is the fairness in the way the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario has been treated?

You have indicated, Mr. Chairman, that after a general discussion on this measure we will deal with the details of the schedule. Those details take up sixty pages of this bill, and I suppose there are more than 250 clauses. When we come to certain of those clauses we will move amendments. I do not know that we will fight on them all, but certainly we will fight on the one which has to do with Lake Centre. Of all the unfair gerrymandering we have ever seen in this country, that takes the cake. Having said that, I want to appeal to the fairmindedness of this committee in dealing with that situation. But as I said, we will deal with certain amendments when we come to the clauses in the schedule.

Mr. TUCKER: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the leader of the opposition has singled out Lake Centre as the main basis of his attack upon this bill, as a member of the Saskatchewan subcommittee I should like to say a few words about what was done in connection with that province. Before I come to that, however, may I refer to something that was said with regard to Glengarry? I listened to the argument with regard to that and I was particularly impressed by the observations of the hon. member for Davenport who has been more or less put forward as the expert on redistribution for the Progressive Conservative party. I heard him say in the committee that he did not see how anything else could have been done than what was done in regard to Glengarry. He said that what was done was quite in order and was quite proper. When he said that, having been more or less put forward by the Progressive Conservative party as the expert on that, I must say that I think all this talk over something being wrong in leaving Glengarry as a seat is without basis. The leader of the opposition has brought it up today knowing as he must the attitude of his distinguished colleague, the hon. member for Davenport. To me that looks like an attempt to make political capital where there is really no basis for it at all. The hon. member for Davenport is sitting right here and if what I say is not correct he can rise and contradict me. I suggest to the leader of the opposition that if he is not going to abide by the judgment of the people he puts forward to represent him on these committees, if he is going to go behind their back and attack what they did in the measured terms he used, it looks very bad to me from the point of view of political good faith.

I must say that I am amazed at the observations of the leader of the opposition in regard to Lake Centre. He said that of all the unfair gerrymandering that had ever been done, what had been done in Lake Centre took the cake. He said that this was a most flagrant piece of political spite, that the practical effect of it was to make it politically impossible for the hon. member for Lake Centre to come back to this house. What is the leader of the opposition getting at? He is not saying that that is an unsound bit of redistribution based upon what a judicial committee or a judicial commission would do. He is not saying it is unfair; he is just saying that the effect of it is that the hon. member for Lake Centre can-

not get reelected. What does he suggest? What is he getting at? Is he suggesting that we should take that map of Saskatchewan and fix a seat in which the hon. member can get elected, no matter what unfairness is done to other constituencies? Is that what he is suggesting?

Mr. FRASER: He will get elected anyway.

Mr. TUCKER: That is not what your leader said. Your leader is saying in effect that we should have drawn a seat regardless of all other considerations of fairness and everything else so that the hon. member for Lake Centre can get elected. That is the effect of what he said; that is the clear inference. My hon. friends are asking for a judicial committee or a judicial commission to look after this thing. Will they consider whether an individual belonging to a certain party is going to be reelected? Of course not.

I am saying in all fairness and honesty that we drew this map on the basis of an endeavour to distribute the seats of Saskatchewan in a fair manner. We presented that map to the hon. member for Lake Centre who was a member of the subcommittee, to the representative of the C.C.F, the hon. member for Melfort. There were many observations in the press suggesting that attempts were being made to affect in some way the hon. member for Lake Centre. It was explained over and over again that these were only suggestions which had been laid before the subcommittee. We asked representatives of the Conservative party and representatives of the C.C.F. to come and inspect the proposals and make suggestions. I said to the hon. member for Lake Centre, "Bear in mind that we have to redistribute the whole of Saskatchewan; we have to consider that other seats besides Lake Centre are involved; you draw us a map of what you think would be right, make suggestions and they will be considered." The only suggestions of any consequence that I recall were made by the hon. member for Lake Centre had to do entirely with his own seat. With regard to the suggestions made by the hon. member for Melfort, I think practically every suggestion he made was concurred in by other members of the committee.

Now then, with regard to population. The population of Saskatchewan was 896,000 in round figures. There were eight cities, and we felt that they should have larger populations. We worked out a suggestion whereby the average city seat would have a population of 46,700, leaving the average population of the rural seats, 43,500. When we looked at the census we found that there had been a great shift in population in Saskatchewan from the south to the north, particularly from the south to the northeast. If we were going to make a fair redistribution we had to take that into account.

We would have to change the boundaries. Furthermore, Saskatchewan was losing one seat under the constitution and we had to do something about that. That necessitated a rearrangement of boundaries no matter what the leader of the opposition may say. We looked at the census and we found, for example, that Lake Centre had a population of 34,400, which was actually 9,100 short of what it should have.

Mr. FULTON: So you took a lot off.

Mr. TUCKER: If the hon. member will allow me.

Mr. FULTON: We have to have both sides of the story.

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member will have a chance to speak later. If I may proceed, it meant that Lake Centre was 9,100 short and we had to add to that area. We also found that Moose Jaw was 7,600 short. The only way we could increase the population of Moose Jaw, without taking from other seats which were already short, was to add something from Lake Centre. The seats were short on population. Rosetown-Biggar was 10,900 short; Kindersley was 10,900 short, so that we could not add to Rosetown-Biggar from it; Moose Jaw was 7,600 short; Wood Mountain was 7,000 short; Assiniboia was 10,100 short and Maple Creek was 9,200 short. This meant we had to add something on to the north rather than from the south or east. Anyone who looks at the map can see that. So we figured we had no alternative but to add to Moose Jaw something from Lake Centre. We could not add anything from Rosetown-Biggar. It was already short by nearly 11,000. So we proposed to add something from Lake Centre to Moose Jaw. We proposed to eliminate one of the seats in the south also to make up for the situation. In our original suggestion to the subcommittee we actually had a situation that we thought was reasonably fair. Amongst other things there had been a good part of Rosthern added to Saskatoon. I certainly hated to lose that part of Rosthern but it was felt that Saskatoon had to be brought up to a reasonable level. As a matter of fact the part of Rosthern taken off actually had a Liberal majority of 137 at the last election. The part added on to Rosthern from Humboldt had a C.C.F. majority of 306. But there had to be a real attempt to adjust boundaries on a fair basis. We confronted the hon. member for Lake Centre with these suggestions, and I asked for suggestions from him.

I should say, in regard to the increase of Rosetown-Biggar, we could not increase it in the west because Kindersley was already short by 10,900; we could not increase it to the north because the seat up there already had to have something added to it; we could not increase it to the south because that would have been at the expense of a seat already underpopulated—the only place we could increase Rosetown-Biggar was to run it to the east into Lake Centre, which was part of the picture of moving the boundaries of the seat north and east.

Actually we did not run the boundary of Lake Centre as far east as we should have done, because we did leave Rosetown-Biggar quite a bit short of the population it should have had. Had we run Rosetown-Biggar farther east than we did it would have meant running Lake Centre still farther east and north. So we thought, in order not to interfere with Lake Centre any more than absolutely necessary, we did not run the seat as far east as we should have. We left Kindersley low by 2,400 votes and Rosetown-Biggar low by 2,400 votes, in order not to interfere with Lake Centre any more than we had to. Our proposal left those two seats each 2,400 short and it still left Moose Jaw about 1,100 short. I tell this committee that that was done in order to interfere as little as possible with the seat of the hon. member for Lake Centre.

Having done that, having considered that situation—and the other members of the subcommittee know that is true as well as the hon. member for Lake Centre—the situation which we proposed left Lake Centre at 43,100.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: On what census?

Mr. TUCKER: At the 1941 census, the one we are going on. That was 400 under the average.

Something has been said about Melville. Our suggestion would have made Melville 43,300, which is about the average, and 200 over Lake Centre as originally proposed.

I have dealt with why we added parts of Lake Centre to Rosetown-Biggar, but still leaving it 2,400 short, and why we added some of it to Moose Jaw, but still leaving it 1,100 short. I put the question, where else could you have added from Rosetown-Biggar to give it the requisite population?

We found that Melville at the last census had a population of 47,100, which was 3,600 over what it should have. Yorkton had 50,300, which as anyone can see was 7,000 over what it should have. Humboldt had 43,300 at the last census. It meant that we had to add on to Lake Centre part of Yorkton and Melville to bring it up to a reasonable level. Humboldt, after adding from Mackenzie to bring it down to the proper level, had 46,400, which was 3,100 over the average. So those seats to the north, Melville, Yorkton, Mackenzie and Humboldt all had several thousand over what they should have, and the seats to the south and the west, even with the additions, were still under what they should have. On the face of that does the leader of the opposition say that we should have left the seat of the hon. member for Lake Centre where it was before, and left those seats to the south and west away underpopulated, for example, left Yorkton at 50,000 in order that he might get elected? Then the opposition say they want a judicial commission to settle the redistribution! I venture to say that no judicial commission would ever have given the consideration that we gave to the hon. member for Lake Centre, and I am going to prove that.

At the 1941 census Lake Centre had 34,400. As I say, we took 1,700 off and added it to Rosetown-Biggar. If anybody thinks that that injured the hon. member for Lake Centre he should look at the last election results. The C.C.F. had a majority in that piece we took off Lake Centre and added to Rosetown-Biggar of 174. That is one way in which the hon. member for Lake Centre is terribly damaged, of course!

Next we proposed to take 5,500 off Lake Centre and add it to Moose Jaw. According to my figures the C.C.F. majority in that piece was 54 over the Conservatives. I do not suppose that the hon. member for Lake Centre was so terribly damaged by having that area taken off where the C.C.F. had a majority of 54 over the Conservatives.

Then we added one township and Watrous to Rosthern.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: You removed Watrous.

Mr. TUCKER: We had to take territory from Rosthern to add it to Saskatoon.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh!

Mr. TUCKER: I do not know why that is funny. We were drawing a map for the whole of Saskatchewan. Having added a part of Rosthern to Saskatoon we proposed to add a piece to Rosthern. That was two townships with 1,600 people. We added on from Melville 5,300, from Yorkton, 8,500, and from Humboldt, 3,700, leaving Lake Centre at 43,100, or 400 under the average. It was necessary to bring Lake Centre up to where it should be. The places that were added from Lake Centre to Moose Jaw and Rosetown-Biggar, were still under what they should

be. The first suggestion of my hon. friend was that Watrous township and one of the townships which had been added to Rosthern from Lake Centre should be given back to him. That first suggestion was agreed to by the hon. member for Melfort and myself. That cut down Rosthern more than it should have been. However, in order to accommodate the hon. member for Lake Centre we agreed to it. That cut Rosthern from 44,000 to 42,400, which was 1,100 under the average, but we did that to accommodate the hon. member for Lake Centre.

The next suggestion of the hon. member for Lake Centre; we had proposed to take seven rows of townships from Yorkton and he suggested that we should take only six and put one township back into Yorkton. That raised Yorkton to 49,000, which was 1,500 over what it should have been. But again, in order to accommodate the hon. member for Lake Centre, the hon. member for Melfort and myself agreed to that suggestion.

Mr. FRASER: Very generous.

Mr. TUCKER: You may think it was not generous, but it is more than a judicial commission would have done.

We come now to the third suggestion of the hon. member for Lake Centre, which was that we should put back into Lake Centre practically half of what we were going to add to Moose Jaw. I remember the words of the hon. member for Lake Centre. He said, "I want to be fair about this thing." He said, "put half back again." He cannot deny he said that. Although that was going to leave Moose Jaw under what it should have been by 2,700, the hon. member for Melfort and myself said to the hon. member for Lake Centre, "All right, we will put half of this original area back into Lake Centre, although it cuts down Moose Jaw by 2,700 and leaves it 4,300 short." So far as I knew that is all he wanted in that regard. He felt it was fair to have that taken from Moose Jaw and added to his constituency. He said he wanted to be fair and that is what he asked for. That is the third suggestion.

His fourth suggestion was to put back into Humboldt nine rows of townships, taking from Lake Centre 3,400 voters and leaving Lake Centre at 41,000, which would have meant that Lake Centre was under what it should have by 2,400, and would leave Humboldt at 49,800 or 6,500 over what it should have had. The hon. member for Lake Centre wanted us to add to Humboldt an area which would give that constituency 6,500 over what it should have and cut his constituency away below what it should have had. At that point the hon. member for Melfort and myself began to think that perhaps—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. TUCKER: —we would likely be accused of doing a little too much gerrymandering for the hon. member for Lake Centre.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PARENT: Did he ask for election by acclamation?

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member for Melfort took the attitude that he could not agree to a proposition which was so flagrantly gerrymandering the situation in order to help the hon. member for Lake Centre. Well, I was trying to keep peace in the family.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is a new role.

Mr. TUCKER: Therefore I made a suggestion—

Mr. MacNICOL: You are getting old.

Mr. TUCKER: —which is number five. I made the suggestion that we put the western part of these townships into Lake Centre and the eastern part into Humboldt—four of the townships into Lake Centre; in other words put six into Humboldt and four into Lake Centre, or a sort of fifty-fifty split. Remember, the hon. member for Lake Centre did not want the whole ten. We were giving him only four out of the ten. A great deal of argument ensued on that. That would have left Lake Centre 600 under what it should have had and would have left Humboldt with 5,500 more than it should have had. I talked. As I said, I tried to keep peace in the family. I talked and talked. Finally I appealed to the hon. member for Melfort. I said, "You know, if you do not give the hon. member for Lake Centre what he wants there will be a big row in the house." Finally the hon. member for Melfort, with, I could see, a great deal of doubt, said, "Well, if the hon. member for Lake Centre will agree to this I will go the length you suggest in order to get agreement in Saskatchewan," which would be something worthy of commemorating. We all agreed to that. I said, "If we are in agreement let us sign the agreement so that there will be no argument about it." I signed my name to it; the hon. member for Melfort signed his name to it and the hon. member for Lake Centre signed his name to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. TUCKER: There is his signature on the agreement. Can anyone—

Mr. COLDWELL: Read what the agreement says.

Mr. TUCKER: It is the schedule to this bill. After it passed the main committee I handed it over to the printer as signed. Here is the situation, Mr. Chairman. Four suggestions were made which did, I am a little ashamed to say, more or less gerrymander things in favour of the hon. member for Lake Centre. But we did that knowing he was the only Conservative member in Saskatchewan, and he kept saying that he could not get elected unless we did something.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Chairman, I do not mind the hon. gentleman being generous in his treatment of the truth, but that statement is unequivocally false.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What statement? The document speaks for itself.

Mr. TUCKER: I do not know to which statement the hon. member is referring. I suppose he does not deny his own signature.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not.

Mr. TUCKER: I suppose he does not deny what his leader has just said. He said that unless a change was made the hon. member for Lake Centre could not get elected. That is, in effect, what I just said, and that is what his leader said a while ago. I suppose his own leader took it from the hon. member for Lake Centre that he could not get elected unless a change was made. That is what his leader said just now. That is the story we have heard continually from the hon. member for Lake Centre. He is an old friend; he is the only Tory left in Saskatchewan, the last of the Mohicans, as they say.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. TUCKER: We accepted three of his suggestions and we went more than half way to accept the fourth. He was so well satisfied that he signed it, and then we have the speech of his leader—

Mr. MACKENZIE: This afternoon.

Mr. TUCKER: —who said that it is a most flagrant piece of political spite. But the hon. member signed it himself. I must admit that I do not understand such political tactics.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Tory mentality.

Mr. TUCKER: It goes beyond anything that I can understand. He says that of all the unfair gerrymandering that ever took place this takes the cake. Does he mean that we gerrymandered it too much to help out the Tory member for Lake Centre, which is the only way any gerrymandering whatever took place? There is the situation, Mr. Chairman. I place the facts before the committee and I say this: I can assure the committee that in the original map which we laid before the subcommittee our idea was to try to arrange these seats on a fair basis. The suggestions made by the member for Melfort were agreed to with the consent of the member for Lake Centre and the suggestions made in regard to Lake Centre seat were acceded to in the manner I have stated. I leave it to this committee as to whether we did not treat the member for Lake Centre fairly and more than fairly.

Mr. MACKENZIE: He said so himself.

Mr. TUCKER: Taking what the member for Lake Centre agreed to and signed as the fair thing to lay before the committee, and which I laid before the committee as the unanimous recommendation of the subcommittee from Saskatchewan, it is not fair to that committee, it is not fair to parliament, to have a subcommittee set up, agreeing to something like that, and then have that made the basis of such an attack as was made by the leader of the opposition this afternoon.

Mr. WRIGHT: As the third member of this very contentious committee from Saskatchewan, who thought they had made a unanimous report, I think it my duty to say a few words on this subject. In the first place, this discussion simply strengthens the argument that we have made all along in this group, that this matter should be taken out of the control of members of parliament. Anyone who has read the debates on this particular bill as it has come before the Canadian parliament over the last sixty or seventy years cannot help agreeing with that. Time after time, whoever was in power slit the other fellow's throat at every opportunity. The other fellow howled to high heaven about it and when the position was reversed the same thing took place again.

Coming to Saskatchewan, the government were in a rather precarious position trying to make a redistribution there. They did not have much support left there, with two Liberal members and one Conservative. One of the Liberal seats had to be strengthened, and as it lay alongside a Conservative seat there was only one thing that could be done. They had to make a choice and they made a choice. They strengthened the Liberal seat at the expense of the Conservative seat. What would the Conservatives have done had they

been in power? We would have found exactly the same thing in reverse. I listened in committee to arguments made by various members of the Conservative group. I listened in the subcommittee also. No one seemed to be particularly interested in the people. Everyone was interested in his own personal interest, in his own personal seat, and he wanted to be sure of that. That was the first consideration and after that they tried to divide up the population.

The hon. member for Rosthern has said we drew this map. We did not draw the first map. I do not know whom he was talking about when he said "we". It was certainly not the subcommittee. When we first met we were presented with a map, and the different meetings of the committee were very short and to the point. I agree with what the hon. member for Rosthern has said with regard to the negotiations that took place in that committee. What he has said is, I believe, a correct interpretation of the various negotiations that took place in that committee. They did not meet for a very long period but in substance those were the agreements which were reached.

As the member for Rosthern has said, the member for Lake Centre did not appear to be very much interested in any other part of Saskatchewan than his own constituency. In the proceedings in the committee he raised only one point that I can remember with regard to any other constituency and that was with reference to Melville, adding an area south of Qu'Appelle valley to that constituency.

If that is the basis on which we are to deal with redistribution, the personal interest and personal preserves of individual members, I do not think we can ever reach fair decisions, and that apparently was the basis on which this matter was considered.

As I have said, regarding the divisions in the province of Saskatchewan, the original map, as far as population was concerned, was the best division made in any province in the dominion. It was the best representation by population. There were no constituencies with under 40,000 and none with over 47,000 except the city of Regina, which was left the same as it was before.

With regard to Saskatoon, on the east side of that city it was necessary to add something to the constituency of Rosetown-Biggar and naturally Saskatoon had to get some population from some other area. That was taken quite conveniently from the constituency of Rosthern on one side and taken in such a way as one would expect from a Liberal government when they were making the redistribution to strengthen their position. And it did strengthen their position as far as Saskatoon is concerned.

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member will admit it took an area in which there was a Liberal majority out of the seat.

Mr. WRIGHT: There was only one safe Liberal seat in Saskatchewan, apparently, on the basis of the 1945 election, although I would not admit today that it would be a safe Liberal seat.

Mr. TUCKER: Doubly safe now.

Mr. WRIGHT: You could take a little out of it provided you got in some more afterwards that was also safe, which was done. That was the basis on which the redistribution was made in Saskatchewan.

I will say this. The Liberal party, in arranging the redistribution, took one thing into consideration first, and that was the fact that they had to strengthen one seat, and they worked everything else around that. The Conservatives, from what they have said in the committee, would have done the same thing. If a Conservative seat had been in danger they would have worked the province around it, irrespective of whatever else might take place.

As regards moving population from the south to the north, that is quite right and the only seat that could be taken out was a seat in the south. We in the C.C.F. knew that was a C.C.F. seat, but we agreed to it because it was the reasonable thing to do.

In the western portion of the province, the division between Swift Current and Maple Creek constituency ran in the original drawing north and south instead of east and west. We suggested that the natural way for the division to run was east and west, since both the railroads and the roads run in that direction and the constituency could be served better if divided in that way. The member for Rosthern agreed to that and so did the member for Lake Centre and that change was made.

The other changes suggested by myself were largely, in fact all, changes which would make for the convenience of the people who were voting. In the original map the lines were drawn on township and range lines. In some instances these township and range lines did not take cognizance of the geography in the area to serve the convenience of the people across rivers where they would not have an opportunity of getting to the polls without going miles out of their way. I made suggestions so as to meet the convenience of the

people in various areas and the chairman of the committee agreed to them and those changes were made.

To sum up, are we going to continue this way of making the redistribution in Canada? I do not think it is fair. I do not think we are strengthening our democracy. Whether we realize it or not, we cannot afford to weaken democracy in Canada. We have seen other countries which claimed to have democracy and claimed to have constitutions leave those constitutions in such a position that they could not be operated. We in Canada cannot afford to leave our democracy in such a position that it cannot be operated fairly for all the people of Canada. I think it is time that we made the necessary changes to give effect to that purpose.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the hon. member for Rosthern had to say, and the recital he made in connection with redistribution in the province of Saskatchewan. First, may I say this to him. At no time was there any consent. Finally on the last day in the subcommittee—and the total period during which we ever met during that subcommittee, for all the meetings, did not exceed forty minutes—the hon. gentleman said, "Well, we will sign this as our report". When I demurred at signing it as our report he said, "Well, if you don't, you will get everything we had first for you; either accept this as the report or we shall give you what we originally had for you". That, sir, was the statement made by the hon. member for Rosthern.

Now I intend to deal in general with certain of his remarks. Throughout his attitude was—and I take it that he was not speaking for himself alone—that first and foremost twenty-four miles on the westerly end of Melville constituency were to be added to Lake Centre.

Mr. TUCKER: Because they had too big a population already.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, Mr. Chairman, there never was any question about population in that.

Mr. TUCKER: Oh, yes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The only question was this: In that portion the Minister of Agriculture had run considerably behind the C.C.F. candidate; and such being the case, it had to be added to some other constituency.

Mr. TUCKER: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, no.

Mr. TUCKER: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I sat down when the hon. member made a statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member for Rosthern is rising to a point of order.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: He has no point of order. I sat through his remarks and did not rise to any points of order.

Mr. TUCKER: Yes, the hon. member did rise once. The hon. member said that the only question was that a part had to be taken off Melville because it had gone against the Minister of Agriculture. I deny that absolutely.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, well—

Mr. TUCKER: Will the hon. member let me say what I said? I call the hon. member for Melfort to witness that there was no such statement as that made. The statement was that Melville had 3,600 over the number it should have, and we had to cut some off it. As to the part we cut off, there was a majority of only a little over 200 there in favour of the C.C.F.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is no point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member made a certain statement—

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is a question of fact.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Let me state what the populations are. The population in 1945—

Mr. TUCKER: In 1945?

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I sat here, Mr. Chairman, and listened without interruption to the Minister of Agriculture's waterboy in Saskatchewan. Now I want to continue.

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member is substituting abuse for argument, is he?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The population of Melville was 38,568.

Mr. MUTCH: What year is that?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is in 1945.

Mr. MUTCH: We were making redistribution on the basis of 1941.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Surely I should be allowed to continue, Mr. Chairman. I sat here and listened—

Mr. MUTCH: Not very often.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Longer than the hon. gentleman has ever been able to do.

Mr. MUTCH: Oh, no. On a question of privilege, I have outlistened the hon. member by weeks.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I think the committee will make more progress if there are not so many interruptions.

An hon. MEMBER: Why waste time?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: As I pointed out this morning, the population of Rosetown-Biggar was 28,495, and of Yorkton, 45,800. As far as the meeting of the committee was concerned, my hon. friend opposite endeavours to say that mention was made of Lake Centre. As a matter of fact, the boundary of ten constituencies in Saskatchewan depended on the boundaries placed on Lake Centre because it is surrounded by ten boundaries. My hon. friend can make all the explanations he wants to; he can raise all the alibis he possibly can, but the fact remains that to increase the population of Lake Centre twenty-five polls were taken off the southern part of the constituency, and they were polls which had belonged to Lake Centre or the constituency of Long Lake ever since the distribution in 1924.

Mr. TUCKER: On a point of order, Lake Centre was only set up in 1933.

Mr. BRACKEN: The hon. member said Long Lake.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Does the truth hurt my hon. friend?

Mr. TUCKER: No, it does not.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My hon. friend has repeatedly found himself in a position in which he had to do what he did not desire to do, but was ordered to do it by his dictator in the province of Saskatchewan. To such an extent is that so that so far as Saskatchewan is concerned this is known as the "Jimmymander." Let me say this; twenty-five polls were taken off the southern part of the constituency in which there was a substantial majority.

Mr. TUCKER: How many?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My hon. friend from Rosthern said that no considerations regarding votes should be before this committee. I place before him what the Prime Minister said in 1933, when he went into detail.

Mr. ABBOTT: Dispense.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Over and over again he pointed out that the effect would be that his majority would in fact, as a result of the interference with his constituency of Prince Albert, be a minority.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It was a dirty piece of Tory work.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My hon. friend from Rosthern was not here and was not aware of the fact that the Prime Minister used the same argument in 1933 as the one I advance in this house on this occasion. I leave the matter here. I repeat that twenty-five polls were taken off the southern end and seven off the west end, and my hon. friend pointed out that there was a C.C.F. majority there. I myself pointed that out yesterday, so that he was not placing any new information before the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE: This is not Sunday.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Two polls were taken off the northwest corner, one in the town of Watrous, the largest town in the constituency, and an adjoining poll. When my hon. friend found that there was a majority there which was adverse to the Liberal party, he was ready and willing to return it to the constituency.

Mr. TUCKER: That is the thanks I get for acceding to the hon. member's suggestion.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Such susceptibility, Mr. Chairman, I have never before known in my hon. friend. Such willingness to be led by me, a humble member in the minority, is indeed a tribute to my powers of advocacy against a heart as adamant as his. Sixteen townships are added from Melville. Is it only coincidence, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Agriculture, instead of having a majority of twenty-four—

An hon. MEMBER: Fourteen.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I think twenty-four was the official count—instead of having that he would have been defeated if this area had not been stuck on somewhere, so they took that twenty-five from the southern end of the constituency of Lake Centre and added fifteen from Melville.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What about Halifax?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am glad my hon. friend brought that up. This morning the Prime Minister made it very clear that under no circumstance would he as Prime Minister ever interfere in any way with the decisions made by the committee. The committee decided unanimously in connection with Halifax constituency. Does unanimity in a committee mean one thing in Nova Scotia and another thing in Saskatchewan? Yet the

Prime Minister allowed a member during a by-election to announce, before parliament knew anything about it, that the decision of the committee was not going to be carried out. Who made that decision?

Mr. MACKENZIE: What about the by-election yesterday?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Who made that decision?

Mr. MITCHELL: The people of Halifax.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The people made the decision announced on Friday by the hon. member for Halifax, that the committee report was not going to be accepted by the government? I would ask the Prime Minister to explain this. When was that portion of the report of the committee changed? Did he have no knowledge that it was going to be changed? Today I am not arguing that any addition be made. I am not arguing against the additions in Yorkton and Melville. I say add them on if you wish. All I object to, and what I will continue to object to, is the knob placed on the top of the constituency, abstracted from Humboldt. My hon. friend can explain it all he will, but the people of Saskatchewan will realize one thing, as the Prime Minister said in 1933; that you cannot add parts to a constituency to give it the appearance of a crossword puzzle without the suggestion that there has been a gerrymander. As far as Yorkton is concerned I have no objection to the addition, though the adverse majority may be tremendous. I have no objection to the addition from Melville, where the adverse majority also may be tremendous. All I ask is the return of the south end of the constituency, which has always been in Lake Centre. I am not here for the purpose of bargaining, but if you say you will not restore that southern end, then the only thing I ask is that these three townships, which cannot affect the result in any way, be restored to Humboldt. In their present position, as I have pointed out on previous occasions, they are not on any line of railway which in any way goes through Lake Centre.

Mr. BURTON: I have many good friends in the area my hon. friend is talking about, but I was just wondering why he thinks I should represent so many more people than the average.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not ask that. I say the area should be restored which was removed. The hon. gentleman wanted to be sure that wherever there was a majority it would be removed. Return to Lake Centre what belongs to Lake Centre. These people have always been in that constituency or its predecessors.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is what happened in 1933.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I was not here then. It is a type of political butchery, and that is all it is.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is what we got in 1933.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes, and you successfully appealed to the Prime Minister of the day in 1932. If necessary I will read some of the appeals made at that time by the present Prime Minister. When the unfairness was made apparent a change was brought about. All I ask is that this northern area which is in no way connected with the constituency of Lake Centre, never having been in either Long Lake or Last Mountain, be taken out; and there will be no argument at all about adverse majorities anywhere else. I make this appeal at this time; and I say to the Prime Minister the excuse he gave this morning, that he had nothing to do with it and that he could not possibly have this matter looked into in any way, is not good enough. I recall to his memory that he made a similar request to mine of the then prime minister in 1932, and as a result he got justice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I wish my hon. friend would show wherein the change was made. The constituency was gerrymandered by the party then in power, and it was left that way.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: All right; I will read what the Prime Minister said and give him the numbers of the pages so he can read it himself, because after all memory does play tricks in after years.

Mr. MACKENZIE: We were here and you were not. In 1933 we saw the dirtiest Tory butchery that Canada ever saw.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I was not here, but *Hansard* was and is; and I read from *Hansard* at page 5561, after the present Prime Minister pointed out that an additional twelve miles would be added to the southern end of the constituency, altering the tentative southern boundary to that extent. This is what the right hon. gentleman said on that occasion:

> Mr. Chairman, for the time and trouble which the right hon. the Prime Minister and those associated with him have given to the matter of the readjustment of the boundaries of Prince Albert constituency, I should like to thank them. I appreciate what has been done, although it is far from meeting the views which I expressed as to what I thought would be fair and just.

Nevertheless it is a change for the better as compared with the boundaries of the constituency as contained in the original report of the special committee to this house . . .

Later on the right hon. gentleman again extended his appreciation. In 1932 the boundaries of Prince Albert were agreed upon by the committee on which the representative of the Liberal party at the time was Mr. Totzke, the then member for the constituency of Humboldt. When in the House of Commons he was faced with the argument that he had consented to what had taken place his answer was: Consented?—

Always I was more or less threatened with the suggestion that if I did not agree to the proposals made by the hon. member for Regina they would be put through anyway, and possibly would be worse than before.

He accepted; but when the matter came before the House of Commons the present Prime Minister made a speech. As an example of political propriety as between persons opposed in political life it was a masterpiece, something that could be read by every hon. member of this house with advantage to himself and to the house. As he has said over and over again, we face one another across the floor of the house, but we do not lose admiration for men who disagree with us. We do not endeavour to destroy them; we argue our point of view. Perhaps one disagrees with much that the Prime Minister does, but in this country one forms an abiding appreciation of what democracy means; that men with opposite points of view can stand up and express those points of view strongly, yet still regard the other man as worthy of consideration. Sir, we do not have in this country a system of liquidation; but do we have a subtle form of liquidation whereby those who disagree, those who attack, those who discharge their responsibilities as members of an opposition shall in consequence be denied that fairness which the Prime Minister himself said in 1932 was of the essence of public life?

I have no apology to make for what took place in that committee. I care not about the overwhelming majority that is added to Lake Centre constituency which may be against me, but I do submit that there is nothing in fairness or justice which justifies the adherence of those three northern portions to Lake Centre. I have said the last I am going to say. My right hon. friend said today that he was not Caesar. There was no suggestion in my words that he was. He was quoting from someone else in 1932 and I quoted him. We all realize that the decision as to what will be done, as to what political opponents will be rejected, eliminated or liquidated, rests finally, not with the membership of this house but with the majority represented by the Prime Minister of this country. It is not going to matter what happens to the hon. member for Kamloops, it does not matter what happens to the leader of this party or to the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario, but in the years to come it is going to matter when it is realized that on this occasion there was an opportunity given to the Prime Minister to stand for the principles which he has epitomized and represented through years of public life.

He says that he is not responsible. True, he did not make recommendations to the committee. But, sir, my final words are these. He did not make recommendations. However, one of the committee recommendations has been changed and I ask if it is not fair that another one be changed. I do not ask that it be changed as far as the fourteen townships are concerned; I ask only that it be changed in connection with three townships which cannot be represented without great difficulty when attached to Lake Centre.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Chairman, the letter that came from the hon. member for Champlain speaks for itself. Answering the remarks of the hon. member this morning I must tell the committee that I was asked twice at the end of March by the hon. member for Champlain to go to his room. On my oath as a member of parliament I say that that is the truth and all the truth. During those interviews he asked me to cross the floor. As a member of the committee on redistribution he asked me to cross the floor. Always as a member of the said committee he wanted to protect me against the dismemberment of my county of Laval-Two Mountains. He asked me to be a good Liberal.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN: Some hon. members are calling "order," but as the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains wishes to make a personal explanation I think he should be allowed to do so briefly.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Chairman, as you say I am speaking on a question of privilege. He asked me to be a good Liberal and I told him, "Listen, my friend, I am a man who respects his own commitments. I will not be a traitor because I always respect my commitments." No one in this house can say anything to the contrary. Only the hon. member for Champlain will deny what he said privately in his interviews and publicly in his famous letter. At the conclusion of his speech he attributed

to the member for Laval-Two Mountains some words which I never said about a colleague. This shows what an insulting speech it was concerning me.

I have only one thing in this world, and that is my honour. It is the most precious of all. I know that all hon. members of this house, Liberals, Conservatives, Social Credit and C.C.F. are ready to defend their honour because honour is the most precious thing any man may have. I will defend myself against every insult thrown at me and at my constituents. I repeat that the shameful bargain which he offered privately during the interviews he organized and publicly by his famous letter as a member of the committee can be termed the greatest scandal of the present government.

The CHAIRMAN: May I remind hon. members that the committee has carried section 1 and section 2. It was agreed that a general discussion would be allowed on section 1, but we are now discussing section 3. Hon. members are familiar with the rules which set out that all discussion in committee must be directly relevant to the section under consideration. I hope hon. members will observe that rule from now on.

Mr. VIAU: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the very sanctimonious speech of the future former member for Lake Centre, after listening to the charge made by the hon. members for Vancouver South and Muskoka-Ontario of gerrymandering, after listening to the speech made by the former premier of Manitoba, the eleventh leader of the Progressive Conservative party in Canada, that gerrymandering was done principally in the province of Manitoba by the subcommittee, I feel it my duty to give the facts to this committee.

Since the debate commenced yesterday morning particular reference has been made to four seats. One would be led to believe that the boundaries of four seats of Kamloops, Muskoka-Ontario, Lake Centre and Neepawa were guaranteed by the British North America Act, that that act guaranteed that the boundaries of those seats would never be changed at any time and that the four present members representing those four seats would be reelected at all times above the will of the electors of Canada or even above the welfare of the state.

When the charge was made by the former premier of Manitoba that in connection with his seat—he never referred to Neepawa; he referred to Portage-Neepawa, but he was referring to his own seat of Neepawa—there had been gerrymandering, that was absolutely untrue. As chairman of the subcommittee for the province of Manitoba I take full responsibility for having outlined the new boundaries for Manitoba constituencies in the next general election. We had to lose one seat in Manitoba. Surely the former premier of Manitoba knows his province well, and when he states that the seat of Neepawa should have remained as it was after the last redistribution he must know that that would have affected all the seats between his present riding and the Saskatchewan boundary: first of all Souris, which is the Glengarry of western Canada, one of the smallest electoral ridings in the west, and represented by a Progressive Conservative; also the constituencies of Brandon, Marquette and Dauphin. All these seats would have had to have a much smaller population and it would have been impossible therefore for the Manitoba subcommittee to bring in a report based on representation by population.

It will be noted that in Manitoba the smallest seat, Souris, represented in this house by a Progressive Conservative, has the smallest population, roughly 22,000. Every small seat in Manitoba is represented in this house by a Conservative member. The constituency in Manitoba which has the highest population at the present time is Selkirk, with 56,000.

I was given carte blanche by my colleagues from this side of the house to draft a plan which would be acceptable to the subcommittee on Manitoba and finally acceptable to this House of Commons. Knowing well the province of Manitoba, I immediately took the view that there were two phases of the redistribution of seats in any province, one political, and the other the principle of representation by population. The latter was chosen by the subcommittee for Manitoba. That meant that every seat, rural as well as urban, should so far as possible have equal representation by population in the next general election. That applies to the sixteen seats for Manitoba which are guaranteed by the amendment to the British North America Act.

As a result of the committee's work, all the rural ridings in Manitoba have a population of 40,000. Yet the Glengarry of western Canada, Souris, which is still the smallest seat in western Canada, was increased up to 27,240, but no mention was made of that by the leader of the Progressive Conservative party. His main complaint, which was taken up by the official organ of the Progressive Conservative party in the city of Winnipeg, the Winnipeg *Tribune*, was that the subcommittee on redistribution for the province of Manitoba had been guilty of political monstrosity.

We amalgamated two Progressive Conservative seats, Neepawa and Portage la Prairie. But over and above that, two other seats were combined, Lisgar and Macdonald. So that if there was any gerrymandering done in Manitoba it was done at the expense of the Liberals, because the seat of Macdonald was wiped off the electoral map of Canada, and that seat is now represented in this house by a man who has served his country well during the seventeen years he has been here and who today holds the position of chief whip of the government party, a record which the hon. leader of the opposition still has to achieve in this house.

The present riding of Portage-Neepawa, as it will be known when this measure goes through, makes it a safer seat for the leader of the Progressive Conservative party—I mention this because he has spoken politically about the situation—than his present seat, because I took a block of Tory votes from Portage la Prairie and added them to Neepawa. So, if the Progressive Conservatives can once get the confidence of the electors they should be able to assure themselves of a representative in the next parliament. But judging by the results of the by-election in Halifax yesterday and by the attitude of the Progressive Conservatives in this house, which I may say I have observed carefully ever since I entered parliament, and having observed what I would call the lackadaisical attitude of the present loyal opposition which has abandoned the ideals of the great party they represent, and knowing that they have not lived up to their responsibilities—

Mr. LENNARD: Order.

Mr. VIAU: If the hon. member will listen it will not hurt his education. I was saying that the Progressive Conservative party have failed to present in this house the real, true sort of opposition which one would expect under our democratic system, and that is not a good sign, if I may say so, Mr. Chairman, for our country. If we are to judge from the results of the Halifax by-election yesterday, where the Progressive Conservatives had 6,000 casualties as compared with the 1945 election, which party is likely to be the loyal opposition after the next general election? If democracy is to be preserved in this country I still stand by the statement I have made in the past that a return to the two old parties is essential and is desired by the people of Canada, but a wholly different attitude will have to be taken by the present members of the Progressive Conservative party if they wish to gain the confidence of the people of Canada. If not, their attitude will tend to an increase of socialism in this country.

Mr. KNOWLES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member is permitted to engage in this kind of partisan discussion the same privilege should be accorded to others. I do not want it, but if it is to be permitted, the same opportunity must be open to the rest of us.

The CHAIRMAN: I quite agree with the hon. member. The discussion at this time is not strictly in order.

Mr. VIAU: Very well, Mr. Chairman. The work done by the subcommittee on redistribution for the province of Manitoba ensures that the rural ridings of Manitoba will have a fair representation by population, all of them being in the 40,000 bracket, and the four urban seats will also be well balanced, with a population of between 55,000 and 60,000.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Chairman, I shall detain the committee for a very short time, but I want to lay before the government and the Prime Minister in particular one or two matters that I think are germane to the present discussion. I am one of the few, I think, who have spoken in this debate who are not personally affected by this redistribution, and perhaps, because of that, I am capable of speaking with some degree of detachment on this matter and may be able to impress upon the government and the Prime Minister the thought I have in mind. This must be quite an education to others besides myself who are going through a debate with respect to redistribution for the first time in our parliamentary careers. From time to time I have read the other debates, but I have never had any experience with a redistribution bill until this particular occasion. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this afternoon I have no desire to discuss the whole question in general. It seems to me that there has been an extended discussion on the general phases of the redistribution. I want to confine my brief observation to the constituency of which we have heard a good deal up to the present time, namely the constituency of Lake Centre in Saskatchewan.

I suppose it could be argued, perhaps it has been argued and it will be argued, that things have happened in previous redistributions which could always be brought up to the advantage or the disadvantage of people on both sides of the house. I fancy, however, that most hon. members, particularly new members who have come in in more recent days, will

want to see that whatever is done in this parliament is somewhat of a departure from the old days which at times were characterized by circumstances that we would not want to repeat in this day and generation. That is no reflection upon hon. members of the past, but conditions have changed and the public conscience today is much more tender, much more easily offended when it comes to representation than it has ever been before in the history of Canadian public life.

When I have been talking to men and women, people who are not interested in any way in who is elected, or the personalities or the boundaries of constituencies, they have said to me, "Is everything quite right with respect to redistribution down in Ottawa? Is any move being made to change certain seats which are represented by prominent, aggressive, active and valuable men in the opposition?" In looking at the matter from a detached point of view, I must confess I think the public conscience will be offended—and I say this with every bit of sincerity that I can summon to my command—unless the Prime Minister and the government undertake to review at least two or three of the major points which seem to stand out like a sore thumb on an otherwise healthy hand, and to try if possible to find some middle way by which the people across Canada will say that at last this parliament did not follow the precedent set by its predecessors during the years and that this government and the Prime Minister himself have met that movement and corrected some of the major defects.

I want to say to the Prime Minister at this time that there is a special reason for it as I see it. I do not think we can allow the feeling to go across this country, and perhaps beyond the boundaries of this country, because the nations of the world are watching how democracies conduct themselves today, that we are not dealing fairly with redistribution. When you touch the basis of representation the ordinary elector feels somewhat shaky and jittery, particularly when he finds that there is a majority in the House of Commons who can perhaps change the constituency in which he is in such a way that he will not be able to have the same type of representation that he has previously enjoyed. This means that there is a heavy discretion, if I may say so, and with it a heavy responsibility resting upon the Prime Minister and the government in connection with the matter.

I do not ask the Prime Minister to do unreasonable things. If I am asking anything unreasonable please refuse it, because I do not want anything unreasonable with respect to this or any other matter. I do not think the Prime Minister will believe that it is unreasonable. In the case of the constituency of the hon. member for Lake Centre, what a very simple matter it would be, without affecting anybody seriously, to remove the three townships at the top of his constituency of which he has spoken, which I fancy might be described by a former minister of agriculture, as he described a similar jutting out in his constituency in 1933, when he called it a wart, and which was referred to by the hon. member for Lake Centre as a knob. It would be so simple an operation that you would not have to give the patient a general anaesthetic. All he would need would be a local one. It would not require any major operation, and it would meet what the public conscience of Canada would require in a case such as this. The Prime Minister would have such a response across Canada that he would feel satisfied with it. It would remove a great deal of the difficulty which will normally attend discussions from now on after this bill has been passed, if the government and the Prime Minister particularly would bow to that very small request, but one, Mr. Chairman, which I think can be made with every good reason and which has a good foundation for it. I appeal to the Prime Minister as I have never appealed to him before to see if he will, before the schedules to the bill are reached, give consideration to that change and to see if we cannot get through this session with the public saying, well, at last in Ottawa they are trying to do a reasonable job; they are trying to be fair to political friends and opponents as well. When the schedule is reached I do not want to have to move an amendment incorporating what I have said. I shall be very much disappointed if I have to do that. I make this appeal to the Prime Minister in a way, as I said before, that I have never done before in the House of Commons because I feel keenly and deeply that this is something that should be remedied, not just in the interests of the hon. member for Lake Centre, but in the interests of a better public conscience and a better system of democracy in Canada.

Section agreed to.

Sections 4 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: We are now on the schedules. Shall we carry all the schedules? Are the schedules carried?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MacNICOL: Take them one at a time.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I call the schedules by provinces? We are now considering the schedule with respect to Ontario. Carried.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I understood that the chairman of the subcommittee was going to make a statement. He had risen to make the statement when you called "carried" Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I regret that I did not see him.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): I am most happy to see it carried without my making the statement.

On the schedules—Ontario.

The CHAIRMAN: We are now considering the schedule with respect to Ontario. Does the schedule carry?

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): I had a statement prepared which I would have delivered yesterday if the debate had gone as we expected. I thought that all the discussion with respect to particular constituencies might have been left until we came to the schedules involving them. Had I read this statement at that time I do not think my hon. friend the member for Muskoka-Ontario would have been speculating as he did with regard to his constituency. I should like to read this statement now, because it gives, I believe, a logical explanation of the action taken with respect to the constituency:

> The Ontario schedule contains 83 constituencies—one more than heretofore. Of the 82 constituencies established by the 1933 Representation Act, 56 are unchanged in this bill,—

Of these fifty-six, forty-one belong to the Progressive Conservative party, of whom there are only forty-eight in the house.

Mr. KNOWLES: Belong to them?

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): In the sense that they now occupy them but will not after the next election.

Mr. MacNICOL: We shall have more after the next election.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): I do not agree with the hon. member in that regard. To continue:

> —sixteen are either increased or decreased slightly, 6 are the subject of 3 changes involving from 10,000-12,000 people in each case and four are the subject of major changes. It has been suggested in the press and in the house that the Ontario subcommittee did not make nearly as many changes as the circumstances warrant and there may be some justification for this view. However, it should be remembered that all the evidence before the subcommittee showed that there had been a substantial increase in the population of Ontario since 1941 and it was strongly urged in the committee that no changes of any kind should be made in view of this and having in mind that the next census is only 4 years hence. Nevertheless, this was not considered to be sufficient reason for postponing those changes which were equitable and unlikely to be affected materially by the census of 1951. In the end, the committee report was unanimous except for one constituency.
>
> As to the changes, it will be sufficient to point out that the most obvious problem which had to be solved was that created by the large populations in the northern constituencies. The people of northern Ontario have been underrepresented for some years—at least as far back as the 1933 act when the constituency of Nipissing had over 88,000 people and was the largest in numbers in Canada returning one member. The committee of that year reduced the western Ontario membership by three and probably felt that they could not take another seat to provide two for Nipissing. But when the 1941 census showed that this 88,000 had grown to 113,000 and that Nipissing, Cochrane and Timiskaming together had over 246,000 people, it became necessary to provide for five instead of three members. As the province was allotted only one additional member by the bill, the subcommittee was obliged to take into consideration the representation of the rest of the province to see if there were any other inequalities which might be adjusted and at the same time provide the extra seat for the north. There are six main divisions of the province recognized by everyone—eastern, central, western, southern, northern, Toronto and York and I believe that all political parties use almost the same boundaries for these divisions—in any event the variations are insignificant. The population, number of members and unit of representation of these divisions is as follows:

Central ..	375,000	11	"	34,100
Eastern ..	463,000	12	"	38,600
Western ..	1,030,000	26	"	40,000
Southern .	483,000	9	"	53,600
Northern .	484,000	9	"	53,700
Toronto and York ...	951,000	15	"	63,400

> It will be seen that Central Ontario has the lowest unit of representation and the subcommittee considered it in order to reduce the membership by one. This was done by combining the districts of Parry Sound and Muskoka and by transferring the townships of Rama, Mara, Thora and Brock to the constituency of Victoria and by transferring the townships of Scott and Uxbridge to the constituency of Ontario. This decision was made after careful study of other possible combinations in Central Ontario—there are at least 3 obvious alternatives.
>
> The people in Parry Sound and Muskoka districts are the best of neighbours and have a great deal in common. They engage almost exclusively in lumbering, hunting and fishing and catering to the tourist trade. There are two common railway and highway systems which touch practically all the larger centres in both districts; there is no town over 6,000 so it could not be said that undue influence was given to any municipality, in fact the districts are fairly evenly balanced—the ratio being 27-22.
>
> The townships in Ontario county are purely agricultural and have nothing in common with the districts to the north. Their communications and markets are to the east and south and the

transfer of these townships to Victoria and Ontario has restored them to more convenient and logical electoral districts. Further—

And this is a point my hon. friend did not explain to the house the other day, because I do not think he understood the memorandum I sent him at his request.

Further, the new constituency of Parry Sound-Muskoka is nearer than any other in Central Ontario to that part of Northern Ontario requiring extra representation—in fact, adjoins the constituency of Nipissing.

That was one of the factors in the decision.

I should add that even after this change is made Central Ontario still has the lowest unit of representation and this is true whether Parry Sound-Muskoka is included in Northern Ontario or in Central Ontario. If included in Northern Ontario the figures are:

Central	35,300
Eastern	38,600
Western	40,000
Northern	46,000
Southern	53,600
Toronto and York	63,400

If included in Central Ontario, the figures are:

Central	36,800
Eastern	38,600
Western	40,000
Northern	45,400
Southern	53,600
Toronto and York	63,400

That concludes the remarks about Muskoka-Ontario, and unless my hon. friend wishes me to explain the other alternatives, I need not. I do not think I need say anything about the other changes, except perhaps with respect to Brant and Wentworth. In Brant-Wentworth we have created a rural constituency where it should have been. We have reduced the county of Wentworth, represented by my good friend the hon. member for that constituency (Mr. Lennard), which before we had this redistribution had a higher population, as a semi-rural county surrounding a city than either of the city constituencies. We brought it down somewhere to the point where it should be, and we have left the hon. member for Brant with the largest part of his riding.

I do not wish to delay the committee longer. I assure the committee that no effort was made to lose the services of the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario. So far as this party is concerned, we are most happy to have him continue as president of the dominion Progressive Conservative association. I feel that perhaps, after yesterday, we might hope that he would retain that office for a long time. But that is only by the way.

All these figures I have given indicate to the committee, I hope, that northern Ontario had to have not only the one seat allowed by the bill but another. They indicate that there was only one section of Ontario from which it could come, namely, central Ontario. Other alternatives were considered, but none of them were as acceptable as this and none of them were as acceptable to the committee as a whole which represented Ontario, for this reason—and I will reduce the discussion, if I may, to a political level. Any other decision that we might have made would have eliminated one Conservative seat, by throwing two of them together. As it is now, we leave my hon. friend thrown in with a Liberal and with almost even chances of reelection. I think he will find that is so and I know he has studied the figures.

Mr. MacNICOL: I really feel flattered considering how little objection has been taken to the redistribution of the Ontario seats. That is the same thing as occurred last time. The schedules went through rapidly. The discussion which has gone on here pertaining to the other provinces just gives us an idea of what we are up against and is a basis for the argument that I have used for many years in this house, namely, that the time has come when redistribution should be performed by a commission consisting perhaps of the surveyor general, the chief statistician, the chief geographer, and other officials of the country. One can picture what will happen next time. In Ontario the advice I gave when the bill was introduced, namely, to let the ridings remain very largely as they are because within five years we shall have another census and another redistribution, was largely followed. I want to say that the Ontario committee, following that advice, made very few changes. I believe the hon. member for Grey-Bruce gave the number.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): Fifty-six seats.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes. I make it fifty-nine, but perhaps the hon. member has later figures than I have. Anyway, that is a big record. And most of the other seats were little changed. I shall refer just for a moment to Glengarry, because it has been mentioned particularly and because in the beginning I suggested that Glengarry should not be touched. I got rapped over the knuckles in the newspapers for saying that.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not very much.

Mr. MacNICOL: We could easily have changed Glengarry by adding to it from the adjacent county of Stormont. One township in Stormont, namely, the township of Cornwall, has a population of 16,034, and the city of Cornwall within the township has a population of 14,117. So that the township and

city of Cornwall then would have made a seat, and we could have taken the other three townships out of Stormont and added them to Glengarry, which would have made Glengarry 29,000. We did not do that, Mr. Chairman, because it did not gain a seat, and what the committee wanted to do was to gain an extra seat for Ottawa. As far as I can see, there was no object in making any change. It would have been a simple matter to have taken three townships out of Stormont. That could have been done, and it likely will be done in the next redistribution. Those townships could have been put into Glengarry, and then you would have a homogeneous seat with ample population, equal to the majority of other seats. But as the committee could not get a seat by doing that, we left it as it was. That was all that happened. I cannot understand this attack on Glengarry. I cannot see it at all, because nothing could have been gained by changing it.

At the next redistribution, what are we going to be up against? Ottawa should have another seat. Everybody knows that. Toronto will have to have at least two more seats. We all know that.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Vancouver, too.

Mr. MacNICOL: I took the stand at that time that Toronto should not ask any more seats on this occasion because it meant taking seats away from rural communities but on the next occasion Toronto and York county will likely require two extra seats. Windsor will have to have another seat. The Essex members are not complaining here because they are not getting another seat, but they would have many reasons to ask. The same goes for Hamilton. Hamilton should have another seat.

Mr. MITCHELL: How about Welland?

Mr. MacNICOL: Welland has to have another seat. At the next election Welland will have about 100,000 population more or less. The province of Ontario must make up its mind to provide six seats from somewhere, and they may have to come off rural ridings. For that reason I do not want to be on the next redistribution committee, if redistribution is done by a parliamentary committee. It should be done by a commission, because this is what we are up against. We have made an exhibition of ourselves in the way we have been going on about these various seats.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Oh, no; the hon. member did very well.

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not know what I could have done in Ontario different from what I did.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. MacNICOL: The question will come all right, but this is important. When the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre made his motion to have this whole business done by a commission I supported it, and voted for it. A good many did not do that. Hon. members can look up the list and see who voted for it and who did not. But that is what should come; it should be done in that way here just as it is done in other British countries. We should not any longer bring this battle into the House of Commons and make an exhibition of ourselves to the people of the country. That is just about what this is; it is just an exhibition. I am not supporting everything that was done everywhere else, but I could defend anything that was done in the province of Ontario, even as to the seat which is represented by my good friend here, the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario. I did my best, as the committee will admit, to prevent that seat from being changed; but another seat in northern Ontario was required, and I know that northern Ontario should have had two more seats because of the large increase in population. It finally came down to the point where my hon. friend's seat and another one were put together. I did not support it then and I am not supporting it now; but outside of that one seat I believe our whole schedule in Ontario was a good record, eighty-two out of eighty-three. If anyone wants to find fault with that, he can do so.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I had my say yesterday, and I do not intend to repeat it today, but I want to add two things. I do not think the statement just made by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce alters the situation in any way. I do not think there is anything further that I need to answer. I do not think it in the slightest alters what I said yesterday. I tried to make it clear yesterday that I was speaking primarily for my constituents; and, as far as they are concerned, I think the case remains as I stated it yesterday and therefore I will vote against it. I just want to add this. In fairness I want to say that I do not feel and never have felt that this was done in such a way as to give me no chance at the next election, because these constituencies have a record which gives one a chance. I just felt, as I said yesterday, that it was dealing my constituency around like a pack of cards, and there is no need of my repeating that.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Carried.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): On division.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): I want to ask the minister who is responsible for this bill if he would have one of his colleagues move an amendment to line eleven, page fifteen, in Danforth riding, where it reads "and on the west by Woodburn avenue". There is no such avenue. The avenue referred to is Woodbine avenue.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member himself move that?

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Yes, I will. I move that the word "Woodburn" in the riding of Danforth, on page fifteen, be changed to "Woodbine".

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Before that is carried, but not speaking to it, may I be permitted one or two observations? If the record is looked up of some twenty-two years ago in this chamber, when it was my privilege then to represent well over 100,000 people, it will be found that I intimated to the Prime Minister of that day that I thought it might be good economy and good business if Canada had only 100 members, gave each one of the 100 a job of work to do, and let the unit of representation be 100,000. My opinion has changed only to the extent of the increase in population. I regret to see this bill going through, adding ten more members to this parliament. We have far too many members now for the population of this country.

Mr. MacNICOL: I would say that, since these were laid out by the chief electoral officer, if any other changes such as those mentioned by the hon. member for Danforth are discovered later it is understood they will be rectified.

Amendment (Mr. Harris, Danforth) agreed to.

Ontario schedule as amended agreed to on division.

On the schedules—Quebec.

The CHAIRMAN: An amendment has been moved by the hon. member for Stanstead, that the word "Gatineau" be deleted and the word "Wright" be substituted therefore opposite the figure 18 on page 21.

Amendment (Mr. Hackett) negatived on division.

Mr. RINFRET: It is very comforting to find so few complaints in connection with the province of Quebec, and I think we owe thanks to the members of the subcommittee for the wonderful work they have done. I wish also to thank the various members from that province for the help they have given in surmounting the various difficulties we encountered in adding eight new constituencies to that province, especially having in mind that this is the first time a number of new constituencies have been added there. This afternoon I was very much interested to hear the leader of the opposition commend this bill for having increased the number of members from the province of Quebec. Apparently he has changed his mind, because last year, when the redistribution bill was voted upon, he and all the members of his party voted against giving this increase to Quebec.

Mr. HACKETT: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I did not vote against Quebec having fair representation but against an amendment to the constitution which according to my lights was passed in an illegal way. I voted against that amendment, not against giving Quebec a fair quota, which I have always upheld. I made this clear in my remarks at that time.

Mr. RINFRET: The amendment would have had exactly the same result; that is, Quebec would not have had the eight additional members.

Mr. BRACKEN: I rise to a question of privilege also. The hon. member has stated that we on this side voted against the measure on the ground that it aimed to correct an inequity in Quebec. That was not the basis of the objection at all, and the impression left by the remark of the hon. member is entirely false. I ask him to accept this statement, as I think everyone in the house will accept it. Certainly I never had any other view than that an inequity had been continued through the years. The government itself had made that decision at an earlier time, and I said this morning I neither criticized it nor condemned it. But I accepted the present decision and commended the government for making the correction, and I ask the hon. member to accept my statement.

Mr. RINFRET: I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Stanstead took the position in the subcommittee that he was representing all the opposition members, and made himself their advocate before the committee.

Yesterday the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario quoted Laurier in 1914, setting down some principles that should be followed in redistribution. He said the first principle was a substantial equalization of population; the second was the preservation of county units, and the third was justice to the electors. That is exactly the way we proceeded in the

Quebec subcommittee. First, we took the population of the province, according to the 1941 census, as 3,331,882, which is distributed in the various portions of the province mainly as follows: on the island of Montreal, 1,116,800; the city of Quebec, 156,640; the territory lying north of the St. Lawrence river, 934,547, and the territory lying south of the St. Lawrence, 1,123,888. These various districts, on the basis of the present representation, have the following average number of inhabitants per constituency: the island of Montreal, with its sixteen members, represented 69,800. The city of Quebec, with its three members, represented 52,215. The northern part of the province, with eighteen members, represented 49,186, and the southern portion with its twenty-eight members represented 41,625.

The members of the subcommittee felt that an average population of some 55,000 or 60,000 was more than adequate for urban constituencies, whereas 40,000 should be the quotient for rural areas. Having agreed upon this principle, the committee decided that the representation of the island of Montreal should be increased to such an extent as to reduce the population per constituency to the average already mentioned, that is, 55,000 to 60,000, and that the other districts should approximate as closely as possible the agreed quotients. The committee found that by adding to the population of the Island of Montreal that of Jesus island and increasing the representation by four the twenty new constituencies on the island of Montreal would average 56,921, the range being from 66,000 in thickly populated areas to 46,400 in semi-rural and sparsely populated districts. The addition to the city of Quebec of a suburb thereof increased the average for the said city to 53,620; and the addition of four constituencies to the northern part and one to the southern part practically equalized the two quotients at 41,304 for the northern part and 40,942 for the southern part.

Speaking of the northern part, the most populous constituencies were Pontiac, with 86,420; Chicoutimi, with 78,881; Charlevoix-Saguenay with 68,087 and Lac St. John-Roberval, with 64,306. The new constituency of Villeneuve was therefore created out of the northern portion of Pontiac, Lapointe out of the western half of Chicoutimi, and the other two were divided to become Charlevoix, Saguenay, Lac St. John and Roberval. In the southern district, after many small changes had been made the effect of which was to apportion more evenly the population of various constituencies, it appeared that the constituency of Gaspe was much too large, with its 57,588 inhabitants and 300 miles of waterfront, exclusive of the Magdalen islands. The logical solution of the situation seemed to be a separate constituency for the islands. This decision is furthermore warranted by the fact that the islands lie 150 miles from Gaspe, to which they were heretofore attached, and 200 miles from Saguenay, and also by the lack of a proper transportation system from and to the mainland.

Yesterday the hon. member for Peace River attacked redistribution in the province of Quebec, though apparently from what he said he did not know what he was talking about, and said that all the constituencies represented by independent members had been touched, but no others. Those various constituencies in the province of Quebec which I have mentioned were not touched because they were represented by independents; it was because they were the largest in the province. I should like to place on *Hansard* the reactions of the various members, independent and others, when the committee report was tabled. I quote from *Le Droit* of April 23, 1947, as follows:

(Translation):

Mr. John Hackett, Conservative member for Stanstead, who acted as the representative of the Quebec independents on the redistribution committee, gave to understand, at the last meeting of the committee, on Tuesday, that most of his "protégés" seemed satisfied with their new legacy.

The independent member for Charlevoix-Saguenay, Mr. Frederic Dorion, whose constituency has been divided into two parts, has stated that the changes had been properly made in the Quebec district. On his part, Mr. Maxime Raymond, bloc populaire member for Beauharnois-Laprairie, does not appear greatly dissatisfied. As regards Mr. Georges Héon, independent Conservative member for Argenteuil, to whose constituency a large slice of Mr. Lacombe's has been added, we have been unable to ascertain his reaction.

The young and fiery Social Credit member for Pontiac, Mr. Réal Caouette, told us calmly, during a brief interview in the lobby of the House of Commons, while puffing at a fragrant cigar, that he had every reason to be satisfied with the changes made in his constituency.

He said: "The committee left me the part of my constituency which is the best both from the Social Credit and the industrial standpoints. I took my largest majority in that area. On the other hand, they have taken away the older Pontiac, where the people are equally divided between Liberals and Conservatives. I can assure you that Villeneuve—the name of Mr. Caouette's new constituency—will vote Social Credit at the next election. The division of my constituency was a necessity in the interests of the province. Besides, by 1951, that district will probably have a third constituency, because the population has increased twofold since the last census was taken, seven years ago, and it is steadily growing. To my mind, redistribution was quite fairly carried out in the whole province of Quebec."

(Text):

Mr. RINFRET: There you have the way in which the report impressed various independents in the house.

Before dealing particularly with the three constituencies which have been mentioned, I should like to place a tabulation on *Hansard* as a reply to what the hon. member for Lake Centre said this morning with regard to minority representation. It is interesting to note that in the present parliament minority representation is on the opposite side of the house rather than on this side. There were 63·1 per cent of the members of the cabinet elected by a clear majority. In the case of Little Chicago 57·5 per cent of the members were elected by a clear majority. On this side of the house 48 per cent of the members, or 61 out of 127, had clear majorities. If we look on the other side we find that 27 out of 68, or 39·7 per cent of the Conservatives, were elected with a clear majority. In the C.C.F. there were only three out of 28, or 10·7 per cent, and in the Social Credit group there was only one out of 14, or seven per cent. The members who were elected by a clear majority number 61 on this side and 31 on the other side. I thought those figures would be interesting to the committee.

I do not think I need to deal particularly with Wright-Gatineau because the committee has already dealt with that. The constituency of Pontiac before redistribution had 86,000 population. It was first suggested that that constituency should be split in two. I thought myself that it would be preferable to divide it into three, taking the mining section on the north, the rural section in the centre, and the rural-English speaking section in the south. However, it was found that the southern portion had a population of only 19,000. After due consideration, it was decided that that was not a sufficient population to create a new constituency, particularly in view of the fact that the other two constituencies which would be created in the same area would have populations below 30,000. After consultation with the hon. member for Pontiac and others, it was agreed that the best solution would be to cut the constituency in two.

I have in my hand a resolution from the citizens of the town of Temiskaming asking that they be included in the southern part of the country, I have also other resolutions telegrams and letters asking that the provincial constituency of Temiscaming be not split in two. I have also telegrams from the chamber of commerce and from the prefect of the county of Temiskaming asking that they be joined with the southern portion of the constituency rather than with the northern portion. The committee adopted that view and has reported that there should be two constituencies in Pontiac.

If the suggestion of the hon. member for Pontiac had been followed the northern portion of the constituency would have had a population of 66,468 while the southern portion would have had a population of only 19,000. The committee did not consider it fair to give one constituency only 19,000 and another one 66,000. The present division is something like 46,000 for the north and 38,000 for the south, and that was considered to be more equitable.

I considered with great interest the letter deposited by the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains, and I fail to see any implication therein of pressure, either on the part of the hon. member writing the letter or by any other hon. member to bring the member for Laval-Two Mountains across the floor. It had been known for some time that he had some such intention, and if the committee had been—

Mr. LACOMBE: I deny any such intention; I never had any such intention.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Who cares?

Mr. LACOMBE: My hon. friend knows my intentions.

Mr. RINFRET: If there had been any eagerness on the part of the government or of the committee to have the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains cross the floor it would have been most enticing to offer him what he wanted. We did not choose to act like that because there is no such consideration. As chairman of the Quebec subcommittee I can tell the committee that never at any time was there any suggestion of pressure exerted by the hon. member for Champlain or any other member of the committee along the lines suggested yesterday and this morning by the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege, I never referred to the hon. member for Outremont. The letter of the hon. member for Champlain speaks for itself.

Mr. RINFRET: The reason why the constituency of Laval-Two Mountains was split is quite simple. The population of Argenteuil was 22,670 and the population of Laval-Two Mountains was 33,000. The two together gave a total population of 56,168, which is a smaller population than that of any two constituencies adjoining one another. It was found, however, upon examination, that the part of Two Mountains mostly does

business with Lachute or the other side of the river, whereas that part comprising Laval sur le Lac, Ste. Rose, et cetera, mainly does business with the city of Montreal. It was therefore found to be most convenient that the constituency be split in two.

We have heard comparisons between the population of Laval-Two Mountains and other constituencies. I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the figures that were quoted this morning or yesterday were taken from the old census and the old redistribution. All these populations have since increased, and very few of those cited by the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains come today within the brackets that he mentioned. For instance, Chateauguay-Huntingdon, which used to have a population of 25,000, has now 37,000; Stanstead, which he gave as 27,000, now has 35,000; Dorchester, which he gave as 28,000, now has 32,000; Wright, which he gave as 29,000 has now 32,000; and Levis, which he gave as 30,000, now has 35,951. Therefore the argument made by the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains does not hold. I do not think I have anything more to say, Mr. Chairman, except to thank again the members of the committee and the members of the house.

Quebec schedule agreed to.

On the schedules—Nova Scotia.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I have an amendment to this schedule, Mr. Chairman, and in the moving of the amendment it will be necessary to make an amendment to the preamble of the schedule, so I ask leave to withdraw the original amendment in your hands so that the hon. member for Grey-Bruce may move a new amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I move:

That the word "thirteen" in the first line of the Nova Scotia schedule be deleted and the word "twelve" substituted; and that there be inserted after the word "which" in the second line the words "unless otherwise expressly stated." That items 8 and 9 of the Nova Scotia schedule be deleted and that the following be substituted therefor:

8. Halifax consisting of the city of Halifax and the county of Halifax, which shall return two members.

And that the subsequent items of the schedule be renumbered accordingly.

Mr. BRACKEN: I take it that the purport of this amendment is to make Halifax a two-member constituency instead of having two separate constituencies there, as is proposed in the bill.

[Mr. Rinfret.]

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): The description is the same as appears in the 1933 representation act.

Mr. BRACKEN: This then would revert to the position as it existed before the committee sat.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): That is right.

Mr. GILLIS: I am amazed at this amendment at this stage of the session. We appointed a committee which went thoroughly into this matter. I know that the member for Inverness-Richmond who represented Nova Scotia on the committee, consulted with me and I was quite satisfied with the arrangements the government were making. I was particularly pleased that they had decided to divide the Halifax dual constituency into two, and now at this stage of the session the Secretary of State introduces an amendment which nullifies all the work of the committee so far as Nova Scotia is concerned. I cannot understand it, and I think a thorough explanation should be given by the Secretary of State of why this change is being made at this time. One reason why I was particularly pleased with the proposal to divide the constituency was that it would give the people of the constituency of Halifax, where there are over 85,000 voters, an opportunity to secure adequate representation for the whole riding, which, in my opinion they have not got now.

Mr. MACKENZIE: They have that now.

Mr. GILLIS: No, with all due respect for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. The county of Halifax geographically covers a much larger area than the city of Halifax and includes farmers, fishermen and lumbermen, and when an election takes place in that city on the dual member basis the people in the county have not the opportunity of nominating anyone to contest the seat who would adequately represent the outlying sections of the riding and know something of the problems of the people there. In addition to that, when an election is held, the city of Halifax makes the nomination, and with all due respect to the men they send here they are not, in my opinion, sufficiently familiar with the problems of the farmers, fishermen and lumbermen in that large area of the constituency lying outside the city to be able to present their problems. Halifax has two representatives representing the city, professional men who when the session is over go back to their own business and seldom see the people in the outlying sections. As a result, the people in the outlying sections have not the representation in this house which they should have. I

am absolutely opposed to this amendment, because what it is doing is this. It is harnessing that whole community to machine politics in the city of Halifax.

I am not concerned with who is elected, so long as the people of Halifax are given a fair opportunity to select their candidate from their own community, not a candidate in a law office 150 miles away, when the majority along that coast are fishermen, farmers and lumbermen. Under this dual member system they are not given a chance to exercise that democracy for which we are supposed to stand. The chief electoral officer, Mr. Castonguay, in the evidence I read before the committee, was strongly in favour of splitting this riding in two and giving both the city and the rural community an opportunity of making their own selections. The reasons for this move certainly appear to me to be political ones. Before I am prepared to accept this change, I want an explanation from the Secretary of State.

Mr. MACKENZIE: After yesterday?

Mr. COLDWELL: That is the whole point.

Mr. GILLIS: That is the whole point, after yesterday. I am looking for response from the people, and I would not want to boast too much about that election, because the opposition there was a terrific defeat for the government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GILLIS: The opposition vote was a terrific defeat of the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What nonsense.

Mr. GILLIS: A great many more voted against you than voted for you.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the schedule under discussion.

Mr. GILLIS: Mr. Chairman, you ask the hon. members to stop interrupting and I shall talk straight to the Secretary of State's amendment. Before the matter is finally disposed of, I want the Secretary of State to tell the committee why this change is made at the present time against the recommendation of the committee which was set up by this house. My second point is that I want the minister to show the committee how Nova Scotia will get an extra seat. I understood him to say that he was changing thirteen to twelve. Does that mean that he is wiping out the additional seat which was to be allocated to Nova Scotia?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): No.

Mr. GILLIS: I want the minister to explain to the committee why at this stage of the session he brings in a recommendation contrary to the recommendation of the committee which the house set up to study this question, which recommendation was agreed to by practically all the Nova Scotia members.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): That matter was discussed when the committee considered the Nova Scotia redistribution. At that time it was understood that the people of the Halifax riding wanted it divided into two separate constituencies. Since the report of the committee was brought in and it came to the attention of the people of Halifax that there was this intention of dividing up that constituency strong representations were made from the Halifax area that they wish to continue to be represented as in the past. As a result, this amendment has been moved today for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. COLDWELL: Who made the representation?

Mr. GILLIS: I should like to follow that up. I have just spent a couple of weeks in Halifax. Who made these representations? I talked to a lot of people in the last two weeks but I did not find anyone who was not completely agreeable to the recommendation that the riding be divided in two, and, mind you, there were a lot on your own side who were in favour of this change.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. GILLIS: No. I should like to know from the minister who made these representations. The hon. member for Inverness-Richmond who was chairman of the Nova Scotia subcommittee is not in his place. This is one thing that he discussed with me and he was completely in favour of it. He informed me that the Nova Scotia members were all quite satisfied and pleased with this change, and the committee passed it. I should like to know who in Halifax are opposed to making this change. Who made these recommendations?

Mr. MACKENZIE: The people who voted yesterday . . .

Mr. GILLIS: They did not vote on this. The Secretary of State definitely said a moment ago that strong representations were made from Halifax. We have a right to know who made them, because the committee recommended that the riding be divided.

Mr. ILSLEY: I want to explain this matter to the committee as I understand it. From confederation down to the present time the city of Halifax has been a dual con-

stituency. Every party makes a practice of nominating one Catholic and one Protestant candidate. It is one of the traditions that may be good or bad in the province of Nova Scotia, we live in a considerable degree of amity as between the members of the various religious denominations, but we do that only by being careful to respect these long standing traditions.

It was felt early this session that the time had come when perhaps a clean sweep could be made of this practice of having dual constituencies in the Dominion of Canada There were only two left at that time; the city and county of Halifax was one, and Queens county, Prince Edward Island, was the other. My own feeling was that it would be desirable, if possible, to get rid of dual member constituencies everywhere. The committee started out with that in mind. There were no representations to the contrary from anyone in Halifax so far as I could ascertain. As the committee continued on with its business, difficulties developed in Prince Edward Island, and the committee decided that they would, for reasons which I know nothing about, but which apparently commended themselves to the committee, leave the county of Queens, Prince Edward Island, a dual constituency. The committee was then in this position, that they would be wiping out the dual constituency probably everywhere except in Queens county, Prince Edward Island. At about that stage, certainly after the committee brought in its report, these representations came. I cannot tell the names of the persons, but it was reported to me that strong representations were made to the effect that the eighty-year long standing arrangements, one Catholic and one Protestant candidate for the parties, should continue.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): It would not be Mr. Isnor.

Mr. ILSLEY: Representations were made to Mr. Isnor and, through Mr. Isnor, to myself. I am most anxious that we do not do anything to stir up difficulties by upsetting long-standing arrangements, such as proportions of appointments to various bodies and so on in the province of Nova Scotia, where the religious denominations live with one another in great harmony—

An. hon. MEMBER: They do in our province.

Mr. ILSLEY: I know, but if there is any danger of that happening in this constituency we had just better leave it where it is, and that is the reason it is being put back the way it was.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

Mr. GILLIS: Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to the minister's opinion—

Mr. ILSLEY: It is true; it is a statement of fact and that is all it is.

Mr. GILLIS: I know, but the minister is overemphasizing it now. I do not suppose there is a place in Canada where there is as little attention paid to the question of religious denomination as in Nova Scotia. That has been all ironed out for at least fifteen years.

Mr. ILSLEY: Excuse me; only because public men have been so careful not to disturb long standing arrangements of this kind.

Mr. GILLIS: I can see how it is. I think if you will check back on the St. Xavier's extension movement you will see that that is how it happened. These people have broken down the difficulties between Catholics and Protestants, and you find these people now working together in every organization for the purpose of trying to advance these organizations.

Even if the situation were as the minister suggests, I do not see how you would be disturbing the allocation. If there were a religious basis to what the minister says I would be one of the first members of the house to say, leave it alone, particularly if there were a danger of disrupting the community from a religious point of view. I do not think there is. For example, in Halifax, if the population of that city warrants the nomination of someone of the Presbyterian faith or of some other faith that is not Catholic, it is their privilege to nominate someone of that faith in the city. On the other hand, if in the other section of the community the Catholic faith is dominant and they desire to maintain that position by nominating someone of that faith, it is the business of the people of the community to make their nomination accordingly. If you go through most of the ridings in Canada, and particularly through the maritime provinces, where there are single member ridings, you will find that care is taken to see that traditions of the past are maintained on that basis. There is no reason in the world why this division cannot be made here and the nomination be made according to the dominant religions in the two ends of the constituency.

Travelling through that riding during the election, I came to the conclusion that two members from the city of Halifax cannot adequately represent that riding. It is scattered; it is hard to get around; it requires a lot of

travelling. There are diversified interests with which a member should be familiar. I believe that the coastline, which is predominantly fishing, some farming and a little lumbering, should have a member selected from these communities, so that he may be available to advise and counsel them on their problems which dovetail into the realm of government.

I am completely opposed to this business. I respect the minister's opinion and I have some idea of what it means, but I do not think the dividing of that area so as to permit those whose interests are not similar to select representatives suitable to themselves can be objected to. The religious angle can be handled in the community, but I do not see how the division of the riding in such a way as to make is more accessible to the member when he returns from the house would transgress the traditions of which the minister has spoken. It would be doing a great service to the people of that community and, moreover, it would be relieving the member of a lot of responsibility. It would be in the best interests both of the member and of the community, and I do not believe that the minister's fears have any grounds so far as religion is concerned. I would ask the Secretary of State, before forcing this through, to give the matter further consideration. I do not think it is good policy on the part of the government to override the decision of a committee of this house who gave the matter serious consideration, and who had the unanimous support of the members from Nova Scotia, and especially when the chairman of the committee is not present. I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. COLDWELL: I have not spoken at all on this matter, but I wish to support the hon. member for Cape Breton South, and in prefacing what I wish to say, I regard this whole debate as a reflection on parliament. This has been a debate which may cause a good many people in the country to despise this parliament and thus undermine this institution, and that is a bad thing at this time. It does seem to me that members of parliament have been forced into the position of looking after their own interests, and that does not go well with the people of the country.

With regard to the Halifax seat, I should like to know what the technique was in securing changes in a committee report brought to the house. Who are the people who made representations—persons unnamed—sufficiently strong to override the will of a parliamentary committee? I should like to know who they are. I will tell you what I believe, Mr. Chairman, if I may do so. I happened to be in Halifax for two or three days at the end of last week and I know something of what the pre-election canvass was both in Halifax and in the surrounding territory. My belief is that the Liberal canvassers in their reports indicated that, if this city were split, the government on another occasion could not carry the rural side of the riding, and that is where the representations came from.

That is another example of the kind of political gerrymandering we should have avoided. Our party moved a motion in February that this question should be decided by an independent commission. The Prime Minister was in accord with that motion, and I counted nineteen members of the Progressive Conservative party who voted for it. But it looked to me as though, in spite of what the Prime Minister's private opinion might be, the Liberal majority had come to the conclusion that they would not permit that to be done because they were in power, and consequently there was a solid vote on that side of the house against the proposal.

The Prime Minister is a gentleman who is respected generally in the house. We look upon him as having had some influence in the growth and development of the Liberal party; and I regret exceedingly that, holding the view he did and expressing it, he was not able to set an example to the Liberal majority by trying to do something to remove from this house the kind of controversy we have had during the last few days.

I think today's debate has been a scandalous one. I want to support the member for Cape Breton South, because I believe that what he says is absolutely correct, that the city man with the professional or business point of view, representing the city constituency, cannot adequately represent the rural part of the riding. Rural problems of lumbering, fishing and farming are entirely different from the problems in a city. I have always felt that a member of parliament who sits for a riding where the economic interests of the people are identical is in a much better position than one who sits for a mixed riding. I have felt that in dealing with the problems of my own constituency. Because I represent a rural and farming community, I was, particularly before I became leader of this party, able to give more attention to these problems than to any other problems in the house. The committee recommended the division of the Halifax seat and I think it should be carried through.

With regard to the religious angle, I agree with the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

I know how important it is to many people that certain persons of certain religious persuasions should represent certain constituencies, and I sympathize with that point of view. But I believe that the problems we face today in this parliament, seeing that we do not deal with education, and the cultural aspect of education, are largely economic and political. It seems to me that the argument which has been advanced on the other side in that regard is not sufficiently impressive to justify the change that is now proposed. I simply rose to support my hon. friend the member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. ILSLEY: Before this occasion passes, I wish to say that the suggestion that the amendment is prompted by any consideration of the vote or whether the C.C.F. is strong in the rural part of the constituency—

Mr. COLDWELL: I did not say the C.C.F.

Mr. ILSLEY:—as compared with city districts or vice versa comes to me as a great surprise. That is not in accordance with the facts. I think I would know if any such consideration was involved in this matter, and I can assure the committee that it is not.

Mr. COLDWELL: It looked that way to me.

Mr. ILSLEY: I have not seen the results, but I read in the papers that the C.C.F. made gains in the country districts. That, however, has nothing to do with this. As soon as I found out that the committee was leaving Queens county, Prince Edward Island, a dual constituency, and taking out Halifax, I realized that we were doing something rather dangerous from the point of view of a mutual arrangement between Catholics and Protestants, and as soon as representations began to come in I felt there was only one thing to do and that was to leave the situation as it had been since confederation.

Amendment agreed to on division: yeas, 62; nays, 48.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the schedule as amended relating to Nova Scotia carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: On division.

Nova Scotia schedule as amended agreed to.

New Brunswick schedule agreed to.

Prince Edward Island schedule agreed to.

On the schedules—Manitoba.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I wish to say just a few words on this schedule as it affects my riding. This afternoon I listened to the debate dealing with certain constituencies in Manitoba.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I sympathized with the leader of the opposition when he complained about the amalgamation of Portage la Prairie and Neepawa.

An hon. MEMBER: Did he?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I think I have worked out a solution for the problem. In Manitoba I intend to move an amendment which, I believe, will be of much benefit to the leader of the opposition as well as perhaps to some others.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Is that the reason for it?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: The situation I refer to is this. In Manitoba the committee had decided to take a certain portion of the old constituency of Neepawa and add it to the constituency of Dauphin. I want to say that I approach this matter on a non-political basis. We have perhaps heard enough of that for one day.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is sanctity all in the hon. member's party?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I am simply pointing out that I am not approaching this from a political angle at all; it is not necessary in this case.

Mr. VIAU: Mr. Chairman, I wish the hon. member for Dauphin would speak to the committee as a whole and not just to his hon. friends on the right.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): If hon. members would be quiet and listen, they would be able to hear.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I will do my best. As soon as the noise quiets down a bit, I am sure everybody will be able to hear me. I was going to say that it is not necessary to approach this matter from a political point of view. It is my view, though hon. members may differ, that no member of this house has a monopoly on the seat which he for the moment holds. I think the people back home are the ones who will make the final redistribution when election time comes around. We in this house should strive to make the constituencies conform as closely as possible to the wishes of the people. I realize that there are difficulties and that representation on the basis of population alone cannot be achieved in our country. However we should

try to come as close as we can to attaining that objective, taking into consideration the size of the constituency, the density of the population—and I am speaking of quantity —and the number of cities or towns which happen to be in a certain area.

The situation to which I refer is this. The new constituency of Portage la Prairie-Neepawa, or Portage-Neepawa as it is referred to here—is smaller in population than Dauphin, according to the schedule. In my opinion, that should be the other way round, for this reason. For one thing, the constituency of Portage-Neepawa is far more accessible, so far as roads and railways are concerned, than is the constituency of Dauphin. Second, there are three fairly large towns in that area, namely, Neepawa, Portage la Prairie and Carberry, while in Dauphin there is only one town of any size, namely the town of Dauphin. Taking it on that basis, I would have expected that the committee would arrive at the conclusion that if there ought to be a larger population in one constituency than in the other, it should be in Neepawa-Portage rather than in Dauphin. I am saying this from a practical point of view. I am quite certain, incidentally, that all members, prospective members or candidates in the Dauphin area will agree with me on that basis, that adding any more to Dauphin, taking into consideration its size, the condition of the roads and so on, is not doing justice to the Dauphin constituency.

A little while ago I mentioned that the leader of the opposition had complained that his constituency was being amalgamated with another one, in which process a seat would be lost. My amendment which would restore Dauphin to its original boundaries and give back to Neepawa the two rows of townships which have been offered to Dauphin, would be one step toward restoring the constituency of Neepawa. If the other members would be willing to give up what they have taken away, then Neepawa would be restored to its original boundaries. However, on any basis you want to look at it, that of population or any other, I believe there is no argument that Dauphin should be given this piece of territory which might be referred to as a knob, as the hon. member for Lake Centre described it in his own case. It does not fit into the Dauphin constituency on the basis of community interest, as was argued by the chairman of the Manitoba committee. I have done some investigating on that score, and I find that the people in that part of the Neepawa constituency which has been added to Dauphin, which includes the towns of McCreary and Laurier, do not do their business in the town of Dauphin. I have lived in that area all my life, and I think I know what I am talking about. They do a certain amount of business in Neepawa and they take trips to Winnipeg, which lead them right through the cities of Neepawa and Portage la Prairie.

Another good reason why that area should not be added to Dauphin is that the eastern portion of it, that which lies along the shore of lake Manitoba, is connected by railroad to the city of Portage la Prairie. It is a branch line which runs from the city of Portage la Prairie. It is not connected by railroad in any direct way with the town of Dauphin. It is true that there is a road through to the town of McCreary, which road is only accessible during certain parts of the year. If someone were to take a trip by train from the town of Alonsa, which is near lake Manitoba, and was going to see his member of parliament in Dauphin, he would have to go to Portage la Prairie on a branch line where the train runs only three times a week, I understand, wait at Portage la Prairie for the next train, and go all the way back to Dauphin. Then he would have to come back by the same route. It would take two or three days to make the trip. My point is that it is not a sensible arrangement, and I am sure that hon. members who have studied the map will realize that. It is for these reasons that I wish to suggest an amendment. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North:

That the schedule for Manitoba as contained in Bill No. 18, an act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, be amended by deleting from section 3 (Dauphin) the following words as they appear in lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

"township twenty-one (21) in ranges ten (10) to sixteen (16) inclusive, and all the settlement lots in township twenty-one (21) in range ten (10) township twenty-two (22) in ranges eleven (11) to sixteen inclusive; lots one (1) to twenty-four (24) inclusive of the Manitoba House settlement; and the north half of township twenty-two (22) in range seventeen (17)";

and inserting same in section 7 (Portage-Neepawa).

Mr. BRACKEN: Might I ask the hon. member to give us the substance of this amendment in non-technical terms? The words he wants deleted contain the legal description of several townships, but perhaps he could say in a very few words what is the substance of the amendment. I rather gather that his proposal would restore to the constituency of Neepawa certain townships in the northern section of the constituency which under the present arrangement have been allocated to the constituency of Dauphin. Would the hon. member make that clear in a brief statement?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Briefly it means that the two rows of townships in the northern portion of what was Neepawa, lying between Riding Mountain and lake Manitoba, have been added to Dauphin. This amendment would put them back in Neepawa, leaving Dauphin with its original boundaries.

Mr. VIAU: The main complaint of the hon. member seems to be that two ranges of townships at the top of what is now the constituency of Neepawa have been included in the constituency of Dauphin, and he suggests that if these two ranges were left with Neepawa that constituency would have a large enough population to form an electoral district by itself, if I understood him correctly.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: No, that is not exactly what I said. I pointed out that the population of Portage-Neepawa could be more safely increased, owing to the nature of that constituency, than the population of Dauphin. The other matter is a separate question.

Mr. VIAU: According to the 1941 census, the population of Dauphin was 40,446. With this change the population will go up to 43,676. We all know that during the war period the population of Manitoba decreased. According to the provincial census of 1945, the population of Dauphin, after redistribution, will be 40,801, which will be balanced by the new constituency of Neepawa with a population of 40,408. As to transportation, the statement that the town of Laurier or the town of Ste. Rose have nothing in common with Dauphin is absolutely untrue. From Silver Creek and those towns on the west coast of lake Manitoba there are roads to the towns of McCreary and Laurier and even Ste. Rose du Lac. Their community interest is in the constituency of Dauphin, not in Neepawa, which is away down south. That was one of the reasons for the change, because there is that community interest.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: The hon. member made one statement which I would ask him to withdraw; I did not want to interrupt him at the time. He said a statement I had made was absolutely untrue. That is hardly the parliamentary way of saying it.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure the hon. member meant it was incorrect.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Well, he should have said "incorrect" if that was what he meant, but he said it was untrue. However I am willing to let that go; it is perhaps a matter of opinion as between the hon. member and myself. I would merely point out that I have spent my whole life in the constituency of Dauphin, and I know the situation there far better than he can know it, living in St. Boniface.

As to his second argument, all that is required is a glance at the map to show that what I have said about rail connections is perfectly true and logical. If the hon. member should ever have the misfortune to travel on a branch line and have to stay overnight to catch another train he would realize the inconvenience that will be caused by this action.

Amendment (Mr. Zaplitny) negatived on division.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I wish to be perfectly fair, and I have another amendment here which I think can be adopted by the committee. If the government wants to take the position that nothing we move here will be adopted, that is their privilege; but we have the privilege of moving amendments.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Move it.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North:

That the schedule for Manitoba as contained in Bill No. 18, an act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, be amended by deleting from section 3 (Dauphin) the following words as they appear in lines 1, 2 and 3.

"township twenty-one (21) in ranges ten (10) to sixteen (16) inclusive, and all the settlement lots in township twenty-one (21) in range ten (10)"

and inserting same in section 7 (Portage-Neepawa).

The import of that amendment is this. If the chairman of the Manitoba subcommittee objects to having the whole rectangular block originally taken from Neepawa and added to Dauphin restored to Neepawa, I am giving him the opportunity to put half of it back; that is, one line of townships at the southern end of the block. Surely then he cannot argue that, because of community interest, the southern half does not belong to Neepawa.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Six o'clock.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Six o'clock.

Mr. VIAU: Does the amendment mean the east half of those sections or the west half?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: The south half would remain in Neepawa and the north half would remain in Dauphin.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Six o'clock.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at seven o'clock.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose for the dinner hour it was considering an amendment moved by the hon. member for Dauphin.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: If this amendment carries, its effect will be practically to equalize the population as between the constituencies of Portage-Neepawa and Dauphin. Taking everything into consideration, I believe that this is a reasonable request to make. I believe that the amendment should be adopted by the committee, because it would obviate the necessity of my moving other amendments which I have ready.

Amendment (Mr. Zaplitny) negatived.

Mr. VIAU: I have an amendment to move which is not contentious. It was discussed with the members of the subcommittee and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. It reads:

After the semicolon in line 6 of the section entitled, "16. Winnipeg South Centre" the section should read:

"Thence southerly on Colony street to the westerly projection of College place; thence easterly along the projection of College place and upon College place until said College place joins on to Ellice avenue; thence easterly along Ellice avenue to Notre Dame avenue west; thence southeasterly on Notre Dame avenue west, Portage avenue and Main street to Notre Dame avenue east, and southeasterly along Notre Dame avenue east and its projection to the city boundary."

After the semicolon in line 6 of the section entitled, "14. Winnipeg North Centre" the section should read:

"Thence southerly on Colony street to the westerly projection of College place; thence easterly along the projection of College place and upon College place until said College place joins on to Ellice avenue; thence easterly along Ellice avenue to Notre Dame avenue west; thence southeasterly on Notre Dame avenue west, Portage avenue and Main street to Notre Dame avenue east, and southeasterly along Notre Dame avenue east and its projection to the city boundary."

Amendment (Mr. Viau) agreed to.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I have another amendment to suggest. If this amendment is adopted I can assure the committee that there will be no more amendments as far as I am concerned. The effect of this amendment will be to leave that portion of new territory which is to be added to Dauphin, and which is on the western side, in the constituency of Dauphin, and to restore the eastern sector to Neepawa. There is a strong and sound argument for this, as I pointed out a while ago. The eastern section of the new territory has no rail connection with Dauphin, while it has a rail connection with Portage la Prairie. I have no hesitation in accepting the new territory on the basis of elections because I know the people there and have full confidence in them. It so happens that I have had something to do with elections in that part of the country. But for the convenience of the people themselves who want to be in close contact with the constituency to which they belong, I think it is only fair that this change should be made. It involves possibly fewer than 1,000 people, and it would enable these people who are situated along a small sector on the shore of lake Manitoba to have contact with their constituency. Therefore, I move:

That the schedule for Manitoba as contained in Bill No. 18, an act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, be amended by deleting from section 3, Dauphin, all the words following the word "of" in line 1, to and including, the word "17" in line 6 and substituting the following therefor.

"Township twenty-two in ranges, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen and the north half of township twenty-two in range seventeen; township twenty-one in range fourteen, fifteen and sixteen."

Mr. KNOWLES: I should like to say a word on this third amendment which the hon. member for Dauphin has moved. I realize that the proper thing to do is to address my remarks to the committee as a whole, but in this instance I shall direct my appeal to the hon. member for St. Boniface who was the chairman of the Manitoba subcommittee and who seems to be the key person in connection with the Manitoba schedule. He knows, and the members of the redistribution committee, know that, although we argued at length, we reached a substantial measure of agreement, but we agreed also to disagree on certain points. So far as my attitude as a member of that subcommittee was concerned, there were three points concerning which I was in strong disagreement.

A week or so after the report was made, the hon. member for St. Boniface proposed a change which took care of one of the points about which there was disagreement. Another point had to do with the boundary line between Winnipeg North and Winnipeg North Centre. I still feel that that is unfair, but I know the attitude of hon. members across the way and for the moment I am not saying anything about that. But I feel that the situation with respect to the line between Dauphin and Portage-Neepawa is one concerning which the hon. member for St. Boniface might see his way clear to agree.

The whole question revolves around a small rectangle at the northern end of the former

constituency of Neepawa which has been taken off that constituency and added to Dauphin. The hon. member has asked in his three amendments that either the whole of that be put back into Dauphin, or that it be cut one way or the other. He has given reasons for the desirability of the change. I think it would make for good relationships so far as the Manitoba situation is concerned if the hon. member for St. Boniface would agree to this change. I want to say that I felt that he made a fair statement this afternoon as to the work of the Manitoba committee, particularly to the extent to which he took full responsibility for the original map that was drawn and the way in which the work of that committee was conducted. I urge him to agree to this change. I point out that the figures we were working on showed Dauphin as it was set out in the schedule to be one of the largest ridings in rural Manitoba, despite the fact that it is in the northern part of the province where accessibility is not as great as in other parts of the province. This afternoon my hon. friend gave figures which were a surprise to me because they did not coincide with figures given in the committee. I discussed that with him at suppertime, and he told me that the figures he gave this afternoon were figures for the 1946 census. On other occasions we have been told we had to stick to the 1941 census figures. On the basis of those 1941 figures, the constituency of Dauphin as it stands in the schedule is really larger than it should be. I hope the hon. member for St. Boniface will agree to this compromise.

Mr. VIAU: I am not the authority to do that. The committee of the whole has the authority with respect to any changes that it wishes to be made concerning not only the constituency of Dauphin but any other constituency. In reply to the argument brought forward by the hon. member for Dauphin and his colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, all I can say with respect to the work done by the subcommittee is that certain concessions were made in the subcommittee, and those concessions were made only to the C.C.F. party. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre knows very well why the line of Dauphin was brought down two ranges of townships. That was my first line from the very start, and it was finally agreed that it should remain as such.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre himself claimed a certain section of the suburbs of Winnipeg. My intention was to confine the seats of Winnipeg within the city boundaries. I made a concession to Portage-Neepawa in respect of an area west of the town of Portage la Prairie, which is an old historic part and known as a Conservative area. Naturally, as Neepawa was extended west of the town of Portage la Prairie, it was only fair that the northern part of Neepawa should be reduced to balance things up.

Mr. KNOWLES: I submit that the hon. member for St. Boniface is hardly on the beam when he puts this on the basis of concessions one way or the other. The whole argument should be on the merits of the case. The hon. member is talking nonsense when he argues that there is any relationship between the boundary of Neepawa in northwest Manitoba and the boundary of Winnipeg North Centre down in the metropolitan area. The fact of the matter is that the requests that Brooklands remain in Winnipeg North Centre is based on the same argument that applies to the northern part of Neepawa, namely a community of interest.

As for the hon. member's statement that he tried in the redistribution committee to confine all the Winnipeg seats within the city of Winnipeg, that argument is, of course, vitiated by the case of Winnipeg South, which includes parts of three or four municipalities outside the city of Winnipeg. I submit that the amendment before us stands entirely on its own feet and that it should be agreed to.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: The hon. member for St. Boniface has made a statement which I do not think should be allowed to pass. He has used the word "concession" and makes it appear that by this amendment I am asking for a concession from the subcommittee or the committee of the whole. I wish to state clearly that I am asking for no concessions. I am simply asking for what is reasonable and just for that constituency, and if the government feel that this is a concession I do not want it, and they can vote down the amendment.

Mr. VIAU: The concession was not made to Dauphin but to Winnipeg North Centre because the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre wanted to assure himself of a good seat in the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. KNOWLES: Let us not have sheer nonsense like that in this debate. The constituency of Winnipeg North Centre has never in all its history returned anyone but a Labour or C.C.F. member. In the last election the majority was something over 10,000, and all opponents of the C.C.F. lost their deposits. The hon. member for St. Boniface has added to Winnipeg North Centre out of Winnipeg North the seven best C.C.F.

polls in Winnipeg North, so that if anybody is trying to make Winnipeg North Centre a safe seat it is the chairman of the subcommittee. That reminds me of an expression of Sir John A. Macdonald's about hiving votes. This is a case of trying to hive C.C.F. votes in Winnipeg North Centre, which is completely unnecessary.

Amendment (Mr. Zaplitny) negatived: yeas, 32; nays, 65.

Manitoba schedule as amended agreed to.

On the schedules—British Columbia.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to get into this, but my name has been brought into it by the hon. member for Vancouver South. I have a suggestion to make in regard to redistribution in British Columbia. I should like to see all the Liberals put into one riding, the one Cruickshank represents. My colleague the hon. member for Vancouver North who represented British Columbia on the committee is unfortunately not able to be present tonight.

An hon. MEMBER: Where is he?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: For certain reasons he has been called home, for very good reasons of which any family man should be proud, although some people may not appreciate that.

I understand that the only amendment to British Columbia constituencies concerns Kamloops. I have a great deal of admiration for the hon. member for Vancouver South. He spoke very kindly about me yesterday and I quite agree with his words of appreciation. I point out to the hon. member for Vancouver South that the Liberal member representing British Columbia on that committee received only one set of instructions, if you call them that, and that was to bring about a redistribution which would be in the best interests of that province for all the people in all the ridings, and I defy contradiction of that statement from anyone.

I do not know whether the hon. member for Vancouver South drives a car. I do not think he does. But I point out to him that in my riding I have to cover an area three hundred miles long and thirty miles wide by car all the time. The hon. member for Vancouver South can cross his riding in a street-car for six cents, and do it in ten minutes. Make no mistake about that. In ten minutes a person can ride all over the ridings in Vancouver. Take the riding of Cariboo. Did you ever go to Cariboo; did you ever see it?

Mr. MITCHELL: Who wants to.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I did.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The only possible way that the hon. member for Cariboo can get over his riding is by aeroplane, and that would take the full indemnity of $6,000. Our instructions or advice to our members was purely and simply that we wanted to be fair to the province of British Columbia, and the hon. member for Kamloops will admit that. I am losing a certain portion of my riding, and I said to the hon. member for Kamloops I would just as soon keep that portion of my riding because it is a splendid portion; is that not correct?

Mr. FULTON: That is correct.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I would be glad to keep it. I am losing it because it is not in the best interest of the province or of my riding to have it retained in my riding. It is a little section away up in the end of the riding that divides one portion from the other portion. It should be in Kamloops. The hon. member for Kamloops has borne me out in my statement that I would be glad to keep that district. They were loyal to me. I am sorry to see them go because I think they would have given me a good majority in the next election.

The hon. member for Cariboo has to cover a territory that no hon. member could possibly cover and do justice to it, even if he spent all his indemnity. That is owing to the way it is scattered. The hon. members for the city of Vancouver and for the city of Montreal can cover their ridings in a short time. In Montreal I understand they can jump over their ridings; they can jump from one end to the other. In the city of Vancouver they can get on a street-car and cover the city in five minutes, and it will cost them only six cents. We cannot do that in any other part of British Columbia. We thought of the best interests of British Columbia. Hon. members talk of their difficulties and so on, but Kamloops was one of the smallest ridings we had in British Columbia. I think it is the smallest in population. It was all covered by a main line railroad and by a main highway. We on the Liberal side have nothing to gain in this particular instance. As a matter of fact, I am afraid that I am losing because in the portion that I am losing, which is to be given to my good friend, the hon. member for Kamloops, I had a lot of supporters. If he is on his toes he may possibly have a chance to win them.

The hon. member for Vancouver South said that since he came to the house the hon. member for Kamloops is the brightest man who has come here. I thought I was, but

apparently the hon. member for Vancouver South does not think so. I am making these few remarks on behalf of the hon. member for Vancouver North, who unfortunately is not able to be here tonight. At no time did we try to do any political gerrymandering in this matter.

I want to point out that the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard, for whom I have the greatest admiration—I think he is one of the finest young men in the province of British Columbia, but unfortunately he is not here tonight—was the Progressive Conservative representative on that committee. In every instance the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard agreed with us and signed his name on the dotted line.

Mr. GREEN: No, he did not.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Just a minute; sometimes even a junior lawyer will speak out of turn. In the first instance, the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard signed his name on the dotted line in agreement with the recommendation of the committee. Then he put—

Mr. GREEN: No.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Just a minute. He put a proviso in—

Mr. GREEN: He did not agree.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Wait a minute. I have a copy of that paper. Then he put a proviso in, "with the exception of Kamloops". Is that not correct? I have a copy of that report. Do not make any mistake about that.

Mr. MACKENZIE: You are quite right.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: When the hon. member for Vancouver South raised his objection.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: When the hon. member for Vancouver South raised his objection because he was afraid that his riding was being interfered with. He says that there is a little jog in the city of Vancouver and that that little jog may occasion him a transfer on the six-cent fare on the street-car. The hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard agreed unanimously with that report and then put the proviso in, "with the exception of Kamloops". The representative of the C.C.F. party will bear me out that I am correct in that statement.

We have heard the discussion about Vancouver-Quadra. They are adding names with which I am not familiar. I happened to be drawn into this because originally I was on the committee. At the suggestion of some hon. members I withdrew my name because my riding was not interfered with. Because I was not familiar with the ridings in Vancouver which were to be altered, I was glad to get out of the extra work. When I hear the hon. member for Vancouver South taking up a lot of time in discussing my colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver North, and talk about Quadra and about the hon. member for Vancouver East—who is going to be hard to beat, I admit, but we have hopes even of beating him—and talk about other ridings I want to say this about Cariboo. There was absolutely no intention to interfere with that riding in a political way. We have interfered to this extent. We have interfered with it in the way which was mentioned by the minister who represents British Columbia in the house when he spoke about the Yukon. Everybody in British Columbia is entitled to representation. We did not think it would be possible for the hon. member for Cariboo to give full representation to that riding, no matter how capable he might be. The immensity of the area is such that it is impossible for one man to represent it properly. Therefore we thought a portion of it should be added to Kamloops. For that reason we suggested that a certain portion of Cariboo be taken into the Kamloops riding. I have yet to hear any complaint from any organization or any individual, either in Kamloops or in Cariboo, that this was done for political reasons.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. We have an amendment to this schedule. Moved by Mr. Green:

That the bill be amended by deleting from the schedule thereto under the heading of British Columbia all reference to the ridings of Cariboo, Fraser Valley and Kamloops, and substituting therefor the description of the said ridings as contained in the schedule to the Representation Act of 1933.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps when I spoke yesterday I was in error in saying that I thought my friend, the hon. member for Fraser Valley, would have been more fair if he had been representing the government on this redistribution committee.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Nobody could have been more fair than I would have been.

Mr. GREEN: After listening to his speech this evening, I feel that perhaps he is not quite so pure and innocent as I thought he was yesterday. However, the fact remains that I have nothing to retract of my statement yesterday in regard to the proposed change in the Kamloops riding, and the amendment which has been moved is for the purpose of leaving the boundaries of the riding as they are at the present time. That also, of course involves leaving Fraser Valley and Cariboo as they are at the present time. The Kamloops riding is already a huge riding. It took the sitting member over five

weeks last summer to get around to the main points in the riding and he was not going by street-car either.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: He must have been crawling on his hands and knees.

Mr. GREEN: He was going by motor car. The hon. member for Fraser Valley has said that it is the smallest riding in population in British Columbia. He is not correct in that statement. There are four small ridings in British Columbia all with a population in 1941 of under 33,000. Kootenay East, 25,559; Kamloops, 27,387, Skeena, 29,612, and Cariboo, 33,002. The proposal is to take about 8,000 people from the Cariboo riding, which would reduce it to 25,000 and add them to Kamloops, which would make it 35,000. That shows pretty well what is being done. On the other hand, the riding which adjoins to the south, that of Yale, has a population of 51,874. That is where the extra population should have come from to bring up the Kamloops riding, not only because Yale is so much larger than Cariboo, but also because the interests of the people of Kamloops are more closely akin to those of the people of Yale than of Cariboo. The part that has been added now lies over a ridge of mountains. It is served by an entirely different railway, the Pacific Great Eastern, which is a British Columbia government railway; the city from which that new area gets its supplies, and with which it is most frequently in contact, is the city of Vancouver and not the Kamloops district at all. The change is not a fair one.

Furthermore, there will be a redistribution again in 1951. British Columbia, at the present rate of growth of population, will then be entitled to several additional members, one or more of whom will have to be fitted into the interior of the province. It is likely that all the interior ridings will have to be changed and I suggest that it is unwise to make this change at the present time for a period of three or four years.

The real problem in the Cariboo is the fact that a portion of it, the Peace River district, is detached from the rest and one has to get to that district by plane from Prince George. This change now proposed does not help that situation. The change is, I believe, made for political purposes.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Oh, no.

Mr. GREEN: I say that, believing it to be true. I do not make such statements if I do not believe them. The Liberals had a majority of 500 in this district that has been added to Kamloops, and the C.C.F. also had a majority over the Conservative. The Kamloops fight was a very close one.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I say publicly to my hon. friend what I said privately to him, that as one in charge of federal Liberal activities in British Columbia I never took the slightest part in any interference with the boundaries of any constituency.

Mr. GREEN: I am not blaming the Minister of Veterans Affairs, but I say again that this change is made for political purposes, and I know that is done. We need not try to shut our eyes to what goes on. It was made for that purpose, because the member for Kamloops got in by a small majority and this difference of 500 is more than enough to defeat him.

That sort of thing should not, I submit, be countenanced. It is most unfortunate to make an attack of this kind on a young member such as the hon. member for Kamloops, who has made such a splendid start in a public career. The hon. member for Fraser Valley has done a good job in trying to defend a bad job done by his good friends, but, no matter what he may say, I do not believe the people of my province appreciate an action of this kind, and I believe they will swing in and support the hon. member for Kamloops just because there has been this attempt to put him out of public life.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I do not know whether the member for Kamloops has spoken on this question. I enjoy hearing him at any time, and we hear him frequently in this house. But does the hon. member for Vancouver South say that at any time I suggested that this portion of my riding be taken out of my riding and put in the Kamloops riding?

Mr. GREEN: One town is taken out of the riding of the hon. member for Fraser Valley in order to make a straight line across the southern part.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Would that not be good business?

Mr. GREEN: A small Tory majority was got rid of when it was taken out. There is the picture. I would appeal to the Prime Minister and submit to him that this is an unfair move and one that should not be allowed to go through. I suggest that the riding be left as it has been since 1933. Actually, with the growth in population since that time, according to the ration book figures, there are practically as many people in Kamloops as in the Cariboo riding and it has been growing quickly. I move the amendment.

Mr. IRVINE: I think I ought to say a few words on the amendment. I am going to oppose it. I hope the committee will believe me when I say that personally I am

not very much interested where the line runs, but I think, in fairness to the committee for British Columbia and to the main committee, I ought to make this point clear. In my opinion the change that has been proposed for the Cariboo riding is very fair indeed. I need hardly tell the committee that the two ridings of Skeena and Cariboo comprise nearly two-thirds of British Columbia. I need not tell hon. members that it is not possible for any man, in the period between sessions, to cover those ridings. It has been said that someone spent five weeks in the attempt. I spent every day from the closing of the house until Christmas eve and did not cover one-third of it, and it cost me $1,700 to do that.

The committee's job was to put two new ridings into British Columbia and to arrange the boundaries of the ridings in such a way as to be fair, having regard to population and having regard also, I presume, to territory. The fact of the matter is that the Cariboo and Skeena ridings are at the north part of British Columbia and join each other, and Skeena joins up on the other side with Comox-Alberni, which is another very large riding. There was no way of taking any part from either Cariboo or Skeena except the way in which it was done. They could not take anything off Skeena and give it to Comox-Alberni because that is big enough now. They could not take anything off Skeena and give it to Cariboo because Cariboo is big enough now. They could not take any portion off north Cariboo because that goes up to the Northwest Territories. They could not take any off the east side because that touches Alberta. Therefore the only place they could take any part off to equalize the situation was to take some part of the southern end of Cariboo riding.

I ask the committee whether what was done was fair and impartial, and I say that it is both fair and impartial. It has already been stated that the population of Kamloops was 27,387. Cariboo was 33,000, and I point out that in the north country, and especially along Prince George, the population has increased very rapidly in the last two or three years. I would not be surprised if it were a third more than it was at the last election.

I wish to compare the population of the rural ridings of British Columbia as they now stand under the measure as it is proposed. Kootenay East for instance, is 25,559; the new Cariboo will have 26,396; Skeena will have 29,612; new Kamloops will have 33,993, and so on. So that if you take all the rural ridings and all the semi-rural ridings in British Columbia, you will find that Kamloops has not been unduly harshly dealt with in so far as numbers are concerned; and in so far as territory is concerned, Kamloops is still a small riding compared with either Skeena or Cariboo. Further, I think anyone who knows the territory well will admit that the southern part of the riding which it has been proposed to put into the Kamloops riding is easily worked from the Kamloops end, and it seems to me to impose no difficulty on anybody.

I want to add just one thing more. I have great admiration for the hon. member who sits for Kamloops constituency, as I have for a great number of other young men whom I see in parliament today, in all parties in this house. I hope they will keep on coming back to parliament as long as they have something in their upper stories; and I think the hon. gentleman to whom I have referred has something there. I hope he will come back. To think that anybody would go out of his way to impose such a situation in order to keep a young man out of the house, to me seems absolutely ridiculous. I cannot imagine that either the Liberal party or any other party would stoop to such a thing as that. When I examine the facts, I really find no grounds whatever for any such accusation.

Mr. MacNICOL: I want to say a word about this amendment, knowing the area fairly well. The riding of Kamloops and the riding of Cariboo on the last occasion—and that was in 1933—were laid out so that one riding would embrace the watershed of the Thompson river; that is, the riding of Kamloops embraces the watershed of the North Thompson and the South Thompson river and the riding of Cariboo embraces the watershed of the Fraser river. To my mind, that was the sensible way in which to lay out those two ridings with a range of mountains between them. But the way in which those ridings are now laid out according to the changes now being made, appears to me to be a violation of the principles which should guide any committee in laying out ridings. At present, in the case of Cariboo, it is in one watershed west of a range of mountains, and in the case of Kamloops it is in another watershed east of a range of mountains.

I have a good deal of sympathy with the hon. member who represents Cariboo because at the moment, as he says, he has to take a circuitous route to go from one part of his riding in order to get to the part in north-eastern British Columbia which is east of the mountains up in the Fort St. John area. There are, I believe, four centres there, namely, Rolla, Pouce Coupe, Fort St. John and Dawson Creek, and one might include Hudson Hope. It does not take very long to go there, and at the moment the British Columbia gov-

ernment is driving a road through Pine pass which will connect all the roadways in British Columbia west of the mountains with the roadways in the northeast part of the riding of Cariboo. I would think it would only have been common sense to allow those ridings to remain as they were until the next redistribution five years hence; because, as the hon. member for Vancouver South said, British Columbia has already increased its population since 1941 sufficiently to warrant its having another two members. It is growing so rapidly that by 1951 it will likely have the right to another four members. I am glad to see British Columbia growing like that. They now have eighteen members. I presume that, after the next redistribution, they will have twenty-two members of parliament, and then all these little things can be ironed out. Why make all this change now? When the house commenced considering this question, I tried to induce it to let things stay largely as they were until the next redistribution, when the whole thing could perhaps be ironed out by a commission which will do the thing properly.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I want to say just one word on this, inasmuch as I was the representative of this party on the redistribution committee. I should like to say that the territory which has been taken from Cariboo and attached to Kamloops geographically and economically has all in common with Kamloops. It is a cattle and sheep country.

Mr. FULTON: What about the mining area at Bridge river?

Mr. ARCHIBALD: The mining area at Bridge river is just a little spot on the map which breaks the general rule. You will find that situation anywhere. I have a mining camp sitting up on the Portland canal all by its lonesome. You cannot eliminate that. But that area, taken in general, has all in common with Kamloops riding. And when redistribution takes place again, it is doubtful whether that territory will be upset inasmuch as it has that economic affinity.

An hon. MEMBER: It has a lot of sheep, anyway.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: The hon. member for Vancouver South has attacked the hon. member for Vancouver North, saying that he had done this with political ends in view.

Mr. GREEN: I must ask for that statement to be withdrawn.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: What is the hon. member saying?

Mr. MacKINNON: That is what the hon. member said.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes. My hon. friend used the words "political motives". I am sorry to have to remind him of that.

Mr. GREEN: No. The hon. member for Skeena said that I had political motives in view when I made that statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE: He said that you accused others. If my hon. friend will pardon me for reminding him of it, he did say that these changes were made with political motives.

Mr. GREEN: I thought he was saying that I had political motives in raising this question.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I do not imagine that the hon. member for Vancouver North is an absolute innocent as far as dealing with his own political party is concerned. But I will say that on this committee he was frank and in the open, and we knew what the score was, right along the line. In the sittings of the committee we got along well until the hon. member for Vancouver South came back and we made adjustments because of his demands. If I had known this was coming up later, I would never have agreed to them; but just to keep peace in the family I did.

An hon. MEMBER: The hon. member will know better next time.

An hon. MEMBER: Blessed are the peacemakers.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: What I cannot understand about these representatives is this. They get up and make appeals for this individual and that individual. I am not now speaking in a detrimental fashion having regard to the hon. member for Kamloops. But one would think some of these people were ordained by the Lord to represent the people.

Mr. MacKINNON: In their own estimation.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I think it was Bernard Shaw who said that Great Britain had plenty of brains, but they were all in the gutter. It is the people of this country who must make up their minds who shall come to this house and who shall not, and it does not matter what province they come from. A great many pages of *Hansard* are being taken up by hon. members speaking and praying on behalf of an individual member; and that does not go down. As far as I am concerned, it is representation by the people for the people.

Amendment (Mr. Green) negatived: Yeas, 22; nays, 76.

British Columbia schedule agreed to.

On the schedules—Saskatchewan.

Mr. GRAYDON: I do not desire to make a speech; I expect to have considerable support for that statement, in any event. This afternoon I asked the Prime Minister if, before the schedules came up, he would consider some change, which I then delineated, with respect to the constituency of Lake Centre. I take it that the Prime Minister has decided against taking any steps in that regard, but I should like to leave the door open for him to do so, if I may; and in moving this amendment I would ask him, if possible, to give support to this change. I move:

That clause No. 4 on page 51 of the Saskatchewan section of the schedule to Bill No. 18 be amended by deleting from the electoral district of Lake Centre the following township, namely No. 32 in ranges 16, 17 and 18 inclusive both west of the second meridian, and adding the said township to the electoral district of Humboldt.

Mr. BURTON: I wish to say a word on this amendment. As the bill stands at present, it gives Humboldt the largest population of any rural constituency in Saskatchewan, and by adding these townships from Lake Centre the difference between the population of those two constituencies will be made still greater. As I indicated this afternoon when I asked the hon. member for Lake Centre a question, I have many friends in the townships referred to, and they are not all of my political opinion. I believe there should be a little balance in representation. I just want to say to those responsible for this bill that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peel will not meet with any objection on my part. Whether these people be Liberals, Tories or members of the C.C.F., I shall be happy to have the opportunity of representing them. But on the argument presented to the effect that these townships belong geographically to Humboldt, and that they will be better served if they are attached to that constituency, I would suggest that the hon. member for Lake Centre must be consistent and agree that township 32, ranges 21, 22, 23 and 24, which are closer to the town of Watrous, to which all communications lead and which town has been put into his constituency, should be added to Lake Centre. I think that would be only logical. I am not here to carry on any horse trading, but I submit that if it is logical to say that the townships enumerated by the hon. member for Peel should be in Humboldt, in spite of the fact that Humboldt already has a much larger population than Lake Centre, then it is also logical to say that those townships adjacent to the town of Watrous and Lake Centre should be taken into that constituency. Let me repeat, however, that I shall be happy to represent them, and if you want to add even a few more townships and ranges I shall do my best.

Mr. TUCKER: I shall not detain the committee for more than a moment. I wish to say that if the hon. member for Lake Centre had not agreed to this proposition; if he had made it clear in the subcommittee as he and his leader have made it in the house that in order for him to get back to parliament it was important that he do not have these three extra townships, I certainly would have made an additional appeal and argued further with the hon. member for Melfort. But when the hon. member for Lake Centre agreed to this compromise proposal of mine when the hon. member for Melfort, by agreeing to it too, went halfway to meet him; when this proposal meant—and as matters now stand—Humboldt was increased to 4,500 above the average for rural seats, I thought I should not line up with the hon. member for Lake Centre in favour of the present proposition, as against the hon. member for Melfort who had already gone half way to meet him in agreeing to my compromise proposal. As far as I am concerned, I have no objection whatever to the hon. member getting rid of these townships. It was a matter of what seemed fair and just. It means nothing whatever to our party; it was only an endeavour to be fair, and I thought when the hon. member signed he was satisfied. If this amendment is carried it will mean that the population of Lake Centre will be reduced to 41,100, which will be 2,400 under the average. If the schedule goes through as it is, the population of Humboldt will be 48,000, 4,500 over the average; and if the amendment is carried, the population of Humboldt will be increased by another 1,800, which will make it 6,300 over the average for rural seats. That is the situation.

Amendment (Mr. Graydon) negatived: yeas, 24; nays, 75.

Mr. McKAY: I should like to say a few words of protest in so far as the Weyburn seat is concerned. I would not have said anything were it not for the fact that I have received a large number of telegrams and letters from residents and organizations of the city of Weyburn protesting vigorously over the elimination of the name "Weyburn" in the new seat which is to be set up in that area. The Weyburn seat was set up in 1914 and has been known as Weyburn for thirty-three years. It is now being amalgamated with Wood Mountain, and the new seat is to be known as Assiniboia.

This is rather confusing because the present seat of Assiniboia is and has been for forty years east of the city of Weyburn. Outside of the fact that it is confusing, it seems to me that this is great discrimination against the city of Weyburn. That city has been quite favourably known in Canada. It was the seat of the South Saskatchewan regiment and it is the most active and influential city in southern Saskatchewan. Several seats in the province carry the names of towns, such as Melfort, Kindersley and Rosthern, towns smaller than Weyburn. The name "Weyburn" means a lot to these people, both city and district, and they consider that it should receive better consideration.

I have a feeling of affection for the name "Assiniboia", because as a boy I was brought up in that area. I believe the name ought to be perpetuated, but I would draw the attention of the committee to the fact that it is being preserved in the town of Assiniboia, over 100 miles west of Weyburn. That is a thriving and progressive town bearing the name of the original territory and it does honour to that name. I do not think it is necessary to eliminate the Weyburn seat in so far as the name is concerned. I should have liked to see a hyphenated name with "Weyburn" part of it. Since Wood Mountain is to be a part of the new seat, I would suggest Weyburn-Wood Mountain as an acceptable name.

I urge the committee to give this matter some consideration. We have a number of hyphenated names in Canada which are well known, and I would refer to Hastings-Peterborough and other such constituencies. In fairness to the city of Weyburn, I should like to see the name of that city forming at least part of the name of the constituency being set up under the present redistribution.

Saskatchewan schedule agreed to.

Alberta schedule agreed to.

Yukon Territory and district of Mackenzie of the Northwest Territories schedule agreed to.

On the preamble.

Mr. RINFRET: In connection with the schedule for Quebec, my attention has just been drawn to the fact that a word has been left out on page 34, paragraph 73. This should read "Verdun-La Salle".

Amendment agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Twelfth report of the standing committee on banking and commerce.—Mr. Cleaver.

CRIMINAL CODE

FREE CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE IN VIEW OF INSISTENCE ON AMENDMENTS MADE TO BILL NO. 364

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, there was a matter upon which we had a free conference with the Senate and on which I should like to make a report to the house. On behalf of the managers of the House of Commons to the free conference with the managers of the Senate with respect to Bill No. 364, to amend the criminal code, I should like to present the following report:

Your managers beg to report that they duly held a conference with the managers appointed by the Senate with respect to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 364 of the House of Commons, intituled: "An Act to amend the criminal code," and that the managers of the Senate have agreed to recommend that the Senate amendments two and fifteen be amended to read as follows:

1. Delete amendment number two of the Senate and substitute the following therefor:

"2. Delete all the words in section 222B after the word 'one,' in line twenty-four, to and inclusive of the word 'otherwise' in line twenty-eight and substitute the following:

'not being in a dwelling house, who causes a disturbance in or near any street, road, highway, restaurant, railway station, public library, tavern, billiard hall, theatre, shop or other place to which members of the public are admitted, whether as a matter of right or otherwise'."

2. Delete amendment number fifteen of the Senate and substitute the following therefor:

"15. Delete paragraph (d) of clause 7, on page 3, lines twenty-four to twenty-eight inclusive, and substitute the following:

'(d) if he uses or has upon his person any weapon during or at the time of the commission or attempted commission by him of any of the offences in this section mentioned or the flight of the offender upon the commission or attempted commission thereof, and death ensues as a consequence of its use'."

I realize that it would be unreasonable to expect the house to understand the purport of these amendments, so that perhaps I had better just present the report and then, later on in the evening, move that the amendments agreed to in the free conference with the Senate be concurred in.

Mr. COLDWELL: I submit that it is highly improper for these amendments to be offered without our knowing their significance. I think hon. members should be given an opportunity of seeing what are the results of the conference. I do not want to delay the pro-

gress of the house, but I think we should wait until tomorrow until we have had an opportunity of reading these amendments.

Mr. ILSLEY: My motion can stand, and I will move it tomorrow at eleven o'clock. In the meantime hon. members will have an opportunity of studying the amendments.

TRANSPORT COMMISSIONERS

EXTENSION OF TERM OF OFFICE OF MR. COMMISSIONER STONE

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport) moved the second reading of Bill No. 455, to extend the term of office of a transport commissioner.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—Commissioner to continue to hold office for not more than one year.

Mr. FRASER: Does this affect only one commissioner?

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is right.

Mr. FRASER: Just Mr. Justice Stone, and only for one year?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not exceeding one year.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

CASE OF J. G. ALLARDYCE—STATEMENT OF MR. HARKNESS

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. D. S. HARKNESS (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the indulgence of the house to discuss briefly a matter which I have been requested to raise and which I shall have no other opportunity to bring before the house. I would not raise it at this late hour of the session if I did not think an important principle were at stake, the principle of under what circumstances and to what extent the Canadian government should protect Canadian citizens and their interests in foreign countries.

The case is that of John George Allardyce, a Canadian soldier who served five years overseas. At the time he left for overseas he had a wife and son two years old. During the time he was overseas his wife became involved with a United States soldier stationed in Calgary, which is Allardyce's home town.

When he returned from overseas he telephoned or wired from Halifax that he would arrive home at a certain time. The day before he arrived in Calgary his wife took the child and left for the United States. His information was that she was subsequently joined by the United States soldier. All his efforts to trace his wife and son proved abortive. He was particularly interested in getting back his son, who was then some seven years of age. The United States army would give no information as to the whereabouts of the soldier.

A short time ago Allardyce was served with a notice that divorce proceedings had been entered against him in the city of Seattle. Upon receiving this notice he took legal advice. He was in no position financially to go to Seattle to fight the divorce case, and if he had fought it, it would have done him no good so far as getting back his son was concerned. Therefore he or his solicitor wrote to the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa asking if they would request the United States government to take steps to have this man's son, who was a Canadian, of course, returned to Canada. The Department of External Affairs refused to take any action in the matter. This is a copy of the letter which they sent in reply:

I have received your letter of June 11, 1947, regarding this case. I regret to inform you that there is no ground on which the Canadian government could properly intervene with the United States government.

This is essentially a private civil dispute and, although we sympathize with Mr. Allardyce, I am afraid that his only recourse is to proceed in the appropriate court in the United States.

If Mrs. Allardyce had removed the child to another province of Canada or to another part of the British commonwealth, the position would be exactly the same. Mr. Allardyce would have to proceed in the courts in that place.

Even if the entry of the child into the United States were contrary to the immigration laws of the United States, that is not a matter about which this government can complain. If the United States authorities do not choose to deport the child to Canada, we could not properly ask them to do so.

I am sorry that we cannot give you any helpful advice or encouragement, but the fact is that the government cannot properly intervene in private civil disputes.

Yours sincerely,

L. B. Pearson,
Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs

I have discussed this matter with the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent); and I must say that he appeared to me, to begin with, to be disturbed over this situation whereby a man who had served his country overseas and lost his son as a result of that service could be given no help to

regain custody of his son. It seems to me that the government has a responsibility in cases of this kind. If this man had been home in Canada he would have been able to protect his own interests; the case would have been an ordinary civil dispute, and there would possibly have been no question of the government's intervening on his behalf.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Where did this happen?

Mr. HARKNESS: At Calgary, Alberta, while he was overseas serving in the army in defence of this country. In view of that fact, it seems to me that the dominion government has a responsibility to do its utmost to have the child returned to the father. All that was requested was that the government, through the Department of External Affairs, request the United States government to have his child returned. That letter indicates that the request was refused. It seems to me that for a man in this situation, away on service and not able to protect his own interests, that is not good enough.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If I may interrupt, has this matter been taken up with the Department of Veterans Affairs?

Mr. HARKNESS: Not to my knowledge, unless it was taken up by Allardyce himself at the veterans affairs branch in Calgary. The course which he followed was to take it up with the Department of External Affairs, which deals with foreign countries.

There comes to my mind immediately the case which the Secretary of State for External Affairs brought up in the house two or three weeks ago, the case of the wife of Mr. Power, a Russian lady whom the Russian government refused to allow to come to Canada. I think the Department of External Affairs acted very properly in its efforts to get the Russian government to have that man's wife returned. But I think the case of this soldier who has lost his son really as a result of being overseas and not being home to protect his interests is an even stronger case, and one which there should be more reason for the Department of External Affairs to take up and attempt to have straightened out.

I do not want to take an undue amount of time on this case, but I should like to read one or two extracts from a letter which I received in connection with the matter, to show that there is strong feeling over it. This letter states:

> There was a time when a Canadian who thought himself wronged in another country could invoke the aid of the British embassy and proper representations were made—no man was refused because of lack of wealth or prominence in life. The American embassies do not hesitate to assert the just claims of citizens of the United States. In Canada we have established our own diplomatic service which appears to have thrown over the British tradition in this respect without adopting the American. Surely our relations with the United States are not so unfriendly that representations on behalf of this man, who has served his country so faithfully in war, would be resented!

I think that is the case. I do not think the United States government would resent for a moment representations made on behalf of a man who finds himself in this unfortunate situation.

The letter continues:

> This young man is quite unable, financially, to go to Seattle to fight for the custody of his child in the courts there. Canada quite rightly refuses to adopt any system of easy divorce but is it not rather hypocritical for us to take this stand and at the same time facilitate an American soldier, who was stationed in Canada during the war, taking the child of a Canadian soldier who, because of service overseas, was unable to protect the child.

I should like to make a plea to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, to the government and to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) to interest themselves in this case, to make representations to the United States government to have this child returned to its proper custodian who in this case, I am sure every hon. member will agree, is his father.

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I wish to say just one word. I shall be glad to cooperate in the fullest degree, but this is the first time I have heard a word about this particular case. As soon as I get the particulars from my hon. friend, I shall be glad to discuss it with my colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, to see what can be done.

Motion (Mr. Mackenzie) agreed to, and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I call one item in legislation just to get it in. It is the Speaker's vote. It is the custom in the last few days of the session to have it permitted with the consent of the committee. I should like to call item 120 and have it stand, and then we shall proceed with the Department of Labour. I am requesting this purely for the purpose of getting the item in. I give assurance now that the admission of this item will not deter or retard or impair in the slightest degree the opportunities of any hon. member who may wish to bring up any grievances before the session concludes.

Mr. ADAMSON: Will the minister say what estimates are to come up after labour?

Mr. HOWE: Reconstruction.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I shall be glad to give the list as far as I can. First of all, labour; then, not necessarily in this order, reconstruction and supply, finance, trade and commerce, national revenue with related departments. While I am putting legislation in now, it is purely for the purpose of the record; then veterans affairs and the Prime Minister's office. I think that pretty well covers the list of departments which are outstanding at the present time. I want to make that assurance most definite; putting legislation into supply tonight does not in the slightest degree impair the right of any criticism on any day of the week.

Mr. BRACKEN: These departments are all you want us to finish tonight.

LEGISLATION

120. General administration, $269,088.

Item stands.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR—UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT, 1940

115. Administration, including expenditures incurred in connection with the activities of the national employment service as delegated by the Minister of Labour in accordance with section 88 of the act, $19,160,280.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, asked a question about the directives to unemployment insurance offices, and the hon. member for Vancouver East asked a question last night about the number of insured persons. I said that in 1947 the number was 2,600,000. I spoke from memory. The number was 2,580,754, which is approximately 2,600,000. He also asked what the number of insured was in 1946. It is 2,355,166. I now table the answers to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre's question.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been drawn to my attention that there is no provision for tabling documents in committee. The minister should wait until the Speaker is in the chair.

Mr. MITCHELL: Then I shall do it tomorrow morning.

Mr. KNOWLES: Table it in the morning as a sessional paper.

Mr. MITCHELL: The hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman) asked me a question about the vacancies in agriculture. As reported as of July 3, 1947, they are as follows: maritimes, 108; Ontario, 1,926; Quebec, 529; prairies, 596; Pacific, 71; total for Canada, 3,230.

[Mr. Adamson.]

Mr. BENTLEY: I have a number of union men and labour men in my constituency, in spite of the fact that it is largely a farming area. Many of them are concerned with some of the operations of the Unemployment Insurance Act. I do not know that the minister can do anything about the main complaint which is that when a person becomes unemployed because of physical inability to carry out such duties as railroading he does not come under unemployment insurance. That is part of the act, is it not? Unless there was an amendment to the act I do not suppose that that could be changed.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is correct.

Mr. BENTLEY: But there is another feature to it, and I think there should be some way of getting around it. When a man becomes unemployed because there is no employment in his line of work and he cannot get a similar job he draws unemployment insurance. We will say that he draws it for two or three weeks at the appointed rate, and then he gets a cold or pneumonia and is confined to his bed. His wife goes down to draw the unemployment insurance; immediately he is considered unemployed because he is sick, and he cannot draw the unemployment insurance. Even though there is still no job, he actually loses his employment in the regular way under the act, but before he gets a new job he becomes ill, and then he is ill under the act and is unable to collect. Could not something be done about that situation?

Mr. MITCHELL: Not without an amendment to the act. He has to be available for employment. That is the act.

Mr. McKAY: I have a question which is along the same line. I understand that the Canadian Pacific railway and Canadian National railway shop men are pensionable at the age of sixty-five. I understand, too, that at that age, if they have not contributed to a pension fund they will get $30 a month. I wish the minister would say whether or not, if at that age they are receiving $30 a month pension and they are quite prepared to take on other employment and cannot obtain a job, will they still be able to take unemployment benefits?

Mr. MITCHELL: That is the act and the regulations. Notwithstanding the fact they get superannuation at sixty-five, if they are fit and available for work they are entitled to unemployment insurance.

Mr. McKAY: They would be entitled to it?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask the minister whether, on the basis of reports from the advisory committees and the people who are involved in the administration of this act, any study is being given to broadening its base? I am not going into all the arguments that we have had in the past about the desirability of a more over-all scheme. I should simply like to ask whether consideration or study is being given to broadening its base?

Mr. MITCHELL: If my hon. friend remembers, some time ago we took the lumbering and logging people of British Columbia within the provisions of the act. Study is being made, I think, at the moment in that particular industry to apply it right across the dominion. I think my hon. friend knows my view with reference to coverage. Anything that I can do to help along complete coverage I shall certainly do.

Mr. KNOWLES: I appreciate what the minister has said about broadening the base in the direction of including more groups of people in it. I also had in mind broadening the base until it becomes a scheme of insurance to cover some of the other things besides unemployment such as ill health and other matters over which a person has no control. I mean moving in the direction of the over-all kind of scheme they have in the United Kingdom.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend knows there has been a discussion about health insurance in this house during the last two or three years. In the Dominion of Canada as in all countries where you have this system of social questions, in Great Britain, for instance, health insurance is in a class by itself, unemployment is in a class by itself and I hope that at some time we shall establish in the Dominion of Canada a system of health insurance.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister knows that very recently these various schemes in the United Kingdom have been brought within the purview of one social insurance act. What we have in the unemployment insurance scheme in Canada is the best basis of anything actually in existence on which to build. I hope the minister is not satisfied with the studies of this matter being made in other departments, but will see to it that in his department there will be a study for the purpose of broadening the base of this legislation.

Mr. MITCHELL: You do not want duplication.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is right; I want one over-all security act.

Mr. MITCHELL: If my hon. friend ever gets to this side, heaven forbid—

Mr. KNOWLES: We have heard that before.

Mr. MITCHELL: —he will find that it is enough to run one big department. I can assure him that the Minister of National Health and Welfare is capable of making that study, instead of having two departments trying to do it at the same time.

Mr. BENTLEY: In the event of a man who has been working on a job for a number of years and paying into the unemployment insurance fund until he reaches seventy, deciding at that age that he wants the old age pension, will he be eligible then for both old age pension and sufficient unemployment insurance to bring him up to the $50 prescribed for the single man under the Old Age Pensions Act, assuming that he has contributed all this life to the unemployment insurance fund?

Mr. MITCHELL: If he is available for work the first consideration will be unemployment insurance. If he is not available for work, then of course the old age pension comes into operation.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—

516. Payments to the provinces under agreements respecting assistance to vocational schools, including undischarged commitments of previous years, $2,000,000.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Will the minister explain this item? The amount last year was $2,500,000, and this year it is $2 million.

Mr. MITCHELL: Does the hon. member wish to have the figures by provinces?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Yes, and the balance due. There seems to be a duplication of figures. Item 113 relates to payments to the provinces under agreements including undischarged commitments of previous years.

Mr. MITCHELL: Item 113 is for youth training.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: And in item 114 there are expenses of vocational training.

Mr. MITCHELL: We took that up last night.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I understood the minister to say it was under the same act.

Mr. MITCHELL: Under the same conditions. The hon. member will see a number of votes that are almost identical. That is something which has grown up out of a pre-war and war condition. I am having a study made to consolidate the whole of the votes and

operations in connection with training in a general way. That is being undertaken at the present time.

Mr. BENTLEY: Next year in the estimates they will be consolidated?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes, but not without consultation with the provinces.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Will the minister be good enough to put those figures on *Hansard*.

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes.

Mr. HAZEN: There is also provision under item 519 for a dominion contribution toward replacement by a province or municipality of machinery used in war emergency training, and so on. Will the minister tell us how that money was distributed by provinces?

Mr. MITCHELL: The statement is as follows:

VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT

Year ended March 31, 1947

—	Dominion allotments 1946-7	Claims paid to April 30, 1947		Total approximate Dominion contributions approved to April 30, 1947 including annual grants
		For previous year	For 1946-47	
	$	$ cts.	$ cts.	$
Prince Edward Island	50,300	40,300 00	45,000 06	93,500
Nova Scotia	257,690	22,324 71	28,024 37	617,000
New Brunswick	222,600	.....	71,035 99	133,000
Quebec	1,551,220	133,963 78	461,498 47	3,220,000
Ontario	1,498,450	579,000 00	589,000 00	1,178,000
Manitoba	332,100	.....	.....	10,000
Saskatchewan	431,360	15,530 32	31,513 71	118,000
Alberta	353,860	90,003 21	154,349 75	471,000
British Columbia	302,420	70,356 88	107,853 16	240,000
Dominion	5,000,000	951,478 87	1,488,275 51	6,080,500

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—

523. Wartime labour relations board, $19,500.

Mr. KNOWLES: What are the reasons for the decrease in this item? This is the wartime labour relations board and the decrease is considerable. I wonder if something more of the wartime labour relations board should not be kept in existence in anticipation of the Canada labour relations board some time next year.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend will understand that during the war I more or less had jurisdiction over the provincial departments of labour with respect to labour relations. In each province there was set up a labour relations board. With the end of the war, and the province assuming their own jurisdiction, these provincial boards will be carried under their own jurisdiction and at their own expense. This vote is merely for the Canada labour relations board. That is a national labour board.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—

528. To provide for transfer of labour to and from places where employment is available in agriculture and industry and expenses incidental thereto, $550,000, National Employment Service —now included in normal estimates under employment insurance act—administration, $11,538,150.

Mr. POULIOT: Will the minister give definite instructions so that forms will be sent out in both languages to the offices of Montreal, Quebec and other cities where there are people speaking both languages?

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend mentioned that to me the other day. My organization is very cautious about that. It has run out of forms owing to the swamp of work at the printing bureau. There has been some delay in the delivery of forms but, as far as my department is concerned, the request will receive prompt attention when we get the forms.

Mr. POULIOT: I understand that the minister's instructions to that effect are definite?

Mr. MITCHELL: Absolutely.

Item agreed to.

Annuities Act—

753. To authorize payment after as well as before the end of the current fiscal year out of the government annuities fund in discharge of obligations under annuity contracts issued prior to the first day of January, 1947 and purporting to have been so issued or amended under the government annuities act and ratified by the governor in council, $1.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister explain this?

Mr. MITCHELL: Contracts were made by certain individuals with the annuities branch over a number of years, and the Department of Justice is not satisfied that they can comply with the law. There is no charge to the treasury. The money has been paid in; the obligation is there and will be met with the passage of this vote. It is a nominal vote of $1.

Mr. KNOWLES: Were these cases of lost survivor contracts with a guaranteed period?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is consideration being given to amending the annuities act to reinstate that kind of contract?

Mr. MITCHELL: Consideration is being given.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—

916. To provide for expenses that may be incurred in the arranging for and the movement of workers from outside Canada to work on farms and other essential industry in Canada where Canadian labour is not available to meet the need—further amount required, $500,000.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: On what basis is the decision made by the government as to whether or not they will advance these expenses? The second question is, are these expenses a loan to the imported labour directly, or is that to the firm? Is payment made to the firm and is it being recovered in every case?

Mr. MITCHELL: I might say to my hon. friend that it deals with the entry of these Polish soldiers into Canada and also people from the camps in Germany and Austria. With regard to the Polish veterans, of whom 4,527 have come to Canada, the British government paid the fares to the Canadian port of entry and the Canadian government paid the fares to the place of employment. In connection with the placement of the Polish veterans, particularly the farmers, my hon. friend must understand that we feel it is our obligation to pay the fare of these Polish veterans to the place of employment, because the placement is done on an individual basis under the jurisdiction of my department. With regard to displaced persons the International Refugee Organization pays the transportation costs to the Canadian port of entry. The employer pays transportation costs from the port of entry to destination of employment on the understanding that he may charge it back to the displaced person if this person does not remain in his employment for a specific period of time, which is about ten to twelve months.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I take it that it is not the policy of the department to collect this money from the mining companies or the lumbering companies?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes, it is.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Does the department pay this to the company?

Mr. MITCHELL: A revolving fund is required to meet the situation until we are able to collect from the companies concerned.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: It is being collected?

Mr. MITCHELL: Absolutely.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF RECONSTRUCTION AND SUPPLY

Demobilization and reconversion—

568. Departmental administration, $1,989,208.

Mr. WEBB: We have heard a good deal about War Assets Corporation. That being the case, I think it would be interesting for the committee and the country to know a little bit about the accounting of this corporation. I think it would also be interesting to know if there is any possibility of this corporation, as it were, going out of existence within the near future. I should also like to get some idea of the number of people in the employ of the corporation at the present time, and also whether the corporation as it now exists really justifies its existence.

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction and Supply): War Assets Corporation is still quite active. Up to the first of June its sales were running at a rate in excess of $10,000,000 a month, which is not small change in the view of this government. Sales in the month of June were, I believe, $7,300,000. It is likely that sales will continue at that level perhaps for the balance of the year.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): What were the sales a year ago?

Mr. HOWE: They were running about $20,000,000 to $25,000,000 a month. Total recovery to date is something in excess of $400,000,000, I believe; and a considerable volume of material remains to be disposed of.

Mr. WEBB: What about the number of employees at the present time?

Mr. HOWE: Roughly, there are eight thousand employees. The number is dropping as we are able to close warehouses. As we can liquidate the contents of a warehouse now, the warehouse is closed and disposed of; and, of course, the men employed in the warehouse are dispensed with.

Mr. WEBB: The numbers are dropping?

Mr. HOWE: The numbers are dropping quite rapidly. The peak employment was something over 10,000. The staff is dropping. The cost of sales is quite reasonable, running about thirteen per cent of the gross.

Mr. BRACKEN: Has the minister ever put on record the amount of money which went into war equipment of all kinds during the war period? Has he ever given an estimate of how much was left when the war was over? Has he ever told the house how much of it has been declared surplus and thereby been made available for sale? Has he ever given a statement as to how much has been sold in each of the years since the war has been over? Has he in mind the amount that is still available for possible future sale or other use? Those are a good many questions to ask at one time, but they ask for information which I think the country would like to have. I suggest that, to the extent the minister can do so, he might try to get that information before his estimates are finished.

Mr. HOWE: It is difficult to say what is the value of the material supplied to the Canadian army. I presume that is what my hon. friend is interested in. It will be recalled that in this country we made material which went to the British allies; it went to Australia; it went to the United States. Perhaps the Department of National Defence could give the value of the material which went to them, but the Department of Munitions and Supply would be unable to do so. They had material manufactured and delivered it as instructed. In some cases the supply line to the Canadian troops would be a British supply line, as it was in Italy. In other cases it might be a Canadian supply line. The Department of Munitions and Supply would not have that information. The material was allocated by the munitions allocations committee. That committee was made up of the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada. Our production was placed before the committee, and it was allocated on the basis of need. If it was allocated to the United States, the United States paid for the material. If it was allocated to the United Kingdom, it was either paid for or charged to mutual aid. If it was allocated to Canada, it was paid for by the Canadian government. It is difficult to put a value on used material. If it was built for war, it was used for war and was returned here in such condition as it may have been in; or perhaps it never left Canada but was used for training purposes.

Aeroplanes are a case in point. An aeroplane may have cost $200,000 to build. It may be worth nothing for civilian purposes. For example, there is the Mosquito aircraft which cost, I think, something in excess of $200,000. There is no sale for it as a post-war aeroplane. There are a great number of them in store. Some fine day we shall take out the engines and all the parts which are worth salvaging, and destroy the rest. Aeroplane recovery is, I should think, in the vicinity of one or two per cent. In some materials it runs to perhaps sixty or seventy per cent, and in other materials it runs to 100 per cent. But there is no pattern of recovery in materials now. Whether it will be possible to obtain the figures which my hon. friend wants, I cannot say; but we shall certainly read this question in *Hansard* and submit the figures as best we can.

Another case in point is called to my attention by my officials, namely, that of the tank which cost $90,000 to build, when scrapped, it produces thirty tons of scrap which sells at $15 a ton. That is an indication of the salvage which can be expected from a war machine which has no peace-time value.

Mr. BRACKEN: I believe the information I requested would be of great public interest, but I quite appreciate that the minister could not be expected to give the answers now. Can he say, through the use of figures or in any other way, what amount of this equipment already has been declared surplus; what are the revenues for each of the fiscal periods since the war, and any approximation of what amount the country will recover through what may yet be declared surplus and sold?

Mr. HOWE: Recoveries so far have been as follows:

April 1-July 11, 1944	$ 390,996
July 12, 1944-March 31, 1945	9,116,131
April 1, 1945-March 31,1946	124,878,369
April, May, June, 1946	70,626,707
July, August, September, 1946 ...	61,057,707
October, November, December, 1946	52,358,313
January, February, March, 1947..	39,238,681

I have not the figure for April, May and June of this year, but it will be approximately $25,000,000.

Mr. BRACKEN: Has the minister made any computation showing what revenues are likely yet to be received?

Mr. HOWE: It is difficult to forecast the further amount that may be declared surplus. The practice of War Assets Corporation is not to take account of any material that it has not in store. In other words, after the declaration is made we can assess the possibilities in regard to the material we have; but each month we obtain more material. We consider it fairly safe to say we expect to realize another $50,000,000, which would bring the grand total to well over $450,000,000.

Mr. BRACKEN: That would be recoverable over the next year or two?

Mr. HOWE: Yes; certainly over the next year.

Mr. BRACKEN: Has the department ever made an estimate as to the percentage of recovery, taking the original cost of this equipment and what the state derives from its sale?

Mr. HOWE: We do not keep a record of original costs. It is too difficult to trace back and ascertain the original costs. I think we would have to give the estimate by categories. As I say in aeroplanes, which represent a very large part of the war expenditures, the recovery is almost nothing. Tanks are in the same category. However, from the war equipment which was surplus to the Canadian army when it stopped fighting we expect to recover somethink in excess of $450,000,000.

Mr. BRACKEN: I have just one other observation, and perhaps the Minister of Finance would listen to this. It is possible that an accurate statement could not be obtained, but I suggest that it would be in the public interest to have an approximate statement of the amount of money the government of Canada put into what might be generally called war equipment; how much of that was wasted in war; how much was left when the fighting was over; how much has been declared surplus, and what the recovery has been. I gather from what the minister has said that there will be a recovery of around $450,000,000, but we have not even an approximate idea of the cost of the goods which will bring in that figure. I gather the minister has not even the approximate cost?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. HERRIDGE: I wish to make a few remarks on this item, if I am in order, with regard to housing; and to ask one or two questions concerning war assets. In my constituency we have a large number of veterans and others who are seeking homes, who at the present time are living in all sorts of accommodation, and in some cases, suffering a great deal of inconvenience. This situation existed throughout the war, and it has not been improved since the end of the war. I believe the minister understands the particular difficulties that exist in my constituency, particularly in and around the city of Trail. Those difficulties are both legal and physical, because of the nature of the country and the limits of the city of Trail, and I do not believe they will be solved until we have a subsidized housing programme in which the dominion, the provinces and municipalities will cooperate.

That is all I am going to say in that connection, but I want to ask a question and offer a suggestion. Personally I believe it is all wrong that many of these veterans and other young people establishing homes in this country should be expected to assume mortgages covering a period of twenty years and amounting to $5,000, $6,000 and $7,000, in order to get homes. I believe we are doing a great deal too much of discounting the future which in the years that lie ahead may bring much grief to many families. I should like to ask the minister if any consideration has been given to partly building homes. What I have in mind is this. Instead of building a complete house and having it all ready to occupy, at a cost of from $5,000 to $7,000, perhaps the foundation could be put in and enough of the house built to serve temporarily as a habitation, with the idea that the purchaser would not assume an obligation of more than $2,000, and that he would complete the house at his leisure over a period of years. In many ways that would be a much sounder arrangement for many people who are trying to obtain houses and who must live on very modest salaries. That is the way in which a good many people established homes in this country in the early days, and I believe the government might well consider a scheme of that kind. Many young men desiring homes would be willing to undertake the building of houses on that basis, and would prefer to assume a total indebtedness of not more than $2,000 and then complete the house over a period of years in their spare time. At the same time they would be free of a great burden of debt. If something along this line could be done at this time we would save material; we would save labour, and we would certainly save the payment of a great deal of interest by many people desiring to establish homes. I believe that under this scheme it would also be possible to build more housing units in a given time. A scheme of this kind would apply perhaps more particularly outside the cities and towns. I should like the minister to say whether he has considered anything in that direction.

My second question is this. In my constituency are hundreds of houses formerly occupied by the Japanese, particularly at Slocan City, Lemon Creek and Roseberry. These houses are, on the average, fourteen feet wide and twenty-four feet long, and are quite well constructed. They would make excellent homes for many people, and in some cases if two of these houses were joined together they would make satisfactory quarters. A good many people in my riding would like to purchase these houses, and have been waiting two years for War Assets to dispose of them. I urge the minister to see that something is done to dispose of at least sufficient of these houses to meet the needs of those people living within perhaps twenty or thirty miles of where those houses are now located. They could arrange for their transportation by road or have them taken down and hauled to their small holdings or homesites in the villages in my district. Can the minister give any information in this connection?

Mr. HOWE: As far as partly completed houses are concerned, my hon. friend will appreciate that that will be an arrangement between the builder and the lending institutions. Loans under the National Housing Act are available for partly completed houses just as they are for fully completed houses. I am quite aware of the arrangement suggested by my hon. friend, and I realize that it is a thrifty method of building a house and one that should be taken advantage of more frequently. However, when the government builds, it builds to rent, and for that type of housing the units must be completed. As far as the houses at Slocan are concerned, I am told that they are in the process of being declared surplus to War Assets Corporation. If that is the case, War Assets Corporation will immediately arrange for their disposal, and I have no doubt that local purchasers will be given consideration.

Mr. FRASER: A few moments ago the minister mentioned the small amount received for tanks as scrap. I noticed a newspaper clipping some two or three weeks ago which stated that the defence department had purchased tanks from the United States government. Were those tanks different from the ones that are being sold at the present time?

Mr. HOWE: For the sake of uniformity, some of the latest design tanks were bought by the armed services from the United States government, I think on the basis of a cent a pound or something like that. The purchase was on a scrap basis. These tanks are more modern than the ones which were built in Canada in the early days of the war.

Mr. FRASER: The minister mentioned Mosquitoes. I understand that in the United States they are spraying or cob-webbing their aeroplanes in order to preserve them. Is anything being done along that line here?

Mr. HOWE: The air force are cob-webbing planes which they are keeping in store as active war planes, but planes declared surplus to War Assets are for disposal. There is no purpose in storing them. If the air force expected to need them, they would not declare them surplus.

Mr. FRASER: What is the procedure when a sale is made by War Assets? A sale is advertised in the paper to be held on such and such a date, and then they say, "subject to prior sale". A person arrives on the job thinking he is going to be able to buy something, but when he gets there he finds it is not for sale.

Mr. HOWE: That seldom happens now. In the early days we had priority arrangements. The first priority went to government departments; the second priority went to provinces, and the third priority went to municipalities. If a sale was in process of being arranged and a priority claimant applied for the goods, the corporation had no option but to sell to the priority claimant, which meant that the goods would not be offered to the public. I am happy to say that we have now modified priorities. A sale may be subject to prior sale, but no prior sale takes place and the material is offered to the public.

Mr. FRASER: I spoke to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, I think on May 2 or 3, with regard to some shrubs around the DVA hospital at Peterborough, and he advised me to get in touch with War Assets Corporation. I dropped them a line, but it was never answered. There was an advertisement in the Peterborough *Examiner* saying that the shrubs would be offered for sale, but when people went to pick them up they discovered there were two trucks from Toronto taking them all away.

Mr. HOWE: We are not florists; we sell war material. If my hon. friend wants to buy shrubs I strongly advise him to get them through a florist.

Mr. FRASER: The Peterborough horticultural society wanted the shrubs to beautify the city, and it was a sore touch to them to have them carted off to Toronto.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I think I must assume some responsibility in support of my hon.

friend. He did come to see me about these. The hospital in Peterborough burned down.

Mr. FRASER: The minister is not the guilty party.

Mr. MACKENZIE: When the hospital burned down and it was not to be reassumed by us I think some adjustment might be made between the various agencies of government and the city of Peterborough.

Mr. FRASER: Some time ago I referred to the crates that are in the Belleville yards. Some of those crates have been there for years, and new ones have been placed there within the last four or five months or even less than that. What is in them and why are they there?

Mr. HOWE: That is a dump from which we sell crated vehicles. The vehicles my hon. friend is talking about may have been sold and the buyer has not as yet taken them away. Every vehicle owned by War Assets has been sold.

Mr. FRASER: They would not leave them a year or two years.

Mr. HOWE: They might.

Mr. FRASER: They are pretty funny purchasers if they do that.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I understood the minister to say a few moments ago that they had not been able to get costs.

Mr. HOWE: We have not tried to get costs.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Does that mean that you sell people things without knowing what they cost? There may be precious little realized on the original cost. I should think it is blind business to sell things without having any idea of the cost. You have already indicated that in the case of aeroplanes and tanks you do know the cost, but do I understand correctly that you disregard costs entirely? Surely that is not so?

Mr. HOWE: If it is an article which has a ceiling price, we sell at the ceiling price. If the article has no common value, we have it valued. We follow a careful procedure on that. When material comes from the armed services we put a value on it and sell it, but that has nothing to do with the cost of manufacture.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Does that mean that there will be available anywhere even a rough computation of the original cost of these things that are being sold by the hundreds and millions?

Mr. HOWE: We could trace down an individual item if there was any interest. For example, we may sell a corvette which cost about $900,000 for about $90,000. I do not think the fact that it cost $900,000 would be of any particular interest to the buyer, to the seller or to anybody else.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): It might be of considerable interest to the people of Canada to know the cost of these things which are being sold for hundreds of millions and which probably cost many times that. I am not criticizing that.

Mr. HOWE: What kind of Canadian would find value in that information? What would he do with the information if he had it?

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I think he would try to guess at whether there had been an efficient job done. We have no means whatever of guessing in the slightest degree at the efficiency of the performance.

Mr. HOWE: A Mosquito aircraft which cost $200,000 may have been used in the war for a period and then be declared surplus to War Assets. The salvage value may be $5,000. Does that signify lack of efficiency on the part of War Assets?

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I would not say so at all.

Mr. HOWE: We may build a tank for $90,000 and sell it for $15 a ton. That does not show a lack of efficiency.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): You do not have to convince me; I agree with that.

Mr. HOWE: I am trying to get the hon. member to tell me what this bulk figure would do.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I appreciate that what you realize from the things you describe is the merest fraction of their cost. But what I am talking about is the large amount of more standard articles, which must have run into hundreds of millions of dollars, where you would know the cost and where people might form an estimate whether you were being efficient or not.

Mr. HOWE: The difficulty is that the material we were selling was not confined to the last great war. We were selling 18-pounder guns from the first great war, and harness and saddles made for the South African war. The production of standard material was at a reasonable price. As more units got into operation and production speeded up, prices dropped, but we do not know when we are

selling an article whether it was made in the early or late stages of the war, and I cannot imagine how, without an elaborate system, you could get that information.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): It need not be elaborate. From what the minister has said it seems to have been a free and easy performance. It would not have been much trouble to have got a pretty close approximation to the price; but, as it is now, there is a wide open escape for everybody.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): A matter that has received wide attention is the disposal of the three plants at Trail, Welland and Calgary. I took this matter up in the house on the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, and I want to read briefly now from the *Rural Co-operator* of January 14, 1947, in connection with the disposal of these three plants which had been built during the war for production for war purposes and then, later, were converted to produce ammonium nitrate, a valuable ingredient in fertilizers. The article in the *Rural Co-operator* reads in part:

> We reported last year respecting the disposal of the government-owned nitrate plants at Calgary and at Welland, Ontario. The situation at that time and throughout the year, so far as our understanding with the government was concerned, was that the government, through Hon. C. D. Howe, had assured us that, even though the Calgary plant, where cheap nitrate was being produced, might be sold, there would be protection for prices for nitrate for fertilizer through the fact that the government intended continuing operation of the plant at Welland.

Those of us who are connected with agriculture were most disappointed when we found that the government—and I say this frankly—had sold the Canadian farmer down the river in disposing of the plant to a United States concern whose only interest was to make profits in this country. We feel bitter about this. I should like to read from a letter that I received from the minister's own office dated March 24, 1947. I had written to the department in connection with the disposal of the Welland plant, and in reply I was informed that this plant was built at a cost of $19,129,246.02 to the Canadian taxpayer. The letter goes on:

> On December 1, 1946, this plant exclusive of inventories was sold to North American Cyanamid Limited for $4,750,000.

I do not think, by any stretch of the imagination, anyone could say that this was a fair price for the plant. I draw the attention of the minister to the fact that he did commit himself and the government to retaining one of these plants to produce a cheap fertilizer for the Canadian farmer. Second, I would ask him to state why the Calgary plant was not kept in operation where, as has been stated, we could produce ammonium nitrate for about $19 a ton even before we got into post-war production, where with larger volume we could have reduced the price. I want to emphasize as strongly as I can that the government were urging an all-out production of food in this country, and we know that there is a world shortage of fertilizer. Then why put into the hands of one or two companies in this country a complete monopoly in the manufacture of fertilizer? With the price of fertilizer going up during the early part of the war, we have no guarantee that these people will not shove the price up still further as they did prior to the war.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend says that they have put the price up. When was that? I understood it was selling lower today than when the government was operating the plant. The fact of the matter is that the Calgary plant and the Trail plant were suitable for manufacturing ammonium nitrate, and the government by a happy invention devised a process for making a fertilizer from ammonium nitarte. Ninety-five per cent of this ammonium nitrate was sold outside Canada. Less than five per cent of the Calgary production was taken in Canada. It was not a fertilizer that western Canada ever uses. It is used a little in eastern Canada, mostly in the maritimes. Why we should hang on to the production of a chemical fertilizer that requires a world market, I cannot see. We did sell out the Calgary plant which developed this fertilizer, and we recovered from the plant more than we spent on building it; that is, the combined Trail and Calgary plants.

The Welland plant was built for the manufacture of picrite, one of the components of which is ammonia. Therefore we had a small ammonia unit in this plant. We converted that to making ammonium nitrate, but the production was not sufficient to do any more than carry the plant. There were chemical features in there which should properly be used for industrial production in this country. It meant that we were laying off staff and getting down to an operating staff on the ammonium nitrate plant. Today it is a full-fledged chemical plant as it was designed to be, and will be maintained as such and keep up with the requirements of the times.

I have heard a good deal of talk about the sale of these plants, but I never heard one logical reason why they should not be sold. Remember this is not a socialist government that I am a member of. Why the government

of Canada should operate government-owned plants to sell fertilizer around the world, I cannot see.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): Then why did the minister commit himself?

Mr. HOWE: If the hon. member will read the letter carefully he will see that I said there was no present intention of selling the plant. A year later I had an opportunity to sell it and I sold it.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: What percentage of the cost did you get for it?

Mr. HOWE: I sold it for $4,750,000.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: About twenty-five per cent of the cost of construction.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Why was the hospital at Prince George, represented by the C.C.F., sold, and why was the hospital at Prince Rupert, represented by the C.C.F., sold? A hospital at Prince Rupert, represented by a C.C.F. member, and a hospital at Halifax, represented, I presume, by a by-election member, were sold for $2,500, but at Chilliwack the department wants some $30,000 for a bunch of mission huts that have no value except for salvage purposes. I have had a lot of letters from the minister's department, and it would take a very good lawyer to understand them. Even he would not understand them. These letters have said that because one property is owned by the city or by the government and the other property has to be put into shape, it accounts for the difference. I wonder whether the minister has ever been to a real district such as Fraser Valley and has seen the piece of property at Chilliwack. If he has he would know the cost of putting that hospital into shape. When one considers that in Prince Rupert a permanent brick or concrete hospital has been offered for the sum of $2,500 and down in Halifax, where I understand they had a little baseball game or some other recreation, another building has been offered for $2,500 and in Prince George the same thing has happened, and yet at Chilliwack we have been asked $30,000 for a bunch of mission huts, one can understand how we feel about it. It would cost a fortune to light and heat these buildings in Chilliwack; yet we are asked $30,000 for them. The only reason the minister's department can give me is that one is on government property and the other is on leased property, and in one case it would take so much to put it back in shape and in the other case half the buildings are gone. I get a little bitter about this when I realize that Prince George, Prince Rupert and Halifax can get away with murder and my riding is expected to pay $30,000 for a bunch of cheap mission huts.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Have a by-election.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I do not want to have a by-election yet. In Chilliwack we have women in from the military camp of western Canada. Maternity cases are being looked after in our hospital at Chilliwack. In spite of that, we are asked to pay this high price. I want an explanation from the minister. He has not given me one yet.

Mr. HOWE: The hon. member has not given me a chance.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I have been giving the minister a chance for three years, and he has been writing letters or some of his officials have been writing letters that do not mean anything except to say that Prince George and Prince Rupert can have it because in one case the property is government owned and in the other case it is on leased property. I am asking for a better explanation than that. We have no by-election in Chilliwack; we do not intend to have one for some time; but I want to know why my riding is being discriminated against particularly when we have the one permanent army camp in western Canada.

Mr. HOWE: All I can say about Chilliwack is this. The collection of huts my hon. friend is talking about happened to cost in excess of $300,000. They are offered to him at ten per cent of the cost, together with land and all appurtenances, which is $30,000. I have a note here which says that Mr. Sparling from our Vancouver office is on his way to Chilliwack now to go into the matter further to see if arrangements can be made.

My hon. friend talks glibly about the situation in Prince Rupert and in Halifax. I may say this about Halifax. Our only instructions to War Assets Corporation is to get the best recovery possible from any article of government property that is assigned to it for sale. If the town happens to own the property and it is on lease and the lease provides that the building is to be removed from the property and the property restored to its original value, I suppose the basis of the sale is exactly that, sold for removal, and naturally it is worth far less for removal than it is if you can use it on the ground on which it is built. We have been told by the experts during the past three years how we should sell this, that and the other thing. We do the best we can. I can assure my hon. friend that politics or

sentiment or doing good to people have no part in the work of War Assets Corporation. It operates to get a fair return.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I am willing to concede that politics have no part in it. The minister told me that doing good has no part in it. A hospital is necessary for the district and that is not taken into consideration. I am told by the minister's own letters that this Jap camp at Tashme settlement was made for $27,000.

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Just a minute; it is under your own signature. You may have forgotten it, but I have not. They asked about $52,000 and a settlement was made for $27,000. The sum of $500 a month was paid in rent. The farm never paid that amount in a year in profit. The minister says that there is no sentiment attached to this hospital. I appreciate the fact that the minister has told me that Mr. Sparling is on his way to the district. I would suggest that Mr. Sparling look at things from a humanitarian point of view and not from War Assets point of view.

Mr. GREEN: I should like to follow up the question asked a few moments ago by the hon. member for Leeds with which the minister did not deal. He asked for some indication as to when the work of War Assets Corporation could be wound up. I understand, from the annual report of the company which covers the twelve months ended March 31 of this year, that they are meeting with a great deal of difficulty now in carrying on their business. For example, on page 8 we find that a lessening of demand for surplus goods is now very apparent. Then on page 10 of the report says that the corporation is now entering into the period of comparatively small single sales. On page 11 it is stated that industry is reaching the end of the period of reconversion, and that this means also that surplus property will have to compete more actively with the products of private industry, and that disposal of surplus from now on will present more difficulty and yield a lower return. I take it that from now on we may expect less profit, less money realized from the transactions of War Assets Corporation, and at the same time expect high overhead. This evening the minister said the number of employees is still 8,000. That is about 2,000 more than the highest number during 1945-46, although it is some 2,000 lower than the highest figure during 1946-47. What about the future of this corporation? The total payroll given in the report is $15,624,-905.31. I presume that was for the fiscal year, but it seems obvious that we shall have heavy payroll and heavy expenditures with constantly diminishing returns. Can the minister give us some further answer to the question placed before him by the hon. member for Leeds?

Mr. HOWE: This material has no value unless it is sold. If it has no value it is turned over to War Assets Corporation. I can assure my hon. friend that the cost—

Mr. GREEN: That is hardly right. If it has no value it is not turned over to War Assets.

Mr. HOWE: If it has no value to War Assets Corporation it is not turned over. What does my hon. friend suggest, that we start giving it away?

Mr. GREEN: The minister need not fly off the handle.

Mr. HOWE: I am not flying off the handle; I am wondering—

Mr. GREEN: I am asking him a question in a reasonable way and not with any attempt to get him into any kind of trouble. I think we are entitled to know something about the policy for the future.

Mr. HOWE: At the moment the cost of doing business is about thirteen per cent of recoveries. The cost may rise. Naturally, if the sales get smaller and selling is more difficult the cost of sales will go up. We anticipate that another $50 million can be recovered from the sale of war assets. We will carry on as reasonably as we can and when the work is finished, when the cost of sales is more than the value of sales, at an appropriate time we shall wind up the activities of the corporation.

Mr. FRASER: Is the $50 million mostly in ships?

Mr. HOWE: Oh, no.

Mr. GREEN: Has there been a change recently in the policy of the corporation? Are they not changing the policy to meet changing conditions?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Having regard to smaller sales and greater sales resistance?

Mr. HOWE: Yes. We are having more branch sales. Branches are a higher proportion of the total than in the early stages. Industrial real estate is practically all sold. The ships are all sold. The items that offer large recovery for individual sale are gone. Sales today represent a great variety of material that is put on display in warehouses throughout the country. The public are asked to go and bid for them, but individual sales are today very much down. In April,

1946, the average sale per invoice was $4,987.45, or practically $5,000 for each invoice. That diminished in December of the same year to $1,225.87. In January, 1947, it was down to $776, and in March it was $706.

Mr. GREEN: Dropping all the time.

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Is the corporation going to continue with a large number of warehouses, or will the good be concentrated?

Mr. HOWE: The warehouses are shut down progressively. The purpose is to concentrate on not more than one warehouse in each area. That practically means each province, treating the maritimes as one province. We are working in that direction and when we get that down theoretically we shall try to retreat into one warehouse at some central point. It is a contracting operation.

Mr. WEBB: The minister mentioned individual sales. I am particularly interested in that, for the reason that I know several service men who wish to obtain lathes and other machinery. What is the policy? To what extent are individuals able to buy in any of this material at the present time?

Mr. HOWE: If a man wants to buy a lathe he buys it from the dealer. War Assets is not a retail business. It is not a place for a man to go and spend $50. It is a wholesale business.

Mr. WEBB: Am I to understand that there is no use in a service man making application for a certain amount of machinery in a certain place, for the reason that it has been turned over to War Assets and he has to go through the operation of buying it from a dealer? He cannot buy direct.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): The minister uses terminology to which apparently some of us attach different meanings. For example, he used the word "reasonable" in describing the policy of War Assets Corporation, but it seems to me that the whole policy is based on the theory that what is good for some people is not so good for others. I say frankly that I do not think it has been a very good policy for the Canadian people, and in this connection I should like to revert to the disposal of plants. I do not think there is really any point in referring to the fact that we do use a good deal of nitrate in Canada in fertilizers. I do not believe the minister would go to an eastern farmer or those in the west who use 11-48 fertilizer mix on their fallow wheat or on their potato crops and tell them that it was not important or that the price should not be kept in line with cost of production and sale prices. I might say that up to date there has been no safeguard that I can see. My information is that already ingredients going into fertilizer mix are increasing. Pressure is being brought to bear for increased prices. The price of fertilizer today is such that, selling for $64 for 11-48 in my own province of Saskatchewan, the farmers cannot use it. The answer is, of course, that if you want soil conservation, if you want to increase and stabilize production, you have to start using this commodity. Here was an opportunity of keeping this product under public control where we could have had this main ingredient going into fertilizer, now that we have found potash in Saskatchewan and could have increased over-all production. I would point out that we have experimentation in process at the universities, and we should have a correlated plan with the Department of Agriculture so that our whole economy would work together, instead of having this hit-or-miss method that we are following. I cannot believe that the Minister of Agriculture was happy about the sale of these things. From the point of view of the agriculturist, it has been a really bad mistake.

Mr. SKEY: May I ask the minister whether he has considered the policy which was followed in the United States for the sale of their war assets? If so, has he considered that policy for Canada? Briefly stated, it is this. They gave their ex-service men priority on any sale. They could go for the first few days, then educational institutions, then state and municipal governments and, finally, the general public. Each group had its date and the ex-service men had a priority to buy these goods.

Mr. HOWE: We tried to devise a servicemen's priority but could not see any way of doing so. The servicemen's priority practically broke down the operation in the United States. They had about three or four disposal agencies before they got around to our process under War Assets Corporation, and in every case it was the servicemen's preference that tied up sales. Even the limited preference we had caused more trouble and delayed operations to a greater extent than any other feature of our programme.

Mr. SKEY: Last year the minister made the same statement, that the United States government had come around to our system. I was in New York in November, 1946, long after the house closed, and they were still using the system I have briefly outlined

tonight. Evidently they did go through with it and it did provide a priority for servicemen. All the serviceman had to do was to present his discharge papers and get into the sale.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): I should like to ask the minister how many motor launches or other craft have been sold to the school of arts and crafts of Rimouski, Quebec, what the sale price was in each case, and what were the terms of disposal What were they to be used for?

Mr. HOWE: Personally I have never heard of the school of arts and crafts in the province of Quebec and I cannot answer the question. The officers here have some vague recollection that a boat or two were sold to them. We can give the reply in the morning.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): One other question. In regard to ball-bearings, when we sat on the war assets committee last year this question arose. Can the minister indicate the value of all types of ball-bearings which were surplus at the end of the war, whom they were disposed to, and the price in each case?

Mr. HOWE: I presume they were parts of automobiles. Is that what the hon. member has in mind?

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): My understanding was that a good many ball-bearings were made of non-standard size. I know something about mechanics, and to me it seems ridiculous that for most of our war purposes apparently these various types of ball-bearings, which of course, are quite expensive, were made non-standard so that their disposal was of very little use in post-war construction, such as for going into automobiles and other types of construction. Maybe the minister could indicate why that was.

Mr. HOWE: The ball-bearings may not have been standard for domestic vehicles. I do not think anyone making a tank would worry very much whether he used ball-bearings which were standard for some peacetime vehicles. He would use the bearings which were required to carry the load. The same would be true of other special army vehicles. I have no knowledge of the situation, but I can very well imagine that a great percentage of the ball-bearings used in war were not suitable for peacetime vehicles.

Mr. MacNICOL: Anybody would know that.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): Earlier in the session I brought to the attention of the minister several thousand tons of steel which had been used in producing wartime barbed wire for farmers in the country. The whole amount of steel that went into that production was wasted. It would have been better if a good deal less of that barbed wire had been made and if we had something that would be of some use now. The whole works is wasted. How long is it the intention to continue to make wartime barbed wire? Why not go back to standard barbed wire so that the farmers will have something when they buy it?

Mr. HOWE: We do not know anything about that. If there was any standard barbed wire made during the war, I presume it was shipped overseas. What the steel companies are making today would not be within the purview of the government.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I should like to know the cost or the amount of rent paid for the lease on each piece of property required for hospital purposes by any department of government during the war, the cost of building each hospital, and the price which each building or property was sold at. I do not expect the minister to give me that information tonight, but I should like to have it tomorrow morning.

Mr. HOWE: I am afraid that the night shift is not working tonight. I shall be glad to get the information for my hon. friend as soon as it can be obtained.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I should like it before the minister's estimates are carried. If he cannot get it tomorrow morning, tomorrow afternoon or tomorrow night will do.

Mr. WEBB: I should like to make what I believe to be a constructive suggestion to the minister. It is in connection with the advertising of war assets. I have pretty nearly every advertisement I have seen in the papers. It seems to me that the great majority of the articles offered for sale are more or less in the form of white elephants. It seems to me that if we had a greater volume of advertising in connection with articles which are really saleable and can be used by a great many people, it would make for much greater sales. I have tried to keep track of the advertising, and yet I have not been able to find anything that is usable in my location.

Mr. HOWE: It is not the practice to advertise articles that are originally sold to the trade. We advertise white elephants because we want to get rid of them at a good price. A lot of standard articles we advertise. But where there is an agency of War Assets Corporation in the area, anyone buying a standard

article is expected to get in touch with the agency and place his order accordingly. Standard articles are usually sold in large batches. We advertise real estate and ships and non-standard usable articles, but not standard ones.

Mr. WEBB: Let us have a good buy once in a while so that we can get something.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): There is one other thing I should like to bring to the attention of the minister. Earlier in one of the aviation magazines there was an article about the Mosquito aircraft stored at Cumberland, where they were being protected with a certain spray or film for future use. I have now been informed that those have been disposed of. Is that correct?

Mr. HOWE: We have not disposed of any Mosquito aircraft. I am told that some of the Cromlin Mosquitoes have been declared surplus and are in process of being transferred to War Assets Corporation. I am informed that only one or two have been sold.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): There was considerable consternation among the people around London as to just what was going on there. We were led to believe that these aircraft were being preserved for future use. These men who were employed there and knew what was going on, said that the engines were removed. When a Mosquito has the engine removed, the air frame is no longer of any use, and it was thought they were being sold for a song. Until the engines were taken out, they were a going concern. It looked as though part of the move was just to get the motor out, then the aircraft could be declared surplus. And when they did not have a plane to put it in, they could declare the motor surplus.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): No, I should like to have an answer to my question.

Mr. HOWE: The hon. member will appreciate the fact that he is asking the wrong minister about that. We get the plane after it is declared surplus, after the army has decided what it will do with it. It is not the function of War Assets Corporation to say what is surplus and what is not. The army tell us what is surplus.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): I think the people got a raw deal. I will tell the minister that.

Mr. SKEY: Did the minister ever have any aircraft from Great Britain or the European theatre declared surplus to him?

Mr. HOWE: Not to my knowledge. I think arrangements were made with the United Kingdom for the exchange of certain aircraft in use there and for certain other aircraft to be produced. I believe there was an arrangement for the exchange of surplus aircraft in the United Kingdom for jet planes now being produced. As far as I know, no aircraft were declared surplus to War Assets in the United Kingdom.

Mr. SKEY: I am glad to get that information. I have been bothering the minister about several things along that line, and I hope the jets arrive in Canada soon.

Mr. FRASER: Can the minister say what the total cost was of operating War Assets for the last year?

Mr. HOWE: While we are getting that figure, I might point out that the costs of operating War Assets Corporation include the cost of operating the Valleyfield repair depot and various costs which add to recovery costs, and which are an operating cost.

Mr. FRASER: That would be included in this?

Mr. HOWE: Yes, that would be included in this.

Mr. FRASER: They would not be included in the statement of War Assets Corporation for the year?

Mr. HOWE: I am afraid I shall have to get that information for the hon. member. Perhaps I can have it later this evening.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I would ask that the item stand until I get an answer to my question.

Mr. HOWE: I think that is a bit unreasonable. The hon. member's question has nothing to do with departmental administration. This item has nothing to do with hospitals around the country. We shall have to get that information from the people who built the hospitals; that is, from the Department of National Defence.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: If the minister's department does not have that information it is about time they found out who has it. Your department has to look after the disposal of the properties.

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Then I want these figures. It seems that some of these properties have been sold at ridiculous prices, maybe too high, maybe too low. How can we check on it if we have not the information? If the minister has not the information I do not think he has any right to come before the committee with his estimates.

Mr. HOWE: Well, I am before the committee.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: And I ask that the item stand until you get that information.

Mr. HOWE: I don't agree.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I don't care whether you agree.

Mr. HOWE: If it is necessary to divide the committee on it, we shall do so. I am willing to meet any reasonable request, but when an hon. member asks me to let an item covering departmental administration stand until I can get from another department of government the cost of certain hospitals and then find from War Assets Corporation the amounts for which they were disposed, I think the hon. gentleman is being unreasonable.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Well, you may think it is unreasonable, but when you are asking me now to approve your estimates—

Mr. HOWE: I am not asking you.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Just a minute. You may have disposed of property costing $50,000 or $100,000; according to your own figures some property cost $200,000. It may have been sold for $5,000, and then you are asking me to approve your estimates.

Mr. HOWE: I am not asking you to approve anything.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Yes, you are; and you are trying to get the people of my riding to pay $30,000 for some property, while at the same time you are selling a property that cost at least as much for only $2,500, and I do not think you have any right to have your estimates approved.

Mr. HOWE: I am asking that they be approved, nevertheless.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: And I am asking that the item stand.

Mr. FRASER: The minister will let me have that information either this evening or tomorrow morning?

Mr. HOWE: I have it now. The cost of doing business of War Assets Corporation was $45,529,102.45. That was the cost for the year 1946.

Mr. FRASER: The fiscal year?

Mr. HOWE: Yes, the fiscal year 1946-47.

Mr. FRASER: To March 31, 1947?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): That raises an interesting question, because that amount is well on to half as much as you expect to realize during the whole current year. You said you expected to realize about $100,000,000. I observe that your staff is down by only about twenty per cent, or perhaps less, and it seems to me that the cost will not be down very much.

By the way, I want to say I have been thinking over the answer the minister gave me some little time ago, about selling all these hundreds of millions of dollars worth of goods with no record at all of the cost. He certainly did not convince me as to the reasonableness of what he was saying, and I doubt if he convinced himself. He made it perfectly clear that he did have the figures available for many of these larger items; and I think he agreed that on all kinds of standard items the figures could be easily obtained. Perhaps this is not a good time at which to do it, but I am going to say now that I think that is wrong, unless there are some points about it I do not understand. Before this war assets thing is finally wound up, I believe figures should be given which will enable us to come to some judgment. Let me say at once I hope I am not going to be unreasonable. I know that articles costing perhaps $100,000 may have to be sold in some cases for one or two or three per cent of their cost, but that is not the case with all kinds of other articles. As the minister has said, some are sold for ninety per cent of their cost and others are sold for more than their cost. I believe a great deal of information should be given, so that people of this country and we who do our best to help protect their interests may have some means of coming to a decision. At the present time we are like a lot of children, with nothing at all on which to base our judgment. The only measure of efficiency we have—and it is a very small one—is the percentage of cost in the department on the actual sales; and according to the figures we now have, they are spending something like $45,000,000 to recover an amount of about $100,000,000 which does not give a very good impression of the efficiency of the department.

Mr. HOWE: That shows how misleading casual information can be.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I quite agree; that is why we want better information.

Mr. HOWE: I can give a break-down of the operating cost. Receiving, classifying and warehousing surplus, $11,398,914.66. Reconditioning clothing and other surplus goods, $2,724,965.18. My hon. friend will realize that we take scrap clothing from the army, put it through a plant,

mend it, recondition it, press it and sell it as usable goods. Perhaps that $2,000,000 would have brought about a recovery of $9,000,000 or $10,000,000. Demolition and disposal of non-salvageable surplus, which means chiefly ammunition; $2,034,965.87. That is a cost from which there was probably some recovery, because, after we take out the explosive, we sell it, and after we decontaminate the shell we sell it for junk, but that is the demolition cost. Recovery from salvageable material from ammunition and explosives, which has to do with the item I just read, $1,066,132.20. Freight and handling, $505,840.31. Lease termination and property restoration expenses, $404,238.89. Miscellaneous expenses, including agents' commissions, technical services and consulting fees, $1,774,247.57.

Then here is an item. We or War Assets took over the ship-building programme as is and where is. In other words, if a ship were three-quarters completed it was declared surplus in that condition. If it were half completed or quarter completed it was declared surplus. It was decided to complete certain ships, because the sale value completed would be very much more than the cost of completion plus the sale value in the half completed state. In that year the government spent $11,139,141.47 in completing ships. Incidentally they included three motor ships which were sold to Canadian National Steamships. Then there was an amount of $4,951,558.25 spent to complete mutual aid. Those items account for the direct operating costs, out of the total of $45,000,000 while the administrative expenses, that is the cost of doing business by the corporation, amounted to $9,528,880.05, which, on business of $220,000,000, would be about 4·35 per cent.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Still it is your whole cost that is of interest, surely. I am not necessarily criticizing that figure, because your recovery last year was very much larger. What is bothering me is that, on the face of it, I would have thought these operations which you describe, and which seem very reasonable but which cost such a lot, would not continue to be carried on to nearly the same extent, and the thing that struck me was that if one can gauge it by the number of your employees, taking that as a rough and ready basis, you will have something like eighty per cent of the cost with only about one-half the recovery.

Mr. HOWE: Our costs today are running about thirteen per cent of recovery. They were only 4·5 per cent at the same time last year.

Mr. JACKMAN: In regard to the control of the assets under the jurisdiction of the company, if you do not place a dollar value opposite the various items, or the bulk of the items, I should like to know how they are controlled. Is it physical control?

Mr. HOWE: The items are examined, listed and priced.

Mr. JACKMAN: You have no dollar value?

Mr. HOWE: Certainly we have. We have no original cost, but we put a dollar value on them.

Mr. JACKMAN: No endeavour is made to get the original cost? When War Assets Corporation receives them, they set up their value based on what they think they can realize; is that the system?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. JACKMAN: So that you have strict accounting control?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. JACKMAN: In a return to a question which I asked some months ago, I notice that the navy turned over this year up to May 6, 1947, $32,000,000 worth of goods; the army turned over $12,000,000 worth, and the R.C.A.F., $32,000,000 worth. When you got those articles that would be their cost, but apparently no endeavour is made to keep a historical record. When you get actual delivery in your warehouses you set up your own value, and then you calculate on what you realize on your sales as applied to that value which you have on your books, or to the original cost?

Mr. HOWE: We do not know the original cost. For instance, the army may turn over an encampment, and they would charge as part of its costs the cost of building roads, laying underground pipe, lease of buildings and so on. There are too many intangibles in a declaration of surplus of that kind to be of any value to us. It may be of interest to the navy that they paid a million and a quarter for a destroyer or a frigate, but it is of no interest to us. We are interested only in what we think we can get as recovery.

Mr. GREEN: As we all know, the Department of Reconstruction and Supply was set up for a limited period, to function during the the reconversion period. During this session there have been frequent instances where duties of the department have been transferred to other departments. On June 23 there was an article in the Ottawa *Citizen* to the effect that the Department of Reconstruction was being disbanded and that it would cease opera-

tions about September 1. Can the minister tell the committee whether that article is correct and, if not, just what are the intentions with regard to winding up the department? He might also tell the committee to what extent he is still exercising his overriding authority over other departments. In the setting up of this department he was given wide powers, including the right to override other ministers in certain respects. Is that right still being exercised and, if so, to what degree? Finally, will he tell the committee how many crown companies there are under his department and give us some idea of their activities?

Mr. HOWE: The Department of Reconstruction and Supply has two functions, one of which is to liquidate Canada's war commitments. That work is nearing completion. The staff of the department has dropped from about 5,000 down to 600 at the moment. The department is responsible for all government housing programmes and also for certain crown companies. There are five, perhaps six of those companies, including Polymer, Eldorado, Canadian Arsenals, Park Steamships Co. Ltd., War Assets Corporation, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and Wartime Housing Limited.

Mr. GREEN: Just the five?

Mr. HOWE: No, seven. There may be others, such as Wartime Shipbuilding, in process of being liquidated. These companies are all doing extremely well under able management.

Mr. GREEN: When is it expected to wind up the department?

Mr. HOWE: That is government policy which will be made known in due course. We do not go by what the *Citizen* says.

Mr. GREEN: What about the overriding powers?

Mr. HOWE: What clause is that?

Mr. GREEN: The minister knows very well that under the act setting up his department he was given overriding powers with respect to other departments. Are those powers being exercised, or is he now minding only his own business?

Mr. HOWE: The overriding powers exist only in the mind of the questioner. The Department of Munitions and Supply, like every other department of government, attends to its own responsibilities.

Mr. GREEN: It is not the Department of Munitions and Supply; it is the Department of Reconstruction and Supply. If I had the statute here I could read the section to the minister. If he is not exercising those powers I do not want to put any foolish ideas into his head. I had better not say anything more about the matter.

Mr. LENNARD: In 1945 I attempted to obtain the steering wheel of the corvette *Dundas* for the Dundas sea cadet corps. I wrote to the Steel Company of Canada, which I understood had purchased the vessel from War Assets, but I was informed in a letter of November 22, 1945, that the corvette *Dundas* was not in Hamilton, that it had been sold to the Sarnia steamship company at Port Colborne. I was advised to write to Captain Scott Misener, president of that company, to secure the information I desired. I wrote to him, and on December 10, 1945, I received an answer stating that when the corvette was inspected in Hamilton harbour it was found that practically every item of movable equipment aboard, even to the extent of the wheel, the ship's bells, compasses, et cetera, had been removed. Some time ago the editor of the Dundas *Star* endeavoured to secure the same article on behalf of the Lions club, and he was given more or less the same information. A couple of years afterward, on April 9, 1947, the Hamilton *Spectator* carried a picture story, showing the hon. member for Hamilton East presenting the steering wheel of H.M.C.S. *Dundas* to the Prime Minister. The information accompanying this photograph was to this effect:

> The helmsman's wheel of the doughty little corvette *Dundas* has found a resting place in high honour even as workmen in Hamilton harbour slash away the plates of the once proud fighting ship and prepare them for feeding into scrap iron furnaces. The ship's wheel, presented to Prime Minister W. L. Mackenzie King, will be hung in his summer home at Kingsmere. The presentation was made by Thomas H. Ross, member of Commons for Hamilton East. The wheel was salvaged by the International Metal Company, which is scrapping a number of corvettes for the Steel Company of Canada.

One corvette *Dundas* was scrapped in Port Colborne in the winter of 1945-46, and I wonder if the minister can inform me if there were two corvettes bearing the name *Dundas*? The information I have is quite misleading, because the original *Dundas* was scrapped by the Sarnia Steamships Limited in 1945-46. Does the minister know whether there were two ships with that name?

Mr. HOWE: I do not know.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What was the cost of the Boundary Bay airport, and what has been realized through the sale or lease?

Mr. HOWE: Boundary Bay airport has neither been sold nor leased; it was turned over to the army and is in the custody of the army at the present time.

Mr. JACKMAN: With regard to this accounting method, which I might say from what we can see from this distance does not seem to be very satisfactory, I think some record should be made of the historical cost of the various items, even to the armed services. I should like to draw the minister's attention particularly to the fact that the Department of Veterans Affairs has turned over $147,000 worth of material this year, and the Department of Public Works, $167,000. Surely those materials are not directly attributable to the war? The people of Canada are surely entitled to know what the cost of these materials was in relation to the amount realized by War Assets Corporation. Suppose we take it for granted that war assets have been turned over to the corporation and that the original cost had been lost sight of or is not on the books of War Assets Corporation. But surely in regard to war assets from other departments of the government, civil departments, the original cost should be set up on the books of War Assets Corporation. I should like an expression of opinion as to what the policy of the corporation would be in that regard.

Mr. HOWE: We are not interested in the original cost.

Mr. JACKMAN: We are.

Mr. HOWE: The place to get that is from the person who bought it. My hon. friend mentioned $147,000. The material for public works was what had been worn out in the service of the department. That cost $167,000 when new. For instance, we sell typewriters, and some of them are sold as junk and others are usable for their spare parts.

Mr. JACKMAN: You have a good explanation if they were junk. What was the original cost? We are entitled to know that.

Mr. HOWE: The president of War Assets told me that there are life rafts which have been declared surplus, and they have had to be pulled up from the bottom of lakes. It might be interesting to someone to know what they cost.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): The minister speaks of recovery. Would that be net or gross recovery?

Mr. HOWE: Gross recovery.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Where does War Assets get its money to operate?

Mr. HOWE: Its income is derived from a certain portion of its sales. Originally it was three per cent, more recently five per cent, and now it has been raised to ten per cent.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): If it gets its income from a portion of its sales, that cannot be the gross recovery which the minister mentioned. Who gets that $400,000,000?

Mr. HOWE: The Receiver General.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Where does that $45,000,000 come from?

Mr. HOWE: It is taken out before we turn the money over to the Receiver General. The first deduction is the actual operating expense, the cost of getting the article in a saleable condition. The cost of Valleyfield comes out and also the cost of warehousing. After these deductions, which are out-of-pocket expenses in creating the value, there is a deduction of an amount fixed by order in council to cover the administration costs of War Assets Corporation. That is deducted and the remainder turned over to the Receiver General as net recoverable income.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Then the Receiver General does not get the $400,000,000?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Then where does its expenses come from if the treasury gets the whole $400,000,000? What is the net amount of recovery, and what is the gross amount?

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend will find all that in the annual report of War Assets Corporation. We have not the figures here. We could give the figures for one year.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Give us the figures for one year.

Mr. HOWE: The total gross for the period 1944 to March, 1947 was $353,200,032.12, and the return to the treasury was $294,842,488.82.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): What were the gross sales?

Mr. HOWE: The gross sales were $353,200,-032.12.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Now what was the net amount?

Mr. HOWE: The net amount was $294,842,-488.82.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): For what period?

Mr. HOWE: From the beginning of operations to March 31, 1947.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): From the beginning of operations?

Mr. HOWE: Up to March 31, 1947.

Mr. FRASER: Canadair was taken over by Electric Boat Company. Has the department anything to do with that company now? I understand that they are discharging Canadian technicians and engineers and taking on men from the United States.

Mr. HOWE: It has nothing to do with my department.

Mr. GREEN: Is this the last year that anything will be required to provide for liquidation of contracts?

Mr. HOWE: This will be the last. Amounts have been provided over the years and there have been considerable balances unexpended. The time element in settling contracts has been greater than anticipated. We are asking a further amount now which will cover the final liquidation of all contracts.

Mr. GREEN: This will clean it all up?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

570. Reconstruction projects, subject to allocation by the Treasury Board, $5,000,000.

Mr. MacNICOL: We voted $10,000,000 under this item last year, and the information given at that time was that it would be used partially, if not all of it, in connection with western programmes. Would the minister say what amount of the $10,000,000 was spent and on what programmes?

Mr. HOWE: Very little of the $10,000,000 was spent. The purpose of the vote is to take care of spotty unemployment. It was anticipated by hon. members opposite—I think I was the only optimist in the house—that there would be considerable unemployment following the war, and the purpose of the $10,000,000 vote was to permit projects to be undertaken to relieve spotty unemployment. Out of the $10,000,000, less than $500,000 was spent. This year it is thought wise to continue the vote, but it has been reduced to $5,0000,000, and it is not anticipated that any considerable amount of that will be spent. It is handled as a revolving fund. If a department draws on it to start a project not provided for in the estimates the department must put an item in the estimates and refund the money when it is voted.

Mr. MacNICOL: Over $500,000 has been spent. What was it spent on?

Mr. HOWE: Small items. The money was refunded. The $10 million was intact at the end of the year. The majority of the items for which money was spent were later voted in the estimates of the department and refunded. I can give my hon. friend what the amounts were. An allotment of $25,000 was provided for an aircraft landing strip at Pentecote, P.Q.; landing facilities at Baie Comeau, P.Q.; $25,000; landing facilities at Forestville, P.Q., $25,000; Pickle lake airfield, $5,000; Red Deer river diversion project, surveys, $115,000; South Saskatchewan river project, surveys, $137,000; telephone line, Whitefish Falls to Killarney, $9,000; wharf extension, Manitoulin island, $23,000; fisheries research board, research re fish oils, $12,500; Louisburg wharf, construction, $210,000; Giant Yellowknife road, Northwest Territories, $18,500; Diamond Drill exploration in bituminous deposits of northern Alberta, $50,000; Bank erosion survey, Squamish river, Vancouver, $2,000; road, Jakes Corner to Atlin, B.C., $15,000; Snare river power development, Yellowknife district, $200,000. These are the allotments. There were recoveries of $540,000. The actual expenditure of that vote was $269,226.09.

Mr. MacNICOL: I have some questions with reference to what the minister has just said. First, as I remember it, last year we were told that part of this $10 million was to be used in connection with the Red Deer river which he has just mentioned, and perhaps the Bow river. I see that $115,000 has been spent in drilling for the foundation of a dam on the Red Deer river. I hold in my hand a core of one of the drills. This drill core was taken from the bottom of the Red Deer river. Has nothing further happened? This drill core gives pretty good evidence of a base for a dam.

Mr. HOWE: Reports were filed here on both of these projects.

Mr. MacNICOL: Nothing has gone on except this $115,000?

Mr. HOWE: No real construction, no.

Mr. MacNICOL: Has anything been done on the Bow river project?

Mr. HOWE: No planning has been done. A report has been filed here within the last few days.

Mr. MacNICOL: That is all that has been done?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: In connection with the $5 million, has the minister any idea of a further plan for that?

Mr. HOWE: It is an emergency allocation.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is any of it being used for the drilling that is now going on in the strait of Canso preparatory to building a bridge?

[Mr. Howe.]

Mr. HOWE: I think the Department of Transport has a special appropriation for that.

Mr. MacNICOL: The minister mentioned $200,000 that was spent last year out of this item. Last year the item was in connection with the Snare river project, which is a hundred miles northwest of Yellowknife, which we have either voted or will be voting, I have forgotten which.

Mr. HOWE: It has been voted in mines and resources estimates.

Mr. MacNICOL: Will part of it come out of this?

Mr. HOWE: No. We have made an initial appropriation to get the work underway, it was a sudden requirement.

Mr. MacNICOL: Nothing for Snare river comes out of this?

Mr. HOWE: The money was paid this year. The money advanced by the department has been refunded.

Mr. MacNICOL: When the Department of Agriculture estimates were before the committee a number of hon. members, including myself, were inquiring about the programme in connection with the extension of the Bow river irrigation project which is very necessary. I observed the other day that when the Minister of Agriculture was at Lethbridge addressing the inaugural meeting of the Western Canada Reclamation Association, to which I was invited, he announced that sums of money were to be allotted to permit them to go right ahead.

Mr. HOWE: No, he did not say that. He announced that the report had been filed in this parliament for a $20 million or $40 million programme or something of that sort. If my hon. friend will read the report which is a study of the engineers, he will get all the information there. I know nothing about it—

Mr. MacNICOL: You are not familiar with it?

Mr. HOWE: I am not.

Mr. MacNICOL: He told the house a short time ago that part of this $5 million would be used for the Red Deer, the Bow river and the Medicine Hat irrigation projects. Does the minister know if any will be used for this purpose? I am all for it.

Mr. HOWE: I am willing to argue the matter.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am in agreement with these funds being voted. The minister has no information as to any programme for which the money is to be used?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: At this time I should like to bring to the attention of the minister an idea that I think should come under this item. The Department of Mines and Resources is carrying on an aerial survey this year of the Groundhog coal fields at the headwaters of the Skeena. Next year the department intends to put in a ground survey crew to see what there is up in these fields. They are just 150 miles from the coast, and, as the minister knows, we are getting short of coal on the coast. I should like to see some of this money go into that survey, so that we can speed it up, which the minister can do as he has done during the war. I should like to see a concentration of effort in that field, so that we would know what we have there and can speedily develop it. I bring it to the attention of the minister possibly because it will be relevant in the immediate future.

Mr. MacNICOL: In connection with what the hon. member for Skeena has just said, within the last two months I have tried to arrange with the folks up in that country as to whether I could get up to the Groundhog coal fields or not. My information is that there is no passable road. If my hon. friend would ask for the construction of a road into that area I would say that it would be money well spent.

Mr. POULIOT: I understand that we are on item 570. The discussion has been business-like tonight; hon. members have asked important questions, and the minister has answered them well. I want to give him a breathing spell. I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that it is no mean job to be the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply at the present time, and the minister deserves special congratulation upon the effort that he is making in handling a most difficult job, a job that is more difficult to handle than anything else. I am surprised that I have to rise at this late hour to tell him my appreciation, which I hope is shared by many others. I do not always agree with the minister, but I am in full sympathy with him and I appreciate all the constructive criticism which comes from both sides of the house. But it seems to me that the minister is deserving of a special tribute for his efforts to improve reconstruction in this country. There are many obstacles in the way,

but I hope that he will be able to overcome them in the very near future with the support and cooperation of all.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—

571. Housing development, including commitments of previous years—to provide for payments of amounts owing under guarantees pursuant to item 60 of schedule A to the Appropriation Act, No. 6, 1946 (and pursuant to corresponding items in previous Appropriation Acts) to approved lending institutions in respect of loans made for the purpose of financing the conversion of existing houses into multiple family houses, such payments to be made out of unappropriated moneys in the consolidated revenue fund, $250,000.

Mr. FLEMING: This item is preceded by the general description: "housing development, including commitments of previous years", and then follow about half a dozen items bearing on different housing expenditures. I want to take up a remark made by the minister in the debate last Saturday morning, July 12, on his estimates, which will be found on page 5517 of *Hansard*, and which contains an amazing statement. The minister said:

> The government takes no responsibility for solving the entire housing problem for this country. It is perfectly ridiculous to suggest that it is government responsibility. Every city has its own housing responsibility as has every province. The government is responsible for the returned men and its responsibility stops at that point.

The statement with which I take issue, is the concluding one: "the government is responsible for the returned men." Yes, of course, we are all agreed on that; but the minister proceeds to say:

> And its responsibility—

That is the responsibility of the government with respect to housing.

> —stops at that point.

I take complete issue with that statement. In the first place, I point out that it runs counter to the legislative action taken by parliament ever since 1935. Long before there was a war; long before there was a problem of housing in connection with returned men; long before that was even thought of, parliament had taken action recognizing a federal responsibility with respect to housing conditions in Canada. That recognition was given in the clearest terms in the National Housing Act of 1944. If the position the minister now takes is a valid one, then the government of which he was a member in 1944 had no business bringing in a national housing act. On his own reasoning, they had no business bringing in that act, and I am sure that neither he nor any other member opposite will argue in support of that position.

In the second place, the position now taken by the minister is an absolute disavowal of the promises made by this government in 1945 in the general election campaign of that year, when they sought re-election. There was not the slightest suggestion in those days about fobbing off the responsibility for housing conditions in Canada on the local or provincial authorities. The government was lavish with its promises looking toward the correcting and curing of housing conditions in Canada, which were then presenting a problem in its incipient stages, which problem has grown to great proportions since. The present Minister of Justice (Mr. Ilsley) in that campaign came to Toronto and talked freely about all the houses that would be built within the twelve months after V-E day.

Mr. ILSLEY: And they were built.

Mr. FLEMING: The propaganda machine of the government was glib in talking about the 600,000 houses that would be built.

Mr. ILSLEY: I said that 50,000 houses would be built and they were built.

Mr. FLEMING: The minister has no business interrupting with that remark. My statement is correct. If he wants to speak he can do so afterwards. Let him follow the rules and not interject remarks of that kind.

An hon. MEMBER: Stick to the facts.

Mr. FLEMING: I was speaking about the promises the government made. The present Minister of Justice made the promise that 50,000 houses would be built in the first twelve months after V-E day.

Mr. ILSLEY: And it was done.

Mr. FLEMING: There was no talk then about the government having a limited responsibility with respect to housing conditions. The Minister of National Health and Welfare talked in glowing terms about the drive for tanks becoming the drive for houses; and there was no limitation of responsibility there, no talk about this being a local or provincial responsibility. There was glowing talk; there were glowing promises, about the construction of from 600,000 to 1,000,000 houses by the government. There was no talk then about these limitations in respect of the housing responsibility of the federal government; no talk of that responsibility being confined to the housing of veterans. It was on these promises that the government got itself elected in 1945. If it had offered the kind of statement the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply

made here last Saturday morning they would not be occupying the treasury benches here at the present time.

Mr. HOWE: No man talks so carelessly or inaccurately about housing as the hon. gentleman now on his feet, or so constantly.

Mr. FLEMING: There is another example of the way in which the Minister of Reconstruction rides roughshod over the rules of the house. He did not get up to ask a question but to make a statement which he cannot justify. He does not like to have me remind him about the promises the government made, and I say that his statement last Saturday represented a complete reversal of the promises on which this government got itself elected in 1945.

Mr. WARREN: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. FLEMING: No, you cannot. I am sorry. I had enough of the hon. gentleman's interruptions recently in the public accounts committee. They were so utterly senseless that I will not waste my time on similar interruptions now. Time is too precious at this juncture of the session.

Mr. WARREN: It is a fair question—

Mr. FLEMING: The government talks freely about what it claims to have accomplished, but about ninety per cent of it has been accomplished by private enterprise. The government takes full credit for it; but there is no suggestion, when my hon. friends are making these glowing claims in regard to performance, about the responsibility being divided or the credit being divided with the provincial and local governments. When it comes to claiming credit the federal government claims the full credit. If they claim the credit, they will have to take the responsibility that goes with it.

Not only that, but there is a fourth factor in the situation and it is this. This government, hanging on to power it grasped under the national emergency legislation, is the one government that has been possessed of all the powers that were necessary to enable it to cope with the housing crisis in Canada.

Mr. WARREN: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. FLEMING: Can you keep the hon. gentleman quiet, Mr. Chairman? If he cannot possess his soul in patience, deal with him as he ought to be dealt with.

An hon. MEMBER: Don't be so offensive.

Mr. FLEMING: To continue, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MITCHELL: If wind could build houses you would build lots of them.

Mr. FLEMING: I did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. MITCHELL: If wind could build houses you would build lots of them.

Mr. FLEMING: Anyone can make remarks of that kind, and I do not know anyone who has befuddled the question of the government's relationship to federal responsibility more than the Minister of Labour. I well remember when his department possessed all the powers that any department of labour could possess or could ask for, he was trying to excuse the failure of this government to take action and get down to brass tacks in the Ford Windsor strike a year and a half ago, by saying, "It is not our responsibility; it is the responsibility of the provinces." When this government had taken all powers from the provinces under the guise of national emergency, that was the excuse of the minister. We will not waste more time on the Minister of Labour.

On these four grounds, Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that what the Minister of Reconstruction is saying does not fit the facts, but is a complete reversal of government promises, and the position he is now taking represents a callous turning of the government's back on the responsibility which is properly that of the federal administration.

When we come to individual items I shall have more questions to ask. I want to ask some questions particularly about the item with regard to Wartime Housing Limited, but the minister has taken his departure.

Mr. McILRAITH: No, he has not. Don't put that on *Hansard*.

Mr. FLEMING: Out of all this welter of promises, in view of the confusion that exists in its various schemes, I say that it is time the government got down to brass tacks and told the committee exactly what the situation is. The last time we had a debate on housing I asked the minister to state what the immediate housing emergency shortage is in Canada to date. On July 22 of last year he made a statement in which he admitted—it was an amazing confession—that, in spite of the glowingly optimistic assertions he had made only a few months before, the emergency shortage of housing units on March 31, 1946, was 150,000, and that even if Canada built 60,000 houses in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1947, the shortage would rise to 180,000, increasing by twenty per cent, by March 31, 1947.

Mr. HOWE: Where did you get that?

Mr. FLEMING: It is in *Hansard.*

Mr. HOWE: Can you quote it?

Mr. FLEMING: The statement was made on July 22. The minister said that the immediate emergency shortage—not thinking in terms of eliminating substandard houses, but the immediate emergency shortage of houses in Canada on March 31, 1946—was 150,000 housing units, and even if Canada built 60,000 in the next ensuing fiscal year that shortage would have increased by March 31, 1947 to 180,000. The committee is looking for information. Will the minister give a report on what that emergency shortage is today, measured in the same terms?

An hon. MEMBER: You left out individual enterprise.

Mr. FLEMING: I now want to deal with one other question while I am speaking about this welter of confusion. It is not very many months ago that we had to complain about the direction of housing affairs in this government being distributed among three ministers. There was a sort of three-ring circus going on, the different ministers competing with one another. The government then made a show of concentrating responsibility in one minister. But it appears that recently, through the agency of Canadian Commercial Corporation, another government department has undertaken a housing or conversion programme involving, as the Minister of National Defence told us, hundreds of units. I think the committee would like to know if there is some attempt at coordination between that programme and the various programmes which the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply is supposed to be directing. I shall have something further to ask on the individual items.

Mr. TIMMINS: I was very much interested in the remarks made last Saturday by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard, and also to read the remarks which were made by the Minister of Reconstruction in which he, for the first time, intimated to the house that the responsibility of the government in respect of housing apparently has to do only with veterans. I intend to direct my few remarks tonight to the question of houses for veterans because, after all, the government now says definitely that this is its only responsibility with respect to housing.

We have pointed out to the minister from time to time that it was up to him to decide for us in Canada what was essential and what was non-essential building; because, after all, even the minister himself and the members of his department have had to admit that building in Canada has for the most part gone over to industrial and commercial construction and not to housing proper. I am reading from a press quotation of the minister's statement given on March 14, 1947, when he was answering some objections which had been made by the Canadian Congress of Labour, and this is what he had to say:

Mr. Howe declared the government could not afford not to capitalize on the present enthusiasm in industry for expansion. The objective at the moment was to keep both industrial and housing construction going at the same time. If 1947 intentions were carried out it would mean fifty per cent more building in Canada than in 1946. However, government efforts had only succeeded in stepping up production of materials by thirty per cent.

I am pointing out that even as far back as March 14 the minister knew that industrial construction was getting the better of housing construction and that, as a matter of fact, we were running into a situation where housing in 1947 was lagging far behind the requirements of the country. I also want to quote from a publication of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, which is known as "Housing in Canada". It came out about July 3, and this is what it states, according to a press clipping:

The publication estimated 7,508 "starts" had been made on houses between January 1 and April 30 in cities and municipalities with populations of more than 5,000.

I am pointing out to the committee and to the government that, as a matter of fact, 7,508 starts in houses is no start at all in this country. Further we read:

Although comparable data was not available for 1946, some indication of the relative position was given in the series of residential contracts awarded. These totalled $34,600,000 in the first quarter of 1947 as against $50,600,000 in January to April, 1946.

All of that indicates that housing is falling far behind. One has only to pick up a building journal, such as *Building in Canada* to see the kind of building which is being gone ahead with this year in place of houses. Looking at *Daily Commercial News,* as of July 9, we find a contract for a biscuit factory in Montreal, $85,000; for a flour storage plant in Toronto, $155,000; for a concrete bridge in the province of Quebec, $300,000. On July 8 we find a contract for a block of stores. On July 7 we find a contract for a telephone exchange, $82,500. On July 4 we find a contract for a civic centre and skating arena costing $300,000. All I am saying in quoting these figures is that, as a matter of fact, the minister has some responsibility in conduiting house construction in Canada, if his statement of July 12 means anything, in which he says that the government is responsible for housing for the returned men and its responsibility stops at that point.

We recognize that we owe a responsibility to the veterans. I do not intend to go into the figures again, but in 1946 the government directly or indirectly affected only 11,652 housing units in Canada. That is all the government's programme had anything to do with. We know that Integrated Housing is having a difficult time to get going, and not many houses are being put up by Integrated Housing this year. The Veterans Land Act will fall far behind last year. Housing Enterprises Limited is closing up in almost all the centres in Canada in which it was under way a short time ago. Wartime Housing Limited is apparently trying to make some progress in various parts of Canada, judging by the advertisements for tenders we see in the papers from day to day. As a matter of fact, if I am correct in this, no further contracts are being taken by Wartime Housing Limited after July 1, 1947. The minister has said repeatedly that these agencies are for the veteran, first and foremost; that the veteran gets the preference with respect to these various housing projects. But the fact of the matter is that there is not any progress being made sufficient to take care of the demands and needs of the veteran in Canada. I am saying that is where we stand today. On this very day we have in Canada no actual housing programme for the veteran. We have never had a veterans housing scheme. These four agencies which we have discussed are simply matters of procedure, matters of priority in building materials and so on which the government have attempted to make work but which have bogged down. It is only a few days ago that the minister said in this house that he had not closed the door on public subsidized housing. I am not suggesting for a moment that the government go into public subsidized housing; far from it. But I think some other project must be brought into existence at this time if the veteran is to get his deserts.

I do not intend to spend my time in criticizing. If the government does not have a plan I am going to suggest one. Of course the government does not have to accept my plan, but it is better than anything I have heard of up to this time. We will start off with this. 1. The amendment made to the National Housing Act a few weeks ago was, in my judgment, a good amendment. It provided for the development of land for building subdivisions; and it seems to me that when they get this plan going—and by the way it should be going now—the first commitments in respect to the land should be for the veterans. I can think of no better way for a veteran to get going than on land such as would be included in one of these developments.

The second point is that the integrated housing plan has a good number of splendid features to it, but I am sure the minister knows even better than I, that the number of builders who are working under that plan is far too small and that it is headed for extinction, probably before this year is out, unless some impetus is given to it. I am suggesting this as the second factor which can be considered in respect of a proper veterans housing scheme. The integrated housing plan can be worked in with these other factors I am mentioning, in order to bring about a well-rounded housing policy for the veterans.

3. I also believe that in regard to these houses for veterans the N.H.A. loans should be greater and on easier terms than anything developed by the department up to the present time. I am quite well aware that, under the National Housing Act, loans of up to ninety-five per cent on the first $3,000, eighty-five per cent on the second $3,000 and so on are available. I said in the house the other day that I did not think any housing projects in Canada were being held up by reason of mortgage finances. That was my conviction in the matter, but I find that to some extent I am wrong. Some of the builders operating under the integrated plan have come to see me since that time, and have told me that for the most part they find themselves blocked because they cannot get the sort of loans which, having regard to the cash payments which can be made by the purchasers, would put them in a position to carry on this kind of housing construction.

An hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. TIMMINS: No, it is not carried. This is a more serious matter than my hon. friend apparently thinks. This is a matter that really goes to the root of the promises which have been made by this government to the veterans. I am saying to the minister that we have not had a veterans housing plan in Canada, and in my small way I am trying to do what I can to give the government a little impetus in this direction.

Mr. WARREN: Who built the 3,000 houses?

Mr. TIMMINS: I am not talking about 3,000 houses; I am talking about 200,000 houses for veterans. I say there are 200,000 veterans in Canada who have never had a decent place to live since coming back from overseas. They are living in somebody's attic; or I have seen four of them living in one

room, sleeping in the kitchen at that. I am suggesting that it is about time something was done in this matter.

4. As far as these houses are concerned, it is my opinion that they should be built by private enterprise; in other words, by private builders. It seems an odd thing that in a city like Toronto there should be only from nine to twelve builders working under the integrated housing plan when, as a matter of fact, there are some 450 builders in that city who could be doing this work if they were given the job and shown how to get on with it. The fact of the matter is that private builders are having such a difficult time, by reason of lack of materials and the competition in obtaining material, with commercial construction, that they cannot go into the integrated plan, nor can they go into any plan for the benefit of the veterans because of the obstacles placed in their way.

5. I am suggesting an absolute building material priority should be given to the veteran who, through his contractor, is building himself a home in one of these developments.

6. And with respect to these houses, let us not build just 1,000 or 2,000; let us build 200,000. Let us put them up by mass production, because I am perfectly satisfied that the veteran would rather have a house meeting his minimum requirements, in which to get himself settled, leaving to the future and to his own devices such matters as the finishing of the attic or the construction of an addition. I have seen a good many first-class low-cost houses in which the attics were left unfinished, where the cost was thereby cut down. I believe that, in the interests of the veteran, a plan should be commenced under which his minimum requirements would be looked after first, leaving these other things to follow.

7. Now, how are we to get the private builder to build under a plan which combines all these various factors? Dollars and cents do not mean very much to him, because, as a matter of fact, the profit on a low-cost house is small, but the difficulties in the way of building are so great that he is stopped almost before he starts. If it is possible to give to the manufacturer of nails or the manufacturer of soil pipe an incentive bonus to bring about greater production, so in the same way it should be possible to give some incentive bonus to the builder, so that he may build under this plan and so that it may be made attractive for him.

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Chairman, it is practically eleven o'clock and there is a message from the senate to be read, so I wonder if we could report progress.

Mr. FLEMING: The minister asked me to give the committee the source of his remarks to which I referred a moment ago. I refer hon. members to *Hansard* for July 22, 1946, at page 3672. At that time the minister said:

As at March, 1946, our minimum immediate housing needs were estimated at 150,000 housing units.

Then he went on to talk about the family formation rate, and so on, and then had this to say:

From these new requirements over the next year, we can subtract some 50,000-60,000 units completed during the year ending March, 1947. I believe that these figures and estimates, though approximate, are valid and that we can anticipate by spring, 1947, an immediate housing deficit of some 180,000 units, or a worsening of the situation by some twenty per cent.

If the minister would keep track of what he says he would not have so many contradictions in the statements he makes.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall this item carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

The house met at eleven o'clock.

(Translation):

PRIVILEGE—MR. HAMEL

REQUEST FOR A CORRECTION IN THE "VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS", IN CONNECTION WITH THE THIRD READING OF A BILL

Mr. J. IRENEE HAMEL (St. Maurice-Lafleche): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On Friday, July 11, Bill No. 411 authorizing the government to enter into agreements with the various provinces, had its third reading.

The *Votes and Proceedings* of the house for that date do not mention that the said bill was read the third time and passed "on division".

On that occasion I voiced my disagreement, as reference to page 5436 of *Hansard* will show.

Therefore, the *Votes and Proceedings* should be corrected so as to indicate my disagreement, and in fairness to those hon. members who did not support the third reading.

PRIVILEGE—MR. POULIOT

CORRECTION OF A REPORT IN THE JULY 11 ISSUE OF "LE SOLEIL"

Mr. JEAN FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, in the first column, on the front page of the July 11 issue of *Le Soleil,* I am quoted as having made the following statement:

Mr. Pouliot said that the whole problem boiled down to a struggle between taxpayers, and he pointed out that there were more dominion than provincial taxpayers.

I never made such a statement. What I said was that the problem boiled down to a struggle between taxpayers and bureaucrats and I pointed out that the bureaucrats were more numerous in the dominion than in the provincial field. I hope *Le Soleil* will make the necessary correction.

(Text):

CRIMINAL CODE

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN AMENDMENTS AGREED TO IN FREE CONFERENCE WITH SENATE

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I wish to renew the motion I made last night, and which was allowed to stand, that the house agree to the amendments to the criminal code agreed upon in the free conference of the managers of the Senate and the managers of the House of Commons.

Mr. BRACKEN: Would the minister make clear the substance of the agreement arrived at in order that the house may understand what we are asked to do?

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is very complicated. Last night I presented the report. The conference dealt with two amendments to the criminal code. One was an amendment to the nuisance sections of the code, and the difference of opinion turned upon the definition of what should be regarded as a public place. The other amendment had to do with a homicide which is brought about by the use of a weapon which is carried by one of the persons responsible for the homicide. It would take quite a while to enter into the fine points, and it took the conference a long time to hammer it out. The reason the motion was allowed to stand last night was that hon. members might have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with these fine points.

Mr. FRASER: Yesterday's *Hansard* is not out yet. We could have done that if we had had *Hansard.*

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the house and to the minister that this matter be allowed to stand until we reach the orders of the day.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

EXTENSION OF AWARD OF CANADIAN GENERAL SERVICE BADGE

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief announcement in connection with the award of the Canadian general service badge. Up to the present, the award of this badge has been limited to men and women who served during the war in the armed forces of Canada. Provision was not made for the award of the badge to Canadians who served in the armed forces of Great Britain or any of the other dominions or other allied governments. In Great Britain no service badge was awarded and a number of Canadians who served in the British forces were not entitled to wear any badge. This applied particularly to a very large number of Canadians, about 4,000 in all who joined the Royal Air Force before and during the war. To meet these cases, it has been decided to extend the award of this badge to Canadians who served in the armed forces of any of the nations of the British commonwealth or allied countries.

Application by those who are entitled to the badge should be made to the director of records, Department of Veterans Affairs, No. 8 Temporary Building, Ottawa, who, after verifying eligibility, will transfer the applications to the Department of National Defence for issue of the badge.

TRANSFER OF SERVICE PERSONNEL RECORDS TO VETERANS AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, on March 21, a question was asked in the house as to the transfer of personal records of former members of the armed forces from the Department of National Defence to the Department of Veterans Affairs. The question was partly answered by my colleague the right hon. Minister of Veterans Affairs on March 25, when plans were already under way for this transfer. I am glad to say that those plans are being carried out so that the records of all

service personnel will be transferred to the Department of Veterans Affairs as part of the government's policy of having everything to do with veterans dealt with by a single department.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

WHEAT—DELIVERY QUOTA—SETTING OF ACREAGE FOR PRODUCTION

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. Has the governor in council or any minister the power to set an acreage for wheat production from which the wheat board will be authorized to accept deliveries of wheat regardless of what that delivery quota may be?

2. If so, under what statute or order in council or regulation?

3. How much wheat has been sold each week during the past six weeks to class I countries other than Great Britain, giving particulars of the countries and the amounts sold to each and the price per bushel in each case?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. The governor in council has not, nor has any minister, the power to control the production of wheat either by setting an acreage for production, or otherwise.

Under the Canadian Wheat Board Act, the Canadian wheat board is empowered to fix from time to time quotas of each kind of grain that may be delivered by producers to elevators or railway cars within any period or periods either generally or in specified areas, or at specified delivery points, or otherwise.

"Quota" is defined in the said act as "the quantity of grain authorized to be delivered from the grain produced on land described in the permit book as fixed from time to time by the board, whether expressed as a quantity that may be delivered from a specified number of acres, or otherwise."

2. Answered by (1).

3. If by class I countries are meant countries receiving wheat at the price of $1.55 per bushel, basis No. 1 Northern, in store Fort William Port Arthur, Vancouver or Churchill, the answer is that no country other than Great Britain receives wheat at this price.

STANDARD PROFITS CLAIMS—BOARD OF REFEREES

Mr. GREEN:

1. How many standard profits claims are now on file and not yet dealt with?

2. Of these, how many are ready for submission to the board of referees?

3. How many claims have been filed through each district office since January 1, 1947?

4. How many claims have been submitted to the board of referees from each district office since January 1, 1947?

5. How many awards have been made by the board of referees since January 1, 1947 (showing the number in each district office)?

Mr. McCANN:

1. 1,830 standard profits claims are now on file and not yet dealt with by the board of referees.

2. Of the above claims 310 have been prepared for consideration by the board.

3. District office:

Charlottetown	0
Halifax	22
Saint John	4
Quebec	12
Montreal	260
Ottawa	23
Kingston	1
Belleville	7
Toronto	118
Hamilton	50
London	56
Fort William	3
Winnipeg	38
Regina	15
Saskatoon	3
Calgary	35
Edmonton	15
Vancouver	111
Dawson	0
Total	773

4. District office:

Charlottetown	6
Halifax	13
Saint John	10
Quebec	18
Montreal	150
Ottawa	26
Kingston	2
Belleville	5
Toronto	154
Hamilton	31
London	35
Fort William	4
Winnipeg	34
Regina	14
Saskatoon	1
Calgary	21
Edmonton	20
Vancouver	36
Dawson	0
Total	580

5. District office:

Charlottetown	7
Halifax	16
Saint John	9
Quebec	13
Montreal	130
Ottawa	26
Kingston	0
Belleville	2
Toronto	185
Hamilton	40
London	40
Fort William	2
Winnipeg	30
Regina	13
Saskatoon	4
Calgary	17
Edmonton	18
Vancouver	38
Dawson	0
Total	590

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

CIVIL SERVICE—FACTORS DETERMINING QUALIFICATIONS OF APPLICANTS FOR POSITIONS

Mr. HAMEL:

1. What factors are considered by the civil service commission in determining the ability of applicants for a position in the civil service?

2. Is an applicant who claims to be wronged by such rating, allowed to appeal therefrom?

3. If so, what is the procedure to be followed?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Return tabled.

IMMIGRATION

INQUIRY AS TO CONSULTATION WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—GUARANTEES OF FULL EMPLOYMENT, ETC.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): May I direct a question to the Acting Minister of Immigration. A cable from a friend in London received late yesterday indicates that large numbers of applicants are queuing daily in front of Ontario House seeking early admission to Canada. I wish to inquire whether or not the federal government has been consulted by the Ontario government about these immigration activities, and if so, what guarantees of full employment and responsibility for such immigrants have been assumed by the government of Ontario or by the government of Canada.

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Acting Minister of Mines and Resources): The federal government was not consulted about this project. After arrangements had been announced the minister of planning, Mr. Porter, called on me and told me of something about the project. Later I received literature put out by Ontario House in London. The project simply consists of providing aeroplanes and arranging for the sale of tickets through a private agency on aeroplanes, tickets being available to those recommended by Ontario House. The literature states specifically that there is no promise of employment and no promise of housing, but that the good offices of the government of Ontario will be available in both directions.

The serious aspect of the project to the federal government is that the arrangements for transportation break across our treaty arrangements with the international civil aviation authority and also those of air transport authority. I was obliged to point that out to Mr. Porter. The problem extends far beyond the Canadian difficulty, but that is a matter on which we have not been formally asked to act on.

Mr. COLDWELL: In the telegram I have been asked to cable a reply to this particular person in London. No responsibility has been assumed by the federal government?

Mr. HOWE: None by the federal government. The federal government has not been formally consulted or asked to take any part whatever in the movement.

Mr. GREEN: May I ask a supplementary question? Quite apart from the transportation problem, is there any objection to a provincial government entering upon an immigration plan of this type? I ask the question because there has been some suggestion about British Columbia taking the same action.

Mr. HOWE: There is no difficulty whatever about immigrants from the United Kingdom entering Canada, provided they are of good character and good health and have sufficient funds to tide them over the period of becoming established. Any province or any agency is quite welcome to sponsor plans for bringing out that type of immigrant. The function of the federal government in that regard would simply be to provide facilities for the examination.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Is it not a fact that the minister promised the Minister of Planning and Development of the Ontario government full cooperation?

Mr. HOWE: That is correct, except that I pointed out to him immediately that a United States plane carrying immigrants from the United Kingdom to Canada could not be per-

mitted to land in Canada. I think it will also develop that a United States plane carrying immigrants from the United Kingdom to Canada will not be permitted to handle traffic in the United Kingdom.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): May I ask if it is perfectly all right for United States planes to carry passengers from Britain to Buffalo?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member will admit that I cannot permit a debate on the question. I permitted the hon. member to ask a supplementary question, and I think that should be sufficient.

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): May I direct a question to the acting minister of immigration? He said a moment ago that persons coming from Great Britain would require sufficient money to tide them over the period of establishment in order to be admitted into Canada. Is it not true that the immigration authorities also demand from Britishers the assurance that housing will be here for them when they arrive? I ask that question because a number have been refused admittance until they have had that assurance.

Mr. HOWE: That suggestion is new to me. I have never known of a case. My hon. friend says he knows positively that people have been refused as immigrants because there is no housing. Perhaps he can give me the correspondence on the point. If he does I shall be glad to look into the situation, since I know of no such prohibition.

Mr. FRASER: The acting director of immigration so informed me the other day, and there are also letters from England and persons in Canada.

NEWFOUNDLAND

DELEGATION TO CANADA—INQUIRY AS TO PROGRESS OF DISCUSSIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that Newfoundland delegates have been here for some time, and that we are hoping this will be the last day of the session, I should like to ask the minister if he is in a position to give us a progress report with respect to the discussions as to the future relations of Newfoundland and Canada. I have not given the minister any notice of this question. I should be satisfied to have him delay his answer until later on in the day, but I think that before we leave some statement should be made.

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I do not think that I would be in any better position later in the day than I am at this moment to answer the question. There have been several meetings with the delegation from Newfoundland, and at the last general meeting of their delegation with our representatives several subcommittees were established to consider various aspects of the problems being explored.

All I can say is that on both sides there is evidence of the sincerest desire to get at all such facts as it would be important for the citizens of the two countries to consider in drawing their conclusions as to whether at this time it is possible to find a basis of closer union that would be of mutual advantage to the two countries. There is the sincerest desire on both sides to smooth out all suggestions of what at first might appear to be difficulties standing in the way. The matter has not progressed to a stage where anything definite can be stated about it, but it is further advanced than it was when this delegation came here, and the advance has been in the right direction. There are still very cordial and hopeful efforts being made on all sides to arrive at something that would appeal to the citizens of both countries.

Mr. BRACKEN: I am sure the house, and the public as well, will welcome the statement of progress by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. If I may be permitted to make one observation, I would say that it is the sincere view of every hon. member that the government will meet with a very great measure of success in its discussions with the Newfoundland delegates.

TRADE AND COMMERCE

INQUIRY AS TO MARKETING OF NEWSPRINT IN GREAT BRITAIN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. What is the present position with respect to the marketing of newsprint in Britain? It has been reported that in view of her difficulties Britain has found it necessary to curtail the imports of newsprint, one of our largest exports. I have not given the minister notice

of this question. If he wishes to delay the answer until later on it will be quite satisfactory to me.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I answered a similar question in the house within the last few days. The situation is that the United Kingdom has dollar difficulties and is looking about for ways to conserve her expenditure of American and Canadian dollars. Newsprint is one of the matters that had been under discussion and there has been correspondence as well as discussion, I believe, between the United Kingdom authorities and the Department of Trade and Commerce.

BARLEY

TEN CENTS A BUSHEL ADJUSTING PAYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I wish to announce that the ten cent per bushel adjusting payment on western barley sold from August 1, 1946, to March 17, 1947, inclusive, will be under way this week-end. On Friday, July 18, the cheques covering this payment will be sent by the Canadian Wheat Board to the grain companies for distribution to their farmer customers. Approximately $5,300,000 will be involved in the payment.

WHEAT

PARTICIPATION PAYMENTS, 1944 CROP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): May I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce what the plans are for sending the wheat bonus cheques, particularly in the areas now suffering from drought in Saskatchewan and other parts of the west.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I presume the hon. member refers to the participation payments in respect of the 1944 crop?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes.

Mr. MacKINNON: The barley payments have now been taken care of. Word is proceeding to get the 1944 cheques out as soon as possible. It is impossible for me to say when it will be physically practicable actually to get the cheques out, but I gave the hon. member assurance before, and I repeat it now, that attention will be given in the issuing of these cheques to see that where the need is greatest the cheques will go first.

FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

FOREIGN EXCHANGE—SUGGESTED CURTAILMENT OF IMPORTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. CHARLTON (Brant): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance, notice of which has been sent him. In view of the huge quantities of fruits and vegetables now accumulating in railway and other storage places in Canada, and the urgency of saving United States dollars, will the government give consideration to taking some action to curtail these imports now that Canadian produce is available, such action to be operative so long as the Canadian supply is adequate?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): A similar question was asked yesterday by the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Clark). The customs tariff now provides for seasonal duties on this type of commodity. Of course, there are usually dumping duties. The government is following the situation but there is no other action which could profitably be taken at this time.

FEED GRAINS

SUBSIDIES ON COARSE GRAINS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): I wish to direct a question to the government. It should properly be directed to the Minister of Agriculture, but he is not here. In view of the extreme shortage of feed grains in eastern Canada, is the government giving further consideration to the matter of leaving the subsidies on coarse grains after July 31.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): May I take the question as a notice and answer later?

Mr. WRIGHT: I believe the Minister of Finance was about to rise. Perhaps he can answer the question.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): The government is considering the matter. I seldom venture into the field of prophecy but it is unlikely that the subsidies will be continued for any stated period of time.

PRAIRIE FARM REHABILITATION

QUESTION OF EXTENSION TO BRITISH COLUMBIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): May I ask the Acting Minister of Agriculture whether

a date has yet been set for representatives of the British Columbia government to come here and consult with the federal government with regard to the extension of the P.F.R.A. to British Columbia?

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Acting Minister of Agriculture): I do not know but I will inquire and let the hon. member know.

[*Later*]:

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): A question was asked me this morning by the hon. member for Kamloops which I said I would answer later in the day. There has been no date fixed as yet for a meeting between the provincial authorities and representatives of the federal government in respect to P.F.R.A., but one will be set as soon as the Minister of Agriculture returns.

REDISTRIBUTION

READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved the third reading of Bill No. 18, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

Mr. JOHN T. HACKETT (Stanstead): Yesterday when this bill was before the committee of the whole house the temperature of hon. members had risen to such a degree that it would have been difficult, I fear, to secure agreement on a proposition as simple as twice two makes four. Earlier in the day I had suggested that the name "Wright," which a county on the north shore of the Ottawa has borne for several generations, be restored to it in place of the name "Gatineau" bestowed upon it by this bill. In the course of my remarks I contended that the issue was not political and I understood the right hon. gentleman who leads the house to say that he considered it in the same light and that it was one on which hon. members might express their opinion without regard to political allegiance. Later my hon. friend the member for Wright (Mr. Raymond) took part in the debate and advanced some reasons for the change of name.

I hope that the hon. member for Wright will not think that I am attempting in any way to dictate to the people of his constituency or even to suggest to them that they have not the complete right to express views concerning a matter which affects them primarily. On the other hand, I hope that the hon. gentleman will not consider me impertinent if I say to him that sometimes people do in haste things they would not do had they considered them a little more maturely. There is a principle at stake, I believe, which probably most people would not be willing to abandon without some thought. The whole continent, on both sides of the international line, is studded with the names of great precursors, the names of men of daring, the names of men who went forth into the wilderness and planted there the seeds of Christianity, of civilization, of culture and industry. We owe it to the future to preserve these names.

The hon. member for Wright said some things about the Gatineau river and the souvenirs which it recalls, the hardihood of the many people who have laboured along its shores. That is well and good, and I share his generous sentiment to the fullest extent. But there was a man who was probably the first to fell trees on the shores of that majestic stream, and I am suggesting to my hon. friend that it is well that his name be not forgotten. The name Gatineau is well preserved. The stream itself is a mighty one and for a long time has been an important highway in the development of our north country. The provincial county of Gatineau is, after all, the official area on which municipal divisions are based and on which the whole municipal and educational fabric rests. Registration and other branches of our civil government rest on provincial county divisions. A federal electoral division is something superimposed on the civil divisions which are essentially provincial. To permit this electoral division to retain the name of that great man who, after all, was the father of what has become the national capital—it was Wright who established the settlement which later extended to and became Ottawa—so that the name of Wright may be kept alive is something that I think we should all wish to do. There is fame and glory enough to go around. There is enough for everyone. I do not think we are adding to the interest of the story of Canada by eliminating a name like that of Wright.

I intend to move an amendment; I ask the house if it will not reconsider the somewhat heated and hurried decision reached yesterday. I am going to ask the hon. member for Wright if in all these circumstances he does not feel that he can support an amendment which would restore to that fine district in the Gatineau valley the name of Wright. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) that the word "Gatineau" which appears under item 18 in the Quebec schedule, be replaced by the name of "Wright", which was the name that area has borne for several generations.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. JEAN FRANCOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): No, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word of appreciation to the hon. member for Outremont (Mr. Rinfret).

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received no amendment.

Mr. HACKETT: There is an amendment on the table. I will hand it up right away.

Mr. POULIOT: I am not speaking to the amendment. I am speaking to the main motion. I wish to say a word of praise of and pay a tribute to the hon. member for Outremont for the trouble he has taken in trying to adjust the difficulties of redistribution. I do not know whether an additional number of members will prove to be a good thing. The future will tell. It will all depend on the new members who will be elected in the various new constituencies. However, I cannot let the opportunity pass without expressing my sympathy for the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe). He is an old colleague of mine and has been in the House of Commons for a great number of years. He was elected some time after I myself was elected, and he was reelected by his constituents at each election except one. Of course he has personal views. No one is bound to agree with all he has said in his various speeches. The membership of the house creates a close association between members of parliament. Personally I have disagreed with others at times, but not all the time, and I have received some support from my Liberal colleagues, from members of the Progressive Conservative group, from some C.C.F. members and some Social Credit members, and even from the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains. I find it pitiful that a constituency of such long-standing disappears from the map. I understand the feelings of the hon. gentleman, and I would perhaps have found stronger words in the dictionary than those he used if the same thing had been done to me.

I was speaking a moment ago about the close association which exists between all members of parliament. We are in the same boat. We have to make the best of it. Even when I disagree with any one of my colleagues, I am ready to give him credit for some quality which has been acknowledged by his constituents who have given him a majority in the previous election. There is also a close association between members of parliament and their own constituents. My constituents have been most kind to me. When it was rumoured that some intriguers wanted to take one-half of my constituency and join it to one-half of the constituency of the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Belzile), there were strong protests in my county from the people themselves. I like them; in fact I love them. They have been most kind to me, and I appreciate it. Even after I cease to be a member of parliament I shall remember the unceasing kindness they have shown me. They are more than constituents; they are friends. Therefore I understand perfectly the feeling of the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains; I sympathize with him, and I am sure that if he decides to run again he will be elected in any constituency he may select.

In all this matter of dividing Temiscouata and Rimouski to create a new constituency I have appreciated the cooperation of the hon. member for Outremont. I explained the situation to him, and he took the trouble to look into the matter personally and make a splendid report to the sophomores, the intriguers and others who had written him promoting plans for a new constituency. Temiscouata is my county; it remains so. It was an act of fairness and justice to the constituents themselves not to make any change. If there have been some difficulties and some annoyances I hope they will be ironed out, and that everything will be done on the basis of justice and fair play.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Hackett moves, seconded by Mr. Wright:

That from item 18 on page 21 of the Quebec schedule the word "Gatineau" be deleted and the word "Wright" substituted therefor.

Mr. EDOUARD RINFRET (Outremont): The whole argument of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr Hackett) this morning was based upon his statement that a similar amendment was dealt with hurriedly yesterday and that the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Raymond) had not fully considered the matter before he made his speech. I would remind the hon. member for Stanstead that the resolution upon which the subcommittee acted was passed in 1939. It was a resolution of the corporation of the county of Gatineau, which includes thirty-two mayors of various parishes. Those thirty-two mayors have since been consulted by the hon. member for Wright and all are in agreement that the change of name should be made. Anyone who listened to the various arguments advanced by the hon. member for Wright yesterday will agree that under the circumstances the change is warranted. The practically unanimous demand of the electors of the county is to the effect that the change should be made, and that is what the subcommittee acted upon. Therefore I am

opposing the amendment and will ask the house to confirm the report of the subcommittee on this matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I would ask in the first instance whether Your Honour is wholly of the mind that the amendment as worded does not conflict with the rule, which states that when a bill comes up for third reading an hon. member may move that it be not read a third time but referred back to the committee of the whole for the purpose of amending it in any particular. I do not think my hon. friend's amendment is so worded. I am raising the point simply that the rule may be considered, not with the view of trying to obstruct my hon. friend.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the point raised by the right hon. Prime Minister is well taken. If the hon. member looks at Beauchesne, second edition, citation 813 he will see:

When a bill comes up for third reading a member may move that it be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole for the purpose of amending it in any particular.

The hon. member is not moving that the bill be referred back to the committee; his amendment suggests a change in the bill itself. Therefore I believe the amendment is not in order.

Motion (Mr. Mackenzie King) agreed to on division and bill read the third time and passed.

CRIMINAL CODE

CONCURRENCE IN AMENDMENTS AGREED TO IN FREE CONFERENCE WITH SENATE

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice) moved:

That the amendments agreed to in the free conference with the Senate to Bill No. 364, an act to amend the criminal code, be agreed to; and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours therewith.

Mr. CHURCH: What is the effect of it?

Motion agreed to, amendments read the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

PENSIONS AND WAR VETERANS ALLOWANCES—AMENDMENT—MR. WRIGHT

On the motion for committee of supply:

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, just before you leave the chair on this motion there is a word or two I should like to say to the government, and particularly to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie). There are a few hours yet before this session will be over and it does seem to me that it is not too late for the government to do something for certain groups of people to whom no consideration has been given during this session. I shall not take the time to enumerate the various groups which I feel have been overlooked; there are a great many, but there are two that I wish to mention. I know that I have the support of all members of the house with respect to these two groups of people.

First of all, I refer to widows of non-pensioned veterans. At the moment the only provision for these widows made by the government is under the War Veterans Allowance Act, and the maximum payment is $30.41 per month. I know the kind of thing that can be said about raising a matter of this kind at this stage of the session, but I ask the government to face the fact that it simply is not fair to ask these women to get along on such a small amount of money. This applies also to the second group I have in mind, namely veterans who have to live on the so-called burnt-out pension, properly known as a war veterans allowance. In this case the maximum amount paid to a single veteran is the same figure of $30.41 per month.

When that figure was set I did not think it was sufficient, but one argument advanced in favour of it was that it was a little higher than the amount of the old age pension and similar benefits in effect at that time. The old age pension has now been raised to a basic amount of $30 per month and in some provinces it is more than that. In fact, this government is urging the provinces to add to the $30, to make it $40 or something more. It has been recognized that more than $30 per month is needed to live on, and I think it is most unfair to ask these veterans' widows and burnt-out pensioners to get along on $30.41 per month.

I know the sympathy to which I have referred is just as strong in the heart of the Minister of Veterans Affairs as it is in the hearts of the rest of us, but in addition to the sympathy he may have in his heart the minister has power in the position which he occupies. I am making an appeal to him and to his colleagues to find some way before this session closes to raise that amount. To allow these people only $30.41 a month is a disgrace.

I shall not go into all the arguments we have brought forward on previous occasions during this session with regard to increases

in the cost of living and the way we feel about the manner in which those increases have been permitted to occur. The fact is that the cost of living has gone up since that figure of $30.41 per month or $365 per year was set. I am sure that this matter appeals so definitely to the hearts and minds of hon. members that nothing more need be said. All of us have had appeals made to us in recent months to do something for groups of people of this kind before the session ends. I am sure that I have the support of hon. members to my right and of hon. members to my left, and I know there is support among hon. members across the way. I hope hon. members from all quarters in the house will join me in asking the government to do something about this matter before this session ends.

Mr. JEAN FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I have just a few words to say and I am glad the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is in the chamber. When he is here the explanations given by the acting leader of the house are in order and are as they should be, but if the Prime Minister had been in the house last night he would have witnessed an unpleasant performance by the acting leader of the house. It was nothing but provocation of the opposition. He did not answer properly the questions that were asked. Last year I lodged a complaint against him. At times he is most provocative. We all wish the session to close at an early date, probably today, but the leader of the house will have to change his tone.

Some hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. POULIOT: Otherwise the session will last two weeks more. I have come here after spending the summer in a most delightful spot. I have come here at great sacrifice. I am here on parliamentary business and I want to be respected as a member of parliament. I do not want to witness another performance such as occurred last night at the closing of the house. That is not a threat, it is a warning. I want the acting leader of the house to be just as polite as the Prime Minister and the rest of his colleagues. I do not want him to bully anyone. I want him to realize that the position he holds is a position of honour and he must prove himself qualified for it. I have waited for a long time to say this.

I am scandalized that the estimates of veterans affairs are coming at the very last hour of the very last day. A great deal of money has been spent for veterans and it is time for us to know how it has been spent and how usefully it has been spent. I have many grievances to place before the Chair. Simply because this is the last day of the session is no reason why I should be prevented from saying what I would have said a long time ago if the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs had been given precedence over useless legislation. I say that with great respect to the Prime Minister. I am on a footing as a member of the House of Commons which is equal with that of the leader of the house. There is only one who is superior to all of us, that is yourself. I remember distinctly that on the eve of his departure from Quebec city in the summer of 1926 for the imperial conference the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), realizing the importance of this position, said "I am the first amongst equals." The Prime Minister is the first amongst equals and, sir, you are the only one who has been given authority over us, and I hope that in the future as in the past you will not forget it.

Mr. G. S. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the remarks made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot). I think it is most unfortunate that the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs are to be practically the last, according to the statement which the minister has just made, to come before us. At this late hour it will be impossible to give the estimates of this most important department of government the careful consideration which they merit. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Veterans Affairs is to many, many hundreds of thousands of Canadians the most important department of government today, and I would suggest to the minister that even at this late hour he give most serious consideration to the recommendations made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, that the War Veterans Allowance Act should be amended with a view to increasing the allowances to make them equal at least to the amount now paid to old age pensioners, and that consideration also be given to the non-pensioned widows, not only the widows of veterans who did not receive a pension but also the widows of veterans who received a pension up to the time of their death but whose disability pension was less than fifty per cent, thereby disentitling the widow to pension.

I point out to the minister that in my opinion it is most essential that we should have in this house a standing committee on veterans affairs. If we had such a committee

functioning as the special war veterans committee has functioned in a very efficient manner in the last two sessions of parliament, thereby relieving the house of a great deal of tedious work, it could have reviewed the War Veterans Allowances Act to provide for these two classes of pensioners.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Veterans Affairs, who I will readily admit has the interests of the veterans at heart, will change the order of procedure and at least bring down the estimates of his department immediately following those of the Prime Minister, and that he will even at this late date take some action whereby these needy veterans and their dependents can be assisted.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a matter that is not covered by existing legislation and to ask the Minister of Justice a question. I have heard, and have received by letter, a lot of complaints about disturbances on street cars throughout the country not covered by the amendments of last week to the Criminal Code, which have resulted in a large number of accidents. Would the government look into that during the recess, and the matter of an amendment to cover it? It is one of the most important factors in accidents, I gather from statistics I have studied. Will the minister give that consideration?

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will give it consideration.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, a word in regard to the question raised as to the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs being left until this time. I hope hon. members will recall that I have within the last month on at least three occasions in this house said that the government would be pleased to bring on any estimates at a time that hon. gentlemen opposite might wish to have them brought on. I made that statement when I met with the leaders of the different parties. I asked if there were any particular estimates that they would like to have considered immediately, and promised that the government would see that they were considered immediately. My hon. friends the leaders of the different groups will bear me out in that. No intimation has come, so far as I am aware, until this moment that the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs should have been brought on at an earlier time. I am sure that if such a request had been made it would have been met immediately by the Minister of Veterans Affairs.

[Mr. G. S. White.]

Mr. MACKENZIE: I have been ready with them for two months.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As to the request my hon. friend has just made that veterans affairs estimates should be taken up without further delay, I have just been speaking with my colleague and he is agreeable and the government is wholly agreeable that those estimates shall be the first to be taken up after the house reassembles at two o'clock this afternoon. We will consider them with the others in the order my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): Mr. Speaker, the question raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) was not with regard to taking up the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs. It had to do with three other matters which we think are of importance at this time. First there was the question of the disability pension for the returned man from this war who is totally disabled and, if married, gets a pension of $100 a month for himself and his wife and $75 a month if he is single. Second, there are a number of widows of veterans of the last war whose pension is only $30.41 if they receive full pension, but many of whom, through some mistake on their part but more often mistakes made by some government department, do not receive the full pension. I know of one case, the widow of a soldier of the first great war who had two sons fighting in the last war and who was receiving the war veterans allowance and the widow's pension, the two cheques being sent out at the same time. Today she is living on $27.41 a month, with a son who was severely wounded and lost an eye at Hong Kong and is unable to obtain suitable employment. He receives some $45 a month. He used to help support his mother both before going overseas and during the time he was overseas.

In view of the answers I have received from the government to date indicating that we are going to have an increased cost of living in this country this fall when the subsidies on grain are taken off and costs are increased to the producers in eastern Canada which will result in higher prices for agricultural products, and with the subsidy of 78 cents a bushel coming off wheat that is being milled for flour, which will mean an increase of three cents a loaf in the price of bread, there is no doubt in my mind and I am sure in the minds of the members of this house that the cost of living is going to increase this fall and winter, and I think we would be derelict in our duty if we left this house

without indicating to the government that we believe something should be done with respect to this matter. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Castleden):

That all the words after the word "that" to the end of the question be left out, and the following words be inserted instead thereof:

This house is of the opinion that the government should give immediate consideration to the amending of the Pension Act and the War Veterans Allowance Act so as to provide increases in the basic disability pension, the war veterans' allowance, and the allowance to veterans' widows and orphans, to enable those receiving these pensions and allowances to meet the increased cost of living.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask whether my hon. friend is satisfied that this motion is in order? My recollection is that the Pension Act has already been passed; if so, this motion is asking for the reconsideration of a measure that has already been dealt with.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I point out that the Pension Act was amended last year, not this year.

Mr. GREEN: On a point of order, there has been no amendment to the Pension Act, and there was a request made this session.

Mr. KNOWLES: It was definitely not amended this year.

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): In seconding this motion I should like it to be noted by the house that we are not making any special reference to the ordinary people of Canada who are supporting this government in its policy of lifting controls. The cost of living is going up. Owing to the fact that the government have set its rate of pension at $75 for a single person who is totally disabled, and $100 for a married man and that the pensions for widows with children were set at a time when the cost of living was not as high as it is at this time, we are making a special appeal on behalf of veterans and veterans' dependents to meet the situation in which they find themselves, and which they are incapable of meeting themselves. We are talking about veterans who are totally disabled but whose pension has not been increased. Because the cost of living is constantly rising it puts them in a position where their standard of living is going down below that which we should allow as legislators of this country.

We are making a special appeal at this particular time that special legislation be brought in now to meet the situation. The house is not likely to meet again until next February. These veterans are stuck. It is quite evident that controls are to be lifted and the cost of living is going up. Much can happen between now and when this house meets again and passes through the regular procedure which is necessary before any legislation can be brought in to increase these pensions. The matter should be dealt with. It is an emergency situation. Efforts should be taken to improve the lot of people who are going to suffer under the presently existing circumstances. We renew our plea that this house and the government in particular take this matter into serious consideration at this time in behalf of people who have done so much for Canada.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): I should like to say a few words in support of this amendment. I have no doubt that the government is not very happy about an amendment of this kind being brought in at this stage of the session, but it would not have happened had the estimates of veterans affairs been brought up for consideration at an earlier date. The attempt of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to switch the onus for that delay onto the opposition parties is ridiculous. At the end of each day's sittings, as the business of the house for the following day was announced, the Department of Veterans Affairs frequently was listed, but always mysteriously it has turned out that the Department of Veterans Affairs is at the end, and the government must take full responsibility for that fact.

Hon. members will realize that in the 1945 and 1946 sessions we had a special committee on veterans affairs where all these problems could be thoroughly discussed. This year there has been no opportunity whatever from the beginning of the session until today to have a discussion on veterans affairs. After all the obstacles possible had been put in our way we did manage to bring about a discussion on the unfairness to merchant seamen, but there has been no chance to have a proper debate on veterans affairs.

The position is this. Old age pensions have been increased. This government has announced as its policy that it is not setting the proper rate for old age pension required for the maintenance of a person without any other income, but is simply making a maintenance grant, paying three-quarters of what they call a maintenance grant; in other words, three-quarters of $30. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin) has admitted several times that $30 is not enough for a person to live on; that it is only meant to be

a maintenance grant and that it is the responsibility of the provinces to pay whatever additional amount is required to enable our senior citizens to live. The veterans are the direct responsibility of this dominion parliament; they are not the responsibility of the provinces. Last Saturday the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe) said that in so far as housing is concerned he accepted responsibility for the veterans, but for nobody else, and the government cannot get away from the fact that the responsibility for the veterans of Canada rests right here in the House of Commons. The veteran is able to get only $30.41 as a war veterans allowance. That is admittedly not a large enough sum for him to live on. The onus for increasing that to a living amount rests on the dominion government. That is one of the main reasons why this amendment is so important.

During the discussion on old age pensions I pointed out this fact to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, and he said that there would be a committee next year at which time the whole question could be considered. That means a delay of a year with nothing being done to help these veterans who receive war veterans allowances, and delay of a year is a very serious thing to men of that age.

The position with regard to pensioners is also serious, particularly the widows and the children whose father was lost in the war. There must be some change made, and made quickly, to benefit them. I suggest to the government that the time has now come to make provision that the children of the soldier who lost his life in the war shall get the same educational benefits as the father would have received had he returned to Canada. There are different other questions which I will not go into any further at this stage, but I do say that this amendment is timely, and that these problems should have been faced by the government many weeks ago.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite proper that hon. members should bring up any question on going into supply which they may deem to be important, and certainly this is one of the most important questions which parliament could have before it. For that reason, among other reasons, I wish to refer to the form in which the amendment comes before the house. The amendment reads:

That all the words after the word "that" to the end of the question be left out, and the following words be inserted therefor.

[Mr. Green.]

If the amendment were to carry it would be in the nature of a want of confidence motion in the government and the government will have to resign, and there would then be no opportunity for any government immediately to consider the condition and well-being of the veterans, their widows and orphans. That is the position. As I say, it is all right to bring up the question at this time to be discussed; I welcome that in the fullest possible way but I want hon. members to understand the significance of the motion as it is worded and which if carried would make it impossible for this government to consider any further at this time the question of the well-being of veterans and members of their families.

Mr. PROBE: Take the whips off and it will be all right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend perhaps knows more about parliamentary government than anyone, but may I say to him, whether the whips were off or not the effect would be exactly what I have described, and if he knew a little more about parliamentary procedure and practice he would have realized that.

I am making it quite clear that the government welcomes any discussion which hon. members may wish to have on this question. It is an important question and it would naturally have come up, and will naturally come up, this afternoon when the Minister of Veterans Affairs brings his estimates before the house; but to ask the government to accept a motion which will mean, if carried in this house, the defeat of the administration itself at this time is asking much more than can be expected of any administration.

Having said this much may I say that I have been looking carefully at the wording of the second part of the motion, and it is to the effect—

. . . that the government should give immediate consideration to the amending of the Pension Act and the War Veterans Allowance Act so as to provide increases in the basic disability pension, the war veterans allowance, and the allowance to veterans' widows and orphans, to enable those receiving these pensions and allowances to meet the increased cost of living.

What is asked for there is immediate consideration of the matters that are therein mentioned. I have never found the government unwilling to give consideration to all important matters, and certainly the government would not be unwilling to give consideration to the matters that are referred to here. But if hon. members mean by immediate consideration that the cabinet must meet, that the Minister of Finance must reconsider

estimates in relation to what may be required for these purposes, and that we shall have to wait here, if any action is to be taken, until the approval of His Excellency is obtained to a resolution to be brought before the house and a bill introduced, it is unreasonable to expect the government to take that step at this time.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: We are willing to wait.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have only to repeat that, as to considering this matter, at the appropriate time and in the appropriate way the administration will be prepared so to do. But if hon. members opposite feel that is not sufficient and wish to press the motion, then they must abide by the consequences of the vote that may be taken.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), that support of this motion would be a vote of want of confidence in the government. The suggestion was made by the member for Regina City (Mr. Probe) that if the whip of authority were removed it would be all right.

My recollection is that last year, in the last days of the session, an amendment similar to this was moved with respect to the removal of the milk subsidy. At that time the government found itself in much the same position as that in which it finds itself today. It realized that there was a large body of opinion in the country opposed to the removal of the milk subsidy. The then leader of the house, the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply, as I remember—

Mr. HOWE: No, the then Minister of Justice.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: All right; I beg your pardon. I was conferring the honour on the wrong gentleman. The then Minister of Justice relieved everyone in the house from any responsibility other than his personal responsibility in giving a vote, and it is interesting to note that as a result of that vote, the free membership of this house, untrammelled and uncontrolled, to use the words of the Minister of Veterans Affairs—free and untrammelled, I believe—voted against the removal of the milk subsidy and voted for the amendment. Then, as soon as parliament adjourned and went home, the government refused to carry out the free and untrammelled vote of the House of Commons.

I am not going to deal at length with the motion which was moved on that occasion.

Mr. HOWE: It was not an amendment on a motion to go into supply.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have sent for the volume. It is not here yet, but my recollection is that I am entirely correct. There is an immediate problem before us now and that is the welfare of these men who today find themselves in the position of receiving a matter of less than $31 a month. They find themselves in difficulties and they ask that parliament do something and not run home when matters such as this are before the house. Immediate consideration of an amendment to the Pensions Act and the War Veterans Allowance Act so as to provide increases for the basic disability pension is sought. If the Prime Minister will rise in his place and free his membership on the other side of the house in a vote such as this, I believe the majority of them will support this amendment so that war veterans allowances and the allowances to veterans' widows and orphans may be increased to meet the increased cost of living.

I join with others who have said that apparently there has been a deliberate effort to keep back certain of the estimates until the end of the session. We follow this practice every year. Last year the promise was made that at the very earliest possible date the estimates would be brought down, and now we are near the end of the session. All of us want to go home, and we are asked in the last forty-eight hours, the last twelve hours, to vote millions upon millions of dollars, a large part of which is in the form of supplementaries made necessary by reason of an election that took place the other day in the city of Halifax.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, yes. There is no doubt about it.

An hon. MEMBER: Who won the by-election?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, you won, certainly.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Apparently the position of affairs is that, whatever promises may be made, they are justified provided the results are favourable to the government. That is apparently the attitude being adopted and I suggest—

Mr. ABBOTT: It is a good alibi, anyway.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, it is an excellent alibi, a fine explanation of a series of promises. I believe the hon. gentleman was one of those who joined in the promising—

Mr. ABBOTT: No, I made no promises. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I made a speech in Halifax and specifically stated that I made no promises. I never made

any promises, and may I add that the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who were on the platform with me, made no promises either.

Mr. ILSLEY: It was the opposition speakers that made the promises.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member for Lake Centre to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have touched on a sore point—

Mr. ABBOTT: Not at all.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: —as my hon. friend evidences. I can quite understand—

Mr. ABBOTT: The soreness is elsewhere.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There is a contribution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCANN: We will beat you every time.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My hon. friend is giving us the benefit of his medical diagnosis—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: —and I am giving you the benefit of a diagnosis of an election campaign when matters were discussed and promises made.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment which is before the house.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I wonder, sir, if you would ask my hon. friends opposite to confine their questions to themselves, because when I am asked questions I have to answer them. I suggest that this is an important matter. There are many thousands of soldiers and the widows of soldiers who served who are desirous of receiving fair consideration. There is no monopoly on any side of the house in that regard and I ask the Prime Minister to relieve his followers from any suggestion that this is a vote of confidence and to allow the members in all parts of the house to show that they want something down now and not one year hence.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that my first duty is not to relieve my followers of anything, or to relieve the house of anything, but to hold the house to its own rules and to see that those rules are carried out.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: They were withdrawn last year.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just a moment, please. There is a motion before the house now that the house go into supply. Hon. gentlemen opposite have moved that the words of that motion be deleted, that all the words after "that" be struck out, which means that the house does not go into supply. If the house is not to be permitted to go into supply, how are we to have the appropriations necessary to carry on the government of this country? Hon. gentlemen know very well that any motion which is made in this form and which denies supply to the government is a motion of want of confidence. I intend to hold the house to that obligation; this is a want of confidence motion, and it must be so considered. I have said in regard to the second part of the motion that we all agree that it contains much with which all parties in this house are in great sympathy, and that the government is prepared to consider what is there requested. Beyond that I cannot possibly go at this time.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): May I just have a moment to reply to the point which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has raised about the effect of this amendment? By speaking now I shall exhaust my right to speak on the amendment, in view of the fact that no point of order has been raised. I would ask the Prime Minister to bear in mind what actually happened last year on August 27.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Last year on August 27 I was in another part of the world. I heard that there was a great deal of confusion in the house at that time and that it would have been much better if much that was done had not been done. I am here at the present time with the responsibility of seeing that the rules of this house are observed, and I intend to exercise that responsibility.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has already spoken. The hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) has risen.

Mr. KNOWLES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken on the amendment. I spoke previous to the amendment.

An hon. MEMBER: The hon. member has spoken too often.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not accept the Prime Minister's inference that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent), who was Minister of Justice last year, and the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe) broke the rules of the house in

what they did in a similar situation. At page 5422 of *Hansard* for August 27, 1946, I read this:

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Minister of Justice) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

That is quite definite; it was a supply motion. Then follow a few pages of debate, starting with myself and one or two others, followed by an amendment moved by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Nicholson), my deskmate, with reference to the milk subsidy. The amendment was in precisely the same form as this one. After that amendment was moved, members in all parts of the house rose and spoke favourably about it until it was realized that the vote would likely be in the affirmative. Accordingly the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply rose and drew attention to citation 489 in the second edition of Beauchesne. His remarks are found at page 5431. They are lengthy and for that reason I do not think I should read them. He quotes the citation, and I shall read that as it appears at page 5431 of *Hansard:*

When an amendment has been adopted to the motion for the house to go into committee of supply or of ways and means, it may be forthwith moved that the house resolve itself into such committee immediately or on a future day.

I shall also read one sentence after that, from the remarks of the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply:

Therefore I should like to serve notice that if this vote carries the government will immediately move that the house go into committee of supply this day.

I submit that the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply was perfectly in order. What happened, as all hon. members will recall, was this. The amendment made by the hon. member for Mackenzie carried. The record of that vote is found at pages 5433-34. There were sixty-nine yeas and forty-one nays. Immediately after that we find the following:

Mr. St. Laurent: I move that the house do now go into committee of supply.

The government was not defeated at all. The hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth) later in the day raised a point of order as to whether the committee of supply was properly constituted, and the government was able to show, from the rules, that what had happened that morning was perfectly in order. The case before us is identical; I realize it is equally embarrassing. But the fact of the matter is that the passing of this motion does not necessarily involve the defeat of the government. Rather it gives the government definite instructions from this parliament of Canada to give consideration to these matters.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): I should like to say that the members of this group are whole-heartedly in support of the amendment before the house. We also should like to see the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) allow a free vote on the part of members of his party with regard to this question. Surely, by unanimous understanding, this vote need not be regarded as a vote of want of confidence but can be regarded merely as representing the demands of the members of this house for a certain specific thing. We have heard in this country a great deal about democracy. Surely it is about time we saw democracy in action in this house. Let us once in a while see the members of this house speak on behalf of their constituents as they know they would like them to speak; and let us see members vote as they know their constituents would like them to vote. It is time we had an end to just lip service.

We agree that the estimates should have been brought down at an earlier date. In spite of what the Prime Minister has said, the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) knows very well that various members have from time to time approached him and asked when the estimates were to be brought down, thus showing an anxiety on their part to have them brought down. Recently, when I approached the minister, I was told that they would be brought down as soon as the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) returned to the house; at the time he was no doubt unavoidably absent. There has been an anxiety on the part of veteran members of this house to have the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs brought down. From time to time requests have been made in this house that a standing committee on veterans affairs be set up. I think it is important that such a committee on veterans affairs should be set up in order, in the first place, to deal with individual cases. The committee which was set up two years ago drafted a charter; and I think that all members on that committee felt that generally speaking they had done a good job in so far as the rehabilitation of the veterans of world war II was concerned. But I think we all realize that the veterans of world war I were the forgotten men of Canada. In addition to that, the majority of the members of that committee were far from satisfied with the type of pension bill that was brought down in this house. It did not represent the unanimous opinion of the members of the committee. I would say it did not even

represent the will of the majority of the members on that committee, but rather represented the will of the government as expressed through the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I shall leave that matter now and deal with it again when we come to the estimates.

We feel that the amount paid under the War Veterans Allowance Act is altogether too low. I think all members of this house know of veterans who are today living under appalling conditions. I do not think that this government or this country can be congratulated upon the way they have dealt with the veterans of world war I; I am not now referring to veterans of world war II. We feel that the rates should be increased to at least $50 a month and that the means test should be abolished.

When the war veterans allowance was first introduced it was in the form of an application of the old age pension to veterans at the age of sixty. At that time we recognized that veterans were pre-aged by ten years; therefore the very least that should be done is to immediately increase the amount of the war veterans allowance to the highest old age pension paid in this country, which at the present time is $40. That is something which should be done at once. It will not be satisfactory; it will not be enough, but at least it should be increased to $40, which is the amount of the old age pension paid in Ontario. I say this because we recognize that the war veterans allowance is a federal responsibility. The government cannot shove it off on the provinces. In view of the fact that the war veterans allowance is an application of the old age pension, certainly we should increase it to the amount of the highest old age pension paid in any part of this dominion.

There is another unfortunate thing about the war veterans allowance. Today it is being used for the purpose of giving an allowance to a soldier who in reality is entitled to a pension. Instead of paying the pension we pay the war veterans allowance, which of course means that the amount of money paid is far less than the amount of the pension would be, and at the same time we do not guarantee the same security for the dependents of the veteran. In addition, of course, the means test is involved in the war veterans allowance, whereas the means test does not apply in connection with the pension.

I am not going to say more on this matter at this time, but when the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs come up we shall have more to say about the various measures coming under that department. I would emphasize the fact, however, that we should give an example of how a democracy can really function by allowing the members of this house, on this important matter concerning the veterans, to express what they know to be the sentiments of the people in their constituencies.

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I think it is to the knowledge of every hon. member that we are now in the 114th day of the session; that during the session while each of some twenty or more departments have been put into supply, each time hon. members might have raised the serious point that has been raised today. It is being done now for one express purpose; that is, for the purpose of endeavouring to place the government in a dilemma in which it would be virtually impossible to carry on. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has made the constitutional position perfectly clear. May I say, speaking as one of those who are proud to support him that on such matters I take the view he takes, and we will support him through thick and thin.

Mr. WRIGHT: The Prime Minister before the people?

Mr. CLAXTON: If by any chance, because of the way in which this has been done, there should be an adverse vote, then we shall be glad to face the people; and the Liberal party is the only party that would be glad at this time. One thing I believe I should point out is the fact that it is in no way the fault of this government or the members on this side of the house that the session has lasted so long. I have had a count made of the way the debate has proceeded from the beginning of the session to July 1. Hon. members may be interested to learn that the Liberal party, with 126 members, has taken up 2,233 columns of *Hansard*. The Progressive Conservative party, with some 67 members, has taken up 2,190 columns; the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation has taken up 1,342 columns, and the Social Credit party 628 columns. Hon. members should take into account the fact that the number of columns I have debited to the Liberals includes all the work of explaining all matters of legislation during the session and the answering of questions asked on the estimates. When we come to a per capita apportionment we find that the Liberal share per capita is 17·8 columns; the Progressive Conservative share is 32·6 columns; the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation share is 47·8 columns and the Social Credit share 48 columns per capita. This indicates

that hon. members on this side of the house have exercised a very considerable degree of self-restraint in order to get through the business that had to be dealt with by the house at this session.

Right through the session the Prime Minister indicated, in warning after warning, that he did not want the situation to develop where a great many estimates had to be dealt with at the end of the session. Right through the session the Prime Minister has held consultations with the leaders of the opposition parties in an endeavour to expedite the business of the house, and right through the session he has asked them to indicate what they wanted brought up. As he has just said, he indicated that it was up to hon. members to indicate their preference as to what items should be brought into supply, what items should be heard first. And as he has said, despite that being done on no less than three occasions, there never has been any suggestion contrary to the procedure that has been followed.

We have a situation of this kind every year; that is, some departments have to be taken last. That is inevitable. Some must be taken first and some last; but those taken last always afford the opposition an opportunity to say they were purposely held over. Sometimes it is the Department of External Affairs, sometimes it is another department, but whatever the department it is always said by the opposition that the estimates were held over deliberately. This session the fact is, and I believe the right hon. Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) has kept score, that the estimates have been further advanced relative to the stage of the session, week by week, than at any time within our history. This session, too, hon. members will recognize that there has been a great body of important legislation, some of it of major consequence, and it has always been ready for consideration. The house has never been held up for a second through lack of business with which to proceed. There have always been important measures on the order paper awaiting attention; then we have this very important question brought up, and in fact sprung on us, in the very last moments.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is self evident to the members of this house and the country exactly what is the purpose of this action. Had it been desired to bring this matter to the attention of the government in such a way that the government could have taken some action on it this session, this matter would have been brought up sooner, but hon. members opposite know that no action can be taken on it now, and this is being done purely for what they consider to be an advantage with regard to the strength of parties and the like.

Mr. KNOWLES: It has been asked for on the orders of the day half a dozen times.

Mr. CLAXTON: We are not going to be taken that way, Mr. Speaker. We are quite prepared to face this issue and to deal with it in a proper and regular way, but at the present time we know how to deal with this kind of thing; that is, vote it down; or if we do not vote it down, then face the country on our record and on the issues right across the board.

The question raised by this motion is one that has been before hon. members on a number of occasions at various sessions. Every hon. member has the same sympathetic interest in the welfare of our fellow Canadians as other hon. members. From my knowledge of members of this house no party has a monopoly of the milk of human kindness or of fairness or justice. The record of this government with regard to veterans and veterans rehabilitation and everything that goes with it is not only without parallel in the history of this country; it is without parallel in any country on the whole face of the earth. We have shown where we stand with regard to these matters and we have endeavoured, with the full support of hon. members and their cooperation in the committee on veterans affairs very frequently, to make this a comprehensive programme to be taken together.

As gaps have been discovered they have been filled, but hon. members will appreciate that the sets of cases which have been put before the house at the present time are cases which are based upon a belief as to what will happen in the future, that is, that the cost of living is going to increase still further.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is already going up.

Mr. CLAXTON: The Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) shares the view held by others, that there should be a levelling out. While we are not going to prophesy, our hope and expectation is that things are just about levelling out and that once again the timing of the government and its record with regard to its fiscal policy has been ahead, not only of hon. friends opposite but of all other countries.

These cases to which my hon. friend has referred and which he has in mind are in the minds of members of the government and all others. One of our obligations is to endeavour to balance the things that need

to be done and to appreciate what should be done and endeavour to deal with the fiscal affairs of the country in a responsible fashion. Everything has to be taken into account. There is no bottomless pit from which money can be drawn to pay all the things we would like to pay to people in need. I notice that my hon. friends opposite have not been cautious in the promises they have made through the session. I have made a list of those made by members of the Conservative party, beginning with the debate on the address, and there have been over 110 separate proposals involving additional expenditures or reductions in revenue.

Mr. FLEMING: On a point of order, just a few minutes ago, sir, you did not permit the hon. member for Lake Centre to discuss a matter because you said it was not germane to the subject under discussion. What earthly relevancy to the immediate subject under discussion have the remarks now being made by the minister?

Mr. CLAXTON: If I may say a word on the point raised by the hon. gentleman, like the Prime Minister, I regard this motion as a vote of want of confidence in the government. I believe it is perfectly proper for me to say that one of the reasons why it is not possible at this particular moment to accept fully and without further consideration the proposal made by the hon. member is that we have to consider the financial responsibility of the government as a whole. I believe that when we make that consideration we are entitled to draw the attention of hon. members of the house to the way in which other parties have weighed similar considerations so that we can cast a balance.

Mr. FLEMING: If this motion is considered as a vote of want of confidence in the government, surely a wide range of debate should be open to all members. If we are going to deal with the record of the government or of other parties, that privilege must be extended to all members of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask hon. members to confine their remarks to the general principle of the amendment before the house.

Mr. CLAXTON: With regard to the principle of the amendment, as I have pointed out, and as the Prime Minister pointed out, it is quite impossible to give effect to it in any other terms except those proposed, that is that the house do not go into committee of supply. As the Prime Minister has said, that would leave us face to face with nothing except a vote of want of confidence. On that score we would know where we stood.

[Mr. Claxton.]

With regard to the proposition itself, I may say that I along with other hon. members have received communications from the classes of people affected. I have considered them and I shall certainly give them the utmost consideration in the future. Beyond that I cannot see where any government under our British parliamentary system can do more. The responsibility for the expenditure of funds must be that of the government, and that responsibility we are prepared to face.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

The house resumed at two o'clock.

Mr. J. O. PROBE (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, this morning the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) moved an amendment to the motion for the house to go into supply in order to focus the attention of the government on certain omissions in the legislation that has been put before the house at this session. In speaking thereto the hon. Minister of National Defence (Mr. Claxton) made the accusation that the amendment was prompted purely by political considerations. To my mind the business of this House of Commons is one of politics, politics in the proper sense, not in the narrow partisan sense, and if the conscience of the government is so tender and delicate that it is pricked by what the hon. member for Melfort has done, I am very glad to be able to add a sting or two to that prick of conscience. I hope that hon. members all over this house who are just as anxious as I am to leave Ottawa and get home and join their families will consider it their paramount duty not to get away on a fishing trip but to stay here until the business of the country is properly concluded.

The Minister of National Defence stated that we were bringing this matter up in the dying moments of the session. Let me refresh the memory of the house with this fact, that my colleague the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has on various occasions attempted to bring this matter to the attention of the house. Furthermore we had a delegation of the widows of veterans allowance personnel in this city at which time again we attempted to focus the attention of parliament on this matter.

This morning the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) undertook to give me a personal castigation because I had suggested to him in all humility—I defer to his great parliamentary experience—that he allow the whips to be taken off when this amendment is voted on; that no official pressure be put

on the members on the government side of the house but that they be left free to record their wishes in this matter. The Prime Minister undertook to lecture me as a green member who is unaware of the rules of the House of Commons. I thought it was in the nature of unfair castigation because I am trying to learn my duties and to discharge them diligently, Mr. Speaker. Apropos of that, if I know the rules of this house, the Prime Minister himself was out of order this morning because three times the right hon. gentleman got up on his feet to speak on this amendment to the motion to go into supply. I am willing to admit that I am in the learning stage. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman has passed that stage. He can give us advice, and I am willing to profit by that advice, but I do not think it becomes the dignity of his high office to lecture in that way a backbencher who is sincerely trying to perform his duty.

In my comparatively short period in this house I have learned that a favourite phrase used on the government benches when a grievance is brought to the attention of the house is that the government will give it serious consideration, or will seriously consider it at some time in the future. Our plea, Mr. Speaker, is that the government give serious consideration now to the questions that have been brought before the house in moving this amendment. When I think of the legislation that has been passed this session by this house, accelerated pensions of $3,000 to $7,000 after five years in the diplomatic service abroad, increased allowances to the senate leaders, judges' pensions—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the principle of the amendment which is before the house.

Mr. PROBE: I must bow to your decision, of course, Mr. Speaker, but I find that the greatest latitude has been given to hon. members on the government side in discussing this question.

Mr. MUTCH: Withdraw.

Mr. PROBE: It is not necessary that I withdraw, and I do not propose to withdraw for the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Mutch) or anybody else, because I am perfectly within my rights.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know that it is very warm outside and that hon. members are tired, but I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the general principle of the motion before the house and to have regard for the dignity and the decorum of the house, of which every member should be jealous.

Mr. PROBE: I will try to be as dignified, Mr. Speaker, as my ungainly figure will permit.

In this amendment to the motion to go into supply we ask that further consideration be given by the government to increases under the Pension Act for the returned men who are in receipt of pensions, and consideration for widows of veterans who were in receipt of veterans allowance. I want to give one example of the attitude of the government towards this question of allowances to widows of veterans who had been in receipt of the veterans allowance.

A case was brought to my attention in my own city of Regina in which a veteran had been in receipt of an allowance. Upon his death the widow came to me to see if it would not be possible for the allowance to be continued on her behalf. I took the matter up with the appropriate officials in Ottawa and the answer I got back was that this woman was not eligible under the rules governing administration under the act, and the suggestion was made by Ottawa: Why do you not see the Saskatchewan government to see that she gets mother's allowance? In other words, the government here just passed the buck to a junior administration. If there is one criterion of the government of the Prime Minister during the years that he has been in office it has been one described colloquially as passing the buck. Certainly it is time that in all seriousness this House of Commons, in all its dignity and with all its decorum, should get down to brass tacks. People are in want because of the family compact nature of the legislation that is being passed in this House of Commons.

I feel satisfied that the hon. member for Melfort will be happy to withdraw his amendment—I have not discussed the matter with him—if the government will give the assurance today that even at this late hour it will give immediate attention to legislation on this subject. We want the legislation on this matter brought in. There is no use in reviewing the arguments. Arguments have been reviewed for months past. The cost of living has gone up, and these people are literally in the bread line, if their only source of income is the kindness or the largesse of the government of Canada. If the Prime Minister would assure the house that a measure will be introduced even at this late hour—in my limited experience I have learned that matters can be introduced in the house on very little notice—

I would feel satisfied that the government had some intention of attending to the real needs of the people.

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Perhaps the house will pardon me if I say a few quiet and kindly words in this debate. After eighteen years in this house I was surprised to learn for the first time that an hon. gentleman felt it necessary to move a resolution in regard to veterans legislation, which is a vote of non-confidence in the government, particularly when only last year, sir, every single party in this house endorsed the most generous veterans legislation in the history of the world. We passed a vote of $749 million for the ex-service men of this country.

Mr. WRIGHT: What has happened to the cost of living since then?

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) was one of them, and one of my best friends on the committee, a very useful and constructive critic on that committee. Now what do they say? They were informed by my leader before this motion was brought down that the estimates of veterans affairs would be up for consideration at two o'clock this afternoon unless the motion was moved. Despite that information, for some reasons which I shall not seek to analyse—

Mr. PROBE: "Political considerations".

Mr. MACKENZIE: Well, I am not saying that. I know this, that in thirty years of experience with veterans matters I have never seen party politics played before.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is not being played now, either.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Today what did you do? You moved an amendment to the budget resolutions, which is a vote of non-confidence in the government, a government which has done more for veterans than any government has ever done in the history of the world.

Let the blame rest where it must. They have destroyed forever the non-partisan cooperation of this house extending, in my memory, over thirty years in regard to legislation for veterans in Canada. That is what they have done, and that is what they are seeking to do. If they think that is going to help the cause of the returned ex-servicemen of Canada they are greatly mistaken. What we need in this house in that regard is the cooperation of all parties and a complete abolition of political considerations.

Mr. PROBE: Bring in the legislation and we will cooperate.

[Mr. Probe.]

Mr. MACKENZIE: If you seek to obtain results, sir, by moving an amendment to a budget resolution, which means the abolition of a government which has done so much for ex-servicemen, you are rendering a distinct disservice to every ex-serviceman in the Dominion of Canada. That is what you are doing by this amendment.

I also suggest, sir, in the strongest possible way, that this is a vote of non-confidence. In my opinion it is entirely out of order. It is a contingent impost upon the people of Canada and as such, in my judgment at least—it may not be worth much—it is out of order. I intend to deal with this matter this afternoon on my estimates, and the house was told that by the Prime Minister. I am prepared to discuss these issues; I am ready to discuss them. Here out of the shadows some nefarious political boxer comes and moves this sinister amendment of non-confidence in the government when the Prime Minister announced that the government's responsible minister—

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MACKENZIE: I was not referring to my hon. friend.

Mr. WRIGHT: To whom did my hon. friend refer, then?

Mr. POULIOT: He is not a boxer; he is a farmer.

Mr. WRIGHT: The minister used some pretty strong language.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I was not referring to my hon. friend.

Mr. WRIGHT: The minister used the words "sinister and nefarious" with regard to the mover of the amendment.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I withdraw the slightest imputation against my hon. friend, because I have the highest possible regard for him.

There were some remarks made this morning by the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), alleging certain discourtesies by myself to the house yesterday. Well, I can assure him none was intended. I think if you look at the record of the house for the last twenty years you will find that in the last two or three days of the session it was always said by whoever was trying to direct the activities of the house that any measure whatsoever would be taken up.

Mr. POULIOT: An impertinent irrelevance.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I did not hear the remark of my hon. friend; I would not respect it very much if I did hear it. But I wish to say this, when we gave the assurance to the house that the estimates of Veterans Affairs

would be considered this afternoon I do think it is bad judgment, to say the least, to move an amendment such as this.

One hon. gentleman whom I respect very much, I think the hon. member for Acadia, said that he had requested me several times to bring down the estimates of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. QUELCH: I did not say that. I said I asked when the estimates were to be brought up, thereby showing anxiety.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I thank the hon. member very much for the correction. I have never yet, sir, been asked by any hon. gentleman in this house to bring these estimates down. These estimates have been ready to come down for three months. I want to tell the house that we have twelve full departments through supply already, a record unequalled in parliament since confederation I want to say this to the house, and I know something whereof I speak—the Minister of National Defence mentioned it briefly this morning: greater progress in supply has been made during this session than at any previous session, at least within my knowledge. We have been fair with the house, but sometimes the house has also put us back in going into supply; they have held us back for at least three days in going into supply, and thereby from getting our estimates advanced. Therefore on every single count we are abundantly justified. Early in the session the leader of the opposition asked that the estimates be brought down early, and we must give him credit for that. He was afraid that supply might be deferred. We tried to meet his wishes as best we could, and we did. We have made more progress this year than in any other year during my time here. I deeply regret the moving of an amendment such as this when hon. gentlemen knew that they could debate it fully when my estimates were before the house, as they were supposed to be at two o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Apparently someone wants to put responsibility on the other fellow for delaying the house. That is not the question at all. Certainly I think the government is fully responsible for this debate that has taken place today. I say that for this reason. Very early in the session I personally requested the Minister of Veterans Affairs to consider the advisability of setting up the veterans affairs committee and it was not done. I am not blaming him for that. I know one minister does not make decisions affecting government policy.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I interrupt in a friendly way? I received requests from members of every party not to set up the veterans affairs committee.

Mr. GILLIS: I am glad to hear the minister say that, because those who made that request must share the responsibility equally with the government, but I can assure him that he did not receive requests from any member of this group not to set up the veterans affairs committee. My reason for raising that question at that time early in the session was that I anticipated something like this towards the end of the session. The veterans affairs committee has brought down a charter, and I think that with the time at our disposal when that legislation was piloted through the veterans affairs committee, under the conditions as they existed then, a fair and reasonable job was done. But within the last year many changes have taken place, particularly with respect to the amount of the necessities of life that the pension as applied now will purchase.

The present amendment merely requests the government to take some action in order to do for the veterans what they have done for practically every other section of society, that is, to compensate them for the increased cost of living. We have done that for practically every other section of society. We have increased judges salaries, and all through industry there have been increases in wages to offset the cost of living. At this time we recognize that the amount of the necessities of life, that is to say food, fuel, clothing and shelter, which the pension will provide is thirty per cent less today than it was in 1939 or on the termination of the war. That pension is fixed and I think the time has arrived when the government should consider the advisability—

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is correct—

Mr. GILLIS: —of jacking up that pension so as to keep the pensioner in the same position as the rest of the people in the country who have had some compensating increases because of the cost of living.

With respect to the amendment, the Prime Minister says it is a want of confidence motion. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no one in this house who wants to force the government into an election, but if the Prime Minister wants to take the stand that this amendment is not going to be accepted, and if a vote is forced on the house and he wants to construe it as a want of confidence motion on this particular question, then as far as I am concerned, and I am

speaking for myself personally, I would be quite prepared to face that and if necessary go into an election, because I think the grievance we are airing now is legitimate.

When we stop for a moment and think back a few years, we realize that this institution would not be functioning today were it not for the people whom we are talking about, who offered their lives for the country. We are not asking anything unreasonable for them, but that the government consider the advisability. If the Prime Minister cannot bring in legislation now at this late stage of the session, we might have some assurance by the Minister of Veterans Affairs or the Prime Minister that this matter will be given consideration and the cabinet will take some steps.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I interrupt again? —and I do not interrupt deliberately but just to be helpful. I have already given the assurance to the officials of the Canadian Legion that early next year we shall have a committee to consider this whole question.

Mr. GILLIS: The assurance the minister has given is to the Canadian Legion.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am giving it now to parliament.

Mr. GILLIS: The minister is giving it now to parliament, that when this session rises the cabinet will give consideration to increasing the amount of pension in order to compensate the pensioner for the increased cost of living, and that action will be taken before the next session convenes.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I think my hon. friend has been with me on many committees and he knows that these things should be carefully reviewed, not necessarily by veteran members but by members of this house, in cooperation with the Canadian Legion and other ex-service organizations, and I think that is the proven and wise way of proceeding in regard to future developments in this matter.

Mr. POULIOT: As soon as he leaves for home the minister will start to work.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Start to forget you.

Mr. GILLIS: That is not enough, in my opinion. I am not doubting the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I believe he will do anything the treasury board will permit him to do. What I am afraid of is the treasury board. I do not know who he is. I cannot put my finger on him.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I think I am one of them.

[Mr. Gillis.]

Mr. GILLIS: But if the Prime Minister, who apparently does not want this vote, can offset it by merely telling the house that when it rises he is quite prepared to consider granting pensioners, say on the 1st of October, an amount in the pension that will offset the increased cost of living since the termination of the war, as far as I am concerned that would satisfy me. I do not think we shall get anywhere by one trying to blame the other. But I leave this thought with the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I believe that the veterans affairs committee should be a standing committee of the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. GILLIS: Thank you very much. Early in the session it should be set up, because this is an important problem.

Mr. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend has my promise that, as far as my colleagues' consent will go, that will be done early next session.

Mr. GILLIS: That is progress at least, and I have no desire to hold the house up. I want to make this observation again now that the Prime Minister is in his seat. I want to repeat what I said a moment ago.

An hon. MEMBER: Question.

Mr. GILLIS: Go behind the curtains and have a smoke. I said we were not desirous of pushing this motion for the purpose of embarrassing anyone but we did feel that the question we raised was a legitimate one and if the Prime Minister can give us the assurance that when this house rises this question of granting a sufficient amount of money to pensioners to offset the cost of living, will be taken into consideration—

An hon. MEMBER: Why can't we go home?

Mr. GILLIS: It would be far better if some of you never came here. You do not contribute very much and the least you can do is to keep quiet.

Mr. TUCKER: The people will be the judges.

Mr. GILLIS: Judging by the number of your gang from Saskatchewan, they are fairly good judges.

Mr. TUCKER: The next time they will be better judges than the last time.

Mr. GILLIS: I was endeavouring to make a short and lucid explanation to the Prime Minister and I think his followers are rather

discourteous. They will not let him hear. They want him to strain his ears. Could the Prime Minister give that assurance, that he will take into consideration the granting of a sufficient amount of money in the pension to offset the increased cost of living since the termination of the war? It has been done for every other section in the country. Let us say, beginning the first of October; could we have that assurance? If we could, then as far as I am concerned, speaking for myself, I would be satisfied to let this go. It is not for political purposes; this is a grievance that should be rectified. With the assurance from the Minister of Veterans Affairs that the matter will be studied, I would suggest that the veterans affairs committee should be a standing committee of the house. If it were, a great deal of this tangle and all this wrangling would be got rid of in regard to these very complex problems, which in my opinion should be considered from time to time and ironed out by sensible people. If those who cannot recommend anything would keep their mouths shut a great deal of trouble would be avoided.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, first of all may I explain to my hon. friend that, as he knows, I was in the house at two o'clock. I received an important communication from England which had to be answered immediately and I left the house in order to dictate the draft of what should be sent in reply. So my absence for those few minutes has not been intended as any discourtesy or any indifference to the committee.

The hon. gentleman asks me to give an assurance in the name of the government. May I say to him that I have been careful at all times, as I intend to be, about giving assurances on anything until I have had an opportunity of conferring with my colleagues. I do not intend to speak in the name of the government on my own responsibility. When I speak in the name of the government I intend to do so with the knowledge that I have my colleagues' entire approval for the stand that I take. May I say that I hold that position in reference to any undertaking given by any minister. I do not recognize the right of any minister to give any undertaking in regard to any important public matter unless it has been discussed in the cabinet as a whole and agreed to by members of the council.

I am as anxious as anyone is to get through discussion at the present time and to have the house prorogue as soon as possible, but I am more concerned about seeing that what is done is done in the right order and in accordance with the rules of the house. My hon. friend says that he does not wish to embarrass anyone. Let me assure him that he will not embarrass this government if he puts this amendment to a vote, because no one is more anxious than I am to know exactly where the government stands in the eyes of the people, and that is where hon. gentlemen opposite or their representatives will place the government at this time. So I hope hon. members will feel free to do just as they please on this motion. I said a little earlier in the day that I was quite prepared to ask my colleagues to consider what is suggested in the second part of the amendment. Farther than that I will not go, and I will not be driven into any other position through fear of any vote in this house at this time.

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): I should like to say a word in order to explain my vote, because I may say frankly that I intend to vote to support the government. I know there may be some misunderstanding with regard to that among the veterans in my own riding. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) were a veteran as I am, I think he would appreciate that. It is rather unfair to put us in this position. I think every hon. member in this house, irrespective of party, has an equal interest in the veterans. I think every hon. member in this house wants to do the right thing by the veterans. It is unfortunate that we should be put in this position.

There is another thing that I wish to make clear. Mention has been made of whips. I have been asked in my own riding about whips. I have never yet seen the whip who could tell me what I must do. I want to make that clear. In saying that I think I speak for every member of the Liberal party, and certainly for those from British Columbia. No influence has ever been brought to bear on me by any member of the Liberal party or the cabinet. I may have made mistakes in the way I voted. I acted in what I thought were the best interests of the people of Canada, but those mistakes were made by me without any influence from any member of the cabinet or any whip. I want that to be clear.

I am sorry that the government cannot see its way clear to take immediate action in this connection. I think they should. I am frank about that. The leader of the C.C.F. (Mr. Coldwell) has in my opinion always been fair. This manoeuvre was probably only one for political position. If we are fair about it, we all know that it is done for certain reasons. I want to point out to

members of the C.C.F. party—and I do not blame them because they stand to gain—that Halifax demonstrated the fact that my good friend, that great Canadian gentleman, the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Bracken) will never be Prime Minister of Canada; and I do not think that Canada is yet ready for socialism.

I am sorry I have to vote against the amendment. I should like to do more for the veterans. But on a straight vote of confidence in this government, I must vote to support it. I think it would be a calamity to Canada if there were a change in government at this time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Kamloops.

Mr. BRYCE: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have risen in my seat at least eight times.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that some other hon. members have risen as often as he has.

Mr. BRYCE: I must bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I still think you are wrong.

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): What I wish to say is given point to by the remarks just made by the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank). Personally I am prepared and shall be happy to support this motion moved by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright). The hon member for Fraser Valley has clearly indicated the dilemma he is in, and I am sure he has the sympathy of all other hon. members, at least those on this side of the house. But it should be pointed out that the dilemma is not of his making. The dilemma is in respect of the position taken by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in connection with this motion.

An hon. MEMBER: What dilemma is there?

Mr. FULTON: It is clear that until the Prime Minister made his statement this morning there was some uncertainty as to what the government's attitude would be on this question, whether or not it would be called a vote of want of confidence. Since it has been indicated that it will be regarded as a vote of want of confidence, the dilemma of the hon. member for Fraser Valley has arisen.

Reference has already been made to what happened last year, Mr. Speaker, but I think we should remind ourselves of the facts with the record before us. Last year a similar situation arose when a motion was moved—

An hon. MEMBER: Repetition.

[Mr. Cruickshank.]

Mr. ABBOTT: Dispense.

Mr. FULTON: —which was not entirely in accordance with government policy.

An hon. MEMBER: It is already on the record.

Mr. FULTON: At one time it was suggested that it might be made a free vote. I understand that the minister of reconstruction (Mr. Howe) this morning stated that he did not suggest that it might be a free vote. I have in my hand *Hansard* for August 27, 1946, in which it is reported that Right Hon. C. D. Howe stated at page 5431:

> Nevertheless the government has no objection to an expression of opinion from the members of the house. I suggest that the vote should be a free expression regardless of party. The various members represent various economies in this country, and an expression of this kind should be the expression of the individual opinion of every hon. member.

Then he went on to say at page 5432:

> It will be in effect an expression of the opinion of members of this House of Commons that the subsidy policy of the government should be continued indefinitely.

An hon. MEMBER: Read the whole of it.

Mr. FULTON: I suggest that there was no reason for the Prime Minister to make this motion one of want of confidence, except that he knew that the government's lack of action would be criticized by a majority of members in the house if it were allowed to go as a free vote.

The Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) has criticized all members who support this motion because he says it will be the first time in thirty years that veterans affairs have been made the subject of politics. I do not accept that statement for a moment. For myself, my vote in support of this motion will be a mere indication of the fact that I am not satisfied with the lack of action shown by the government in dealing with this question. Particularly is that so since the ladies themselves were down here this session asking that some action be taken in this regard; so the matter certainly was brought to the attention of the government and nothing has been done about it. For these reasons I am going to support this motion if it is put to a vote, as I hope it will be.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Since my name has been mentioned several times—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

An hon. MEMBER: You have already spoken.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: On a question of privilege—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Is the hon. gentleman raising a question of privilege?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Yes; and I do not need any assistance from those members on my own side who come here only once a month. The previous speaker said the Prime Minister had ruled that this would be a vote of confidence. That ruling had not been made before. And since the hon. member for Kamloops made some reference to the hon. member for Fraser Valley let me tell him that my leader has been leader for twenty years, and this party has not had five leaders in five years.

Mr. WILLIAM BRYCE (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to get the floor for so long that there is practically nothing left for me to say. Everything I intended to say when I first rose at half-past eleven this morning has been said. On previous occasions I have left veterans affairs to the younger men who fought in the last war, but this matter affects my buddies of a previous day, the widows of many of those men, and those who are unemployable, between fifty and sixty years of age. I feel very strongly on this question, and I feel ashamed of the House of Commons today that politics should be brought into the consideration of this matter. This is something for the benefit of the men who offered their lives for us, and it should be kept on a much higher plane than that; yet here we have sunk to such a level that we are discussing matters of elections in connection with it.

People are suffering today in an attempt to live on $31 a month. The Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) said anyone supporting this amendment would be hurting the veterans. I can assure my right hon. friend that I have never hurt any veterans and never will; but I am supporting this amendment. I belong to the legion, and I have dozens of branches in my constituency. I have here a letter from the legion that has not yet been placed on record, and I am going to read just two paragraphs, because I know time is very valuable today. Every hon. member of this house has received a copy of this leter, which states:

> Before the session closes the Canadian Legion requests members of parliament to consider the plight of unemployable, totally disabled pensioners, and pensioned widows with children to support.

That is something worth while for this government to look after. Then the letter concludes with these words:

> We would, therefore, ask you to make this cause your own, so that the matter shall be dealt with before parliament prorogues.

It is because of this letter that I feel justified in rising today and suggesting to the government that something should be done; and I intend to support the motion.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I regret exceedingly that in the last hour or so the debate has taken the course it has taken. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has placed us in the position that whether or not we might have felt the purpose of the amendment had been served, we must now ask for a recorded vote of this house.

The resolution is very simple. The Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) said it was an amendment to the budget. It is nothing of the kind. If you will look at the resolution you will see that it merely states:

> This house is of the opinion that the government should give immediate consideration to the amending of the Pension Act and the War Veterans Allowance Act so as to provide increases in the basic disability pension, the war veterans allowance, and the allowance to veterans widows and orphans, to enable those receiving these pensions and allowances to meet the increased cost of living.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has not read all the motion. He has read part of it, but not the essential part. I would ask him please to read the part he left out.

Mr. COLDWELL: All I left out were the first words, which are:

> That all the words after the word "that" to the end of the question be left out, and the following words be inserted instead thereof.

That is, those words would replace the words, "that the Speaker do now leave the chair."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The motion was that the house should go into committee of supply in order that the government of the country might be carried on.

Mr. COLDWELL: We are not interfering with going into supply.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Oh, yes, you are.

Mr. COLDWELL: Oh, we can always find technicalities to excuse ourselves when we want to do something other than the thing we should do. However, altogether apart from that, the intent of the amendment is exactly as I stated it, and it seems to me it would have been very simple indeed for the government to give the assurance for which we asked.

After all, in April of this year, due to the policy of the government in removing controls, the cost of living jumped almost two points. In May the cost of living increased almost to the same extent. In fact the cost of living has risen sharply over the last few months and indeed since the end of the war. Consequently, having reached this point in the session, I think we are justified in asking that this be done, since no provision is being made anywhere in the measures now before the house, as far as we can tell, for meeting this very urgent situation. So I say that since the Prime Minister has thrown out the challenge we cannot do other than accept it.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I have just a word or two to say with regard to this amendment. It has been said that the government has been very generous, more generous than any other government in the world, and that may be true. What I regret is that the government has been generous to too many people, and there has been no complaint from anyone in the opposition when outsiders were given the preference in regard to everything. Therefore I find not that the government has not been sufficiently generous but that it has been too generous to one class of people. That is why the cases of some of our own soldiers should be adjusted.

The amendment asks for increases: first, in the basic disability pension; second, in the war veterans allowance; and third, in the allowance to veterans widows and orphans. It is not a question of increases to all but a matter of adjusting some pensions and allowances which have not been fairly established by the department. My great objection to the Department of Veterans Affairs is that it is a department where wrongs are not redressed; and they are not redressed because the minister seems indifferent to what goes on in the department. When my hon. friends speak of the high cost of living, it is true. Why is it so? It is the old story; it is on account of taxes. Why do we have taxes? We have them because of expenditures. When we were protesting against some expenditures running into billions of dollars all my hon. friends of the Conservative party, of the C.C.F. group and of the social credit group voted for those expenditures. I do not see how they can oppose government policy when they vote for increases in taxes, for increased expenditures and for increases in the cost of living.

Moreover, I cannot understand the logic of other parties which put candidates in the field against the government candidates.

We had a by-election in Halifax and I remember saying to one of my good Conservative friends—

Mr. SPEAKER: May I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that we are discussing an amendment.

Mr. POULIOT: Every hon. member has been speaking of the high cost of living. If you look at the amendment you will see that it has the cost of living as its basis. First, pensions are mentioned; second, allowances are mentioned and, third, allowances are mentioned again and it is said that they should be increased in order to meet the higher cost of living. The opposition parties are not logical in putting candidates up against the government and in opposing government policy in the house as they are doing by this motion. I am explaining what it is.

They are opposing government policy in the house today. This is the same thing as happened during the by-election. They all vote with the government on the main issues and then afterwards those issues are contested in the different elections. They seem to forget the votes they have cast in the house in support of government expenditures because they criticize them afterwards when they go to the people. They say, "This should not be done, that should not be done." How can they do that? As sensible men how can they swallow everything in the house and vomit it up outside the house? That is what they are doing all the time. When some hon. members try to protest against expenditures it is useless. It is always good to spend money.

We now have the results which were foreseen for a long time by a few of us. We were called all sorts of names because we spoke our minds. We supported a wholly Canadian policy, a policy that would put Canadians before all others. How is it that our returned men and the widows and orphans of ex-service men cannot get enough? It is simply because we have put foreigners, strangers and outsiders on an equal basis with those who served in the Canadian army, and sometimes we give them preference. That is why I objected to it.

I do not think the remedy is in an amendment like the one brought forward by the hon. member of the C.C.F. party. They are surprised when someone speaks to them in the language of common sense and shows them how they are acting contrary to their former votes. I can do that because I voted against it, but those who voted for it cannot

do it. I have the right to do it and I do it, not with joy but with regret. I should be delighted to err but I cannot.

I have no sympathy whatever for the Minister of Veterans Affairs and I do not think he deserves any. I appreciate the stand taken by the Prime Minister when he said in his own language that he was not going to be blackmailed by anyone, that he wanted to wait for the opportunity to make an announcement. That is the language of a leader. His policy is not going to be dictated by those who vote against it in the house, by those who belong to other groups. He should listen to his own supporters. He should draft his policies after consulting his own supporters. How is it that a young Conservative member gives a lecture to the Prime Minister because he has not answered properly a question put before the house by the C.C.F. group? The Prime Minister used the language of Asquith: he said, "Wait and see."

A lot has been done for the returned men, and I do not think they can complain. There are some wrongs which should be redressed; probably 10 or 15 per cent, but the soldiers have been well looked after theoretically. Some credit must be given to the government. I tell my hon. friends that I am not concerned about an election. If an election occurred tomorrow I would be in the hands of my electors. If they vote for me I shall be proud to represent them; if they vote against me, I shall return home and make more money with my law practice.

The question is not one of an election. The problems of the soldiers, the veterans, and their widows and orphans should not be made a political football. The last reason why I am bound to oppose this amendment is that I am anxious to get on with the estimates. I shall not say one word more. I want the estimates right away.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Wright), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Adamson
Archibald
Argue
Bentley
Blackmore
Blair
Boucher
Bowerman
Bracken
Bryce
Burton
Campbell
Caouette
Case
Castleden
Charlton
Church
Coldwell
Coyle
Diefenbaker
Fleming
Fraser
Fulton
Gillis
Graydon
Green
Hackett
Hansell
Harkness
Henderson
Herridge
Hlynka
Homuth
Irvine
Jackman
Jaques
Knowles
Lennard
Low
McCuaig
McCullough (Assiniboia)
Macdonnell (Muskoka-Ontario)
McKay
MacNicol
Probe
Quelch
Robinson (Bruce)
Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Timmins
Townley-Smith
Webb
White (Hastings-Peterborough)
Wright
Zaplitny—54.

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott
Beaudoin
Belzile
Benidickson
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Blanchette
Boivin
Bonnier
Bourget
Bridges
Brown
Claxton
Cloutier
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Coté (Verdun)
Cournoyer
Cruickshank
Denis
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Dubois
Emmerson
Eudes
Farquhar
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gariépy
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gladstone
Golding
Gour (Russell)
Gourd (Chapleau)
Hallé
Healy
Howe
Ilsley
Jean
Jutras
King, Mackenzie
Kirk
Lafontaine
Langlois
Lapointe
Laurendeau
Leger
Lesage
Little
McCann
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McIlraith
McIvor
Mackenzie
MacKinnon
MacNaught
Maloney
Marquis
Martin
Maybank
Mayhew
Mitchell
Mullins
Mutch
Nixon
Parent
Picard
Pouliot
Raymond (Wright)
Reid
Richard (Gloucester)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Rinfret
Robinson (Simcoe East)
Ross (Hamilton East)
St. Laurent
Stuart (Charlotte)
Tremblay
Tucker
Viau
Warren
Weir
Whitman
Winters—84.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): I was paired with the hon. member for London (Mr. Manross). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): I was paired. Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I was paired with the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Casselman). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): I was paired with the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Breithaupt). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I was paired with the hon. member for Inverness-Richmond (Mr. McGarry). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McLURE: I was paired with the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Dionne). Had I voted, I do not know how I would have voted.

Mr. STOKES: I was paired with the hon. member for Chambly-Rouville (Mr. Pinard). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MENARY: I was paired with the hon. member for Cape Breton North-Victoria (Mr. MacLean). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. LACOMBE: I was paired not with the hon. member for Champlain but with the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Motion (Mr. Mackenzie) agreed to, and the house went into supply, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

454. Departmental administration, $1,651,360

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): With the consent of the committee I wish to make a brief introduction to the presentation of the estimates of veterans affairs, which have been ready for over three months. It may be of assistance to hon. members if I make this brief statement regarding veterans affairs as a whole. The figures which I shall quote include the supplementary estimates which were tabled a few days ago. These aggregate $4,925,000, almost entirely for hospital and other treatment purposes.

The estimates now before the committee for all activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs for the fiscal year 1947-48 aggregate $450 million. The total estimates for 1946-47 were $749 million. The decrease is $299 million. These figures include statutory items as well as items to be voted. They also include, in addition to normal government services, the amounts required for loans and investments. A very large amount of the decrease is due to the fact that the payment of war service gratuities is now very nearly completed. There are also substantial reductions under a number of headings as follows:

Treatment and pension examinations for world war II	$21,000,000
Post-war discharge rehabilitation benefits	24,230,000
Hospital accommodation and facilities	13,000,000
Grants to veterans settled on provincial lands	1,000,000
Grants to Indian veterans settled on reserve lands	1,000,000

However, Mr. Chairman, largely because of an increase in the number of veterans entitled to war veterans allowance and to pension, there are certain votes in which the estimate for 1947-48 is greater than the estimate passed last year. We have been able to reduce the requested appropriations for all administrative items other than those related to the payment of pensions and war veterans allowances. Increases in these two items are directly related to the increased number of veterans who will be receiving benefits under this legislation.

While there is a very substantial reduction of $299 million in the estimates for the Department of Veterans Affairs this year, it is appropriate that I should assure the committee and the country that this reduction is due entirely to the fact that certain services and payments related to the demobilization period are very nearly completed. These reduced expenditures do not reflect any impairment in the high standard of services which parliament has authorized for war veterans. There is not, and there shall not be, any falling off in the quality of services which this country has rightfully insisted shall be available to former members of our armed forces.

I want to say a word about pension and to give a fairly graphic picture to the house. The total amount provided in the 1947-48 estimates for pensions for both world war I and world war II, is $80,750,000. Our appropriation for 1946-47 was $74,750,000, and the actual expenditure was $70,748,000. On May 31, 1947, there were 181,200 pensions in force representing an annual liability of $70,725,000. The pension liability is increasing at the rate of approximately $800,000 a month in Canada. Our estimated expenditures under this head for 1947-48, are based on the belief that this rate of increase will continue throughout the fiscal year.

I come to the question discussed earlier this morning of war veterans allowances. Let me give just a few facts. The four votes

providing for funds necessary to meet payments on account of the allowances authorized by the War Veterans Allowance Act total $14,480,000. Our estimate for 1946-47 was $14,180,000 and the actual expenditures were $12,000,000. On May 31 there were approximately 31,350 allowances in effect representing an annual liability of approximately $14,750,000.

It is necessary, sir, to provide funds to meet the liability we have under the act, although from actual experience we usually find that the full amount is not required because of the fact that recipients receive and report other incomes thereby permitting a reduction in the amount of allowances payable. There has been a steady increase in the amounts payable under this act for several years, and it is expected that this trend will continue owing to the fact that veterans of world war I are now entering the age at which they will be entitled to receive benefits.

Coming to the important question of treatment, the department's medical treatment services have been raised to a very high standard and have received commendation from many sources, especially one from Winnipeg the other day, from the Canadian Medical Association. During the fiscal year 1946-47 it was necessary to expand our treatment facilities rapidly to ensure that veterans might receive treatment of the high standard to which government policy entitles them. The several votes, including the supplementaries, providing funds necessary for the department's treatment services covering operation of hospitals, payments of allowances to veterans receiving treatment, and construction of hospitals, total the very great sum of $65,300,000. The decrease this year in our treatment service is $31 million. The actual expenditure was $78 million last year. Our hospital facilities are being improved and modified as rapidly as possible under present conditions, and the estimate of $10 million for this purpose represents our anticipation of the extent to which during the current fiscal year we shall be able to carry on with the construction of new hospitals, extensions to existing institutions, and modernizing the present premises.

It will be necessary during the year to close a number of hospitals which were opened primarily to meet the peak load during the demobilization period. These hospitals are being closed only after the number of patients reaches such a low figure that continued operation of the hospitals is not justified, and then only when other facilities for proper treatment of veterans are available in the area concerned or in adjacent areas.

In regard to benefits, a study of the department's estimates will show that provision is being made for the fiscal year 1947-48 to the extent of $94,850,000 for post-discharge rehabilitation benefits. This compares with the 1946-47 figure of $96 million, although our estimate last year was $119 million.

During the current fiscal year many veterans will reach the end of the period during which they have entitlement to certain benefits under the veterans rehabilitation act. This applies particularly to out-of-work allowances and in a lesser degree to vocational training. It is expected however that expenditures on account of "benefit awaiting returns" will continue at a high rate as veterans become established in their own businesses and upon farms.

Expenditures on account of university training are expected to reach a peak during 1947-48 at a sum in the neighbourhood of $39 million. The amount required for this purpose will, however, decline in future years as veterans complete their courses or cease to have entitlement to assistance. It has been gratifying to observe how remarkably well student veterans have done in their courses at the several universities across the whole dominion. They have ranked high among the winners of scholarships and prizes in our Canadian universities. I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that as a result of what this parliament has done, the contribution of these veteran graduates to the welfare of Canada will be such that the expenditure in training will always be regarded as one of the most profitable investments this country has ever made.

There is, sir, cause for gratification in the fact that the contributions to the unemployment insurance fund on account of veterans is continuing at a high rate. The significance of this fact is that the veterans of Canada are finding their place in the industrial life of this country. The Veterans Rehabilitation Act provides that when a veteran has spent approximately three months in insurable employment the Department of Veterans Affairs shall pay into the insurance fund a sum equivalent to the contributions which would have been paid had the veteran been engaged in that employment during the period of his service in the armed forces. Up to March 31, 1947, contributions amounting to $10,280,000 had been paid on behalf of more than 136,000 veterans. We estimate that we shall require $15,000,000 for this purpose during the present fiscal year.

I now come to gratuities. This is what the people of Canada have done. Payments on account of war service gratuities to which

veterans are entitled under the War Service Grants Act had reached the total of $453,350,000 on March 31, 1947. That is what the people of Canada have done, and rightly done, for those who served during the war and saved us. The amount paid during the last year was more than $221,000,000 for war service gratuities alone. Those moneys are paid over to the veteran in a series of monthly instalments immediately following his discharge. We now find that these payments have very largely been completed. This is a statutory item and only a fragmentary percentage of the original liability remains unpaid.

We did something else in this parliament, and we were the only country in the world that did it; I refer to reestablishment credits payable over a period of ten years. The amount of credit entered up to the account of veterans under the War Service Grants Act is slightly in excess of $365,000,000, which they can use for ten different purposes decided upon by this house in its wisdom. The amount to which veterans are still entitled as shown in the books is $191,000,000. Under the terms of the legislation this amount is available to them at any time within ten years from January 1, 1945, or the date of the veteran's discharge, whichever is the later date. The extent to which payments may be required during the coming year is impossible to estimate with precision, since it depends upon the impulses of possibly several hundred thousand veterans. The item is statutory. In making up the estimates we have thought it wise to count on a somewhat heavier demand during 1947-48 than was experienced last year.

Just one word on the Veterans Land Act. We have discussed it many times already during this session, and possibly I should not say much more. The settlement operations under the Veterans Land Act have now reached large proportions. The point I want to leave with the committee is this. We had some trouble with our housing, as hon. gentlemen know, but the larger operation has been tremendously successful. Up to April 30 of this year, qualification papers have been issued to 63,535 veterans. Loans and grants had been approved to a total of $128,746,308.

Mr. WRIGHT: Just at this point may I ask if the minister has the figures as to the veterans who have actually been settled?

Mr. MACKENZIE: No. I will get them. These were applied as follows: 14,817 farmers, $70,300,058; 10,990 small holders, $56,833,696; 427 commercial fishermen, $1,612,554. That makes a total of 26,234 veterans who had obtained financial assistance under the Veterans Land Act up to April 30 last. It is expected that by the end of the present fiscal year this number will be over 35,000. The veterans established under the act are meeting the terms of their agreements with complete satisfaction. For the last fiscal year—and I wish the committee would note this—95·2 per cent of maturities were paid by our settlers on the land; that is, world war II settlers. Repayments, including initial deposits, totalled $12,068,297. It will be observed that the appropriation asked for in connection with the administration of this act closely approximates the sum voted last year.

That, sir, is a synopsis of the activities of what I believe is today the largest department in this government, a department which, I may say, has received the kindly support of every party in the house, and certainly from my colleagues and my leader it has received the most marvellous and inspirational encouragement. If after thirty years in parliament I shall find it necessary to leave active public affairs, I shall never be so proud of anything in my life as of the work I was privileged to do during the last twelve years for the ex-servicemen of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): This morning I suggested to the minister that there should be a standing committee on veterans affairs, and this afternoon I understood the minister to say he was in favour of such a committee. I wonder if the minister would go a bit further and say he will have such a committee set up early next session.

Mr. MACKENZIE: As the Prime Minister said, no single minister makes a decision on behalf of this government, but it is my intention to recommend to my leader and my colleagues that we have a committee next year.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I thank the minister, and I know if he recommends it we will probably have a standing committee of the house on veterans affairs. It is hardly necessary to review the work of the veterans affairs committee during the two years it sat. As I said this morning, however, if this committee had been set up this session probably the motion and debate that took place today would have been avoided. Many times since last session the agitation on the part of various veterans' bodies in regard to the basic rate of pension must have been brought to the attention of the department. It has been brought up in the house many times and has been very actively discussed, particularly since last session, by branches of the legion all over Canada. I have noticed

press comments and reports covering large sections of this province, indicating that various branches of the legion have passed resolutions to be forwarded to the minister advocating an increase of from 25 per cent to 33⅓ per cent in the basic rate of pension. Before the minister's estimates are through I should be very glad if he would make some statement as to his attitude or feeling in the matter of an increase in the basic rate of pension, which rate I understand was set about 1920 and has not been increased since.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If my hon. friend will permit me I should like to give him the figures, and they very largely bear out what he has just said. In 1925 the cost of living index was 119·8. In 1939 it was approximately 100. On March 1, 1947, it was 128·9, and on April 1, 1947, it was 130·6. The increase between 1925 and 1947 was 7·6 per cent. The increase between 1939 and March 1, 1947, was 28·9 per cent, and the increase between 1939 and April 1, 1947, was 30·6 per cent. The annual pension liability, as I said, was $70,000,000. The cost of a 7·6 per cent increase would be $6,000,000. The cost of a 28·9 per cent increase would be $23,000,000.

Perhaps while I am on my feet my hon. friend would permit me to give the corresponding figures with regard to the war veterans allowance. The cost of living index in 1930 was 120·8. In 1939 it was approximately 100, and on March 1, 1947, it was 128·9. The increase from 1930 to 1947 was 6·7 per cent; the increase from 1939 to 1947 was 28·9 per cent. The annual war veterans allowance liability is $14,000,000. The cost of a 6·7 per cent increase would be $938,000, and the cost of a 28·9 per cent increase would be $4,046,000. War veterans allowances have been increased from $20 to $30.41, an increase of fifty per cent, or more than the increase in the cost of living from either 1930 or 1939.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I thank the minister; but when he got up I thought he was going to give us his attitude or his feeling toward an increase in the basic rate of pension. The figures he gave as to the increase in cost of living may be very interesting, but personally I have not much faith in the figures as to the cost of living as shown by the bureau of statistics, because I believe any housewife in Canada, no matter in what part of the country she lives, will tell you in no uncertain terms that the cost of living has increased far more than is shown by the figures issued by the bureau.

The minister said the veterans allowance had been increased from $20 to $30.41, an increase of 50 per cent. I would say to him at once that when the allowance was fixed at $20 it was far too low. The fact that there has been some slight increase, even though that increase amounts to 50 per cent, does not mean that the rate being paid today is at all adequate. The situation becomes more marked when you compare soldiers' pensions to old age pensions. As the minister knows the rate of old age pensions has greatly increased; and in Ontario, the province with which I am most familiar the mothers' allowance, workmen's compensation and similar allowances have been increased over the years. Surely the minister would be the last to say that the basic rate of pension or veterans' allowance should be lower than the allowance paid by any other department or any province. This morning I mentioned briefly the case of the widows of pensioners with a disability of fifty per cent. My understanding—and if I am wrong I hope the minister will correct me—is that on the death of a fifty per cent disability pensioner his widow will continue to receive something like $40 to $60 a month as a pension. If the pensioner has a disability of less than fifty per cent his widow will receive no pension, unless she comes under the provisions of the War Veterans Allowance Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If I may correct my hon. friend, just to keep the record straight, in the first case mentioned the widow is entitled to a pension of $60 a month.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): That is where the disability is fifty per cent or more?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Correct.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I am quite in agreement with that. There must have been some reason for fixing fifty per cent as the point of division, but it seems to me that when the husband dies the widow is more than ever in need of a pension, and should be entitled to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is fixed at fifty per cent because then there is a presumption that death was due to service.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I will not quarrel with that, either. But on even more than compassionate grounds I would say that if during his lifetime a man was in receipt of a pension of only five per cent or ten per cent or anything up to fifty per cent, on his death the widow should be entitled to more than she receives now, which I believe is something like one-third the pension which was paid to her husband. If the department realizes and admits that the

widow is entitled to a pension at all I cannot understand why, after the death of the pensioner, his widow should not be entitled to an adequate pension without having to apply under the War Veterans' Allowance Act, in which case she is met with this most unfair means test. I hope the minister will make some statement on this point which I consider to be very important.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I interrupt again? I am just trying to be helpful. If death is due to a disability attributable to service, then usually a pension is granted.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): At this late date, as far as the veterans of the first war are concerned, you will find that the members of the pension commission are as hard as the granite which comes from the land where the minister comes from.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I think the pension commission are very kind-hearted people.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I should like to mention a matter which came up on June 9 when the Minister of Finance had his budget resolutions before the house. This had to do with part of the reestablishment credit which is paid to a veteran attending university. The details may be found on page 3942 of *Hansard*. I referred to the case of a married veteran attending university who was receiving $60 per month—say he receives $60 during the university period. His wife is working. The Minister of Finance told me that in computing the amount of income tax payable by the wife she would deduct from the $600 the veteran received an amount of $250, and all over the $250 would be deducted from the exemption of $1,500 allowed to the wife and she would pay tax accordingly.

The Minister of Finance pointed out that this particular wife was not supporting her husband because the husband was getting the allowance. I tried to point out to the Minister of Finance on that occasion that this was not a matter of a husband receiving income or salary, that the student veteran was actually receiving a part of his reestablishment credit. As I understand it, no part of a gratuity, reestablishment credit or any benefit received because of war service is taxable in any way.

I understand further from the Minister of Finance that a student veteran who took a job during the summer and earned $500 or $800 or whatever it might be would have to add to that amount the $600 he was receiving as a reestablishment credit in computing his income tax. If that is so, I think it is most unfair to the veteran. The minister knows that many representations were made in the veterans committee that the $60 a month was not sufficient. If the minister knows anything about conditions in Toronto as far as board, transportation and other things are concerned—

Mr. MACKENZIE: It would be $80 a month.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): In this case the wife was working and he got only $60. I think the minister will find that it would be most difficut to get along on $60 a month. I heard the minister refer once in the veterans affairs committee to the time when he went to school. I agree with him because I know when I went to school $60 would have been a great deal of money. Unfortunately today in Toronto, and I think this would apply to practically every university town, $60 a month is quite small.

The veteran should be encouraged to take employment during the summer in order to earn money to help him through the next year. He must also provide for the time when the allowance of $60 a month will run out because his period of entitlement may be only twelve months or so. If what I say is correct and if the explanation given by the Minister of Finance is correct, many of the veterans attending university are going to be sadly disillusioned about the $60 a month they are getting.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I thank my hon. friend most sincerely for his observations. I shall renew my investigations of the situation which he has described.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I appreciate what the minister has said but I think he should go farther. These men will be taxed for their earnings in 1946 and they will be subject to tax for this year. The minister may recall the item which appeared in the press of yesterday that tuition fees at the university of Toronto were being increased by at least twenty per cent. I will leave it at that and hope that the minister will make an investigation into this unfortunate matter. If he finds the facts are as I have stated them I hope they will be corrected.

Just a word about the pension commission which the minister says is very kind-hearted. I have never found them to be that way. The minister will recall that the old question of preenlistment disability came up at many meetings of the veterans affairs committee and was the subject of discussion along with the question of the benefit of the doubt. Can the minister assure the committee that the

pension commission are dealing fairly with the veterans in connection with preenlistment disability?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I happen to know every member of the pension commission. They are all men who served; they are comrades of my hon. friend and of myself. I know how sympathetic they are. The chairman is present and I know how sympathetic he is to the type of case mentioned by my hon. friend. I can assure him that every sympathy and consideration will be given to preenlistment conditions.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): That sounds very nice if that is actually the way it works out. I should like to explain what often happens. When a veteran is up before this kind-hearted pension commission he is often faced with his medical sheet or other records and he is shown where he answered a question asked by a doctor or some other examiner. That answer probably referred to a difficulty that occurred many years ago but we find this kind-hearted pension commission instantly pouncing on that one point and taking the position that whatever the present disability is, it is due to a preenlistment condition which was not aggravated by war service.

In many cases information is obtained from the soldier in connection with these matters in a rather unfair way. He is not told that anything he says may have some bearing on a claim he might make for pension in the future. When these cases are taken up a letter comes back from the pension commission relating the condition to something back in 1932, 1935 or in the 1920's. It is stated that in the opinion of the medical officers of the pension commission that is responsible for the present condition. If a pension is granted it is on a small scale because they claim that practically the whole disability is due to something that happened before enlistment. The medical examination of any soldier who joined the army in 1942 was a great deal stiffer than the examination the minister and I went through in 1914. The soldier was examined thoroughly in every way by specialists. Every part of his body was examined, and he was X-rayed, and it was pretty difficult to put anything over. The soldier got a more thorough examination than he would get if he was applying for a policy of $5,000, $10,000 or $25,000 from any insurance company in Ontario. I say to the minister again that after the soldier has had this most thorough medical examination and has been accepted in the army with A-1 category, anything that happens to him after that should be attributed to his war service irrespective of what the kind-hearted pension commissioners may say, irrespective of what documents the medical officers of the pension board may sign, and a pension should be awarded to the soldier on the basis of his disability.

At the conclusion of his remarks the minister referred briefly to the Veterans Land Act. I for one would like the minister to make a further statement on veterans housing, which is a very important matter, not in any one isolated spot but across the whole dominion.

Mr. MACKENZIE: A complete and comprehensive report on veterans housing has been prepared and is now available, and when we come to that item I shall be only too glad to table it or to let any hon. member of the house have a copy of it. It deals with every single project in every province in the dominion and with what has been accomplished, and the general conclusion of that report is that the repairs will be completed at the end of this month of July. I have not the report before me at the moment but I shall be glad to table it at the commencement of proceedings tomorrow, if we last that long.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): Would the minister make a statement on one further matter which I brought before the house some two or three weeks ago in regard to the Veterans Taxi Owners Association of Montreal? At that time I understood the minister to say that an investigation was being made or a report was being obtained, and I rather expected that following that the minister would make a statement to the house. I noticed a press dispatch from Montreal dated yesterday which stated that Major Ferland, formerly with the Department of Veterans Affairs, had been before the court on that day and that one Colonel Hay of the Department of Veterans Affairs had made the statement that at the time this taxi association was formed Major Ferland was an official of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and further that many of the veterans involved in this taxi association had called at Major Ferland's office in the Department of Veterans Affairs to pay their fees. I hope the minister has the report or the particulars, because these boys are anxious to know just what the Minister of Veterans Affairs is going to do to help them.

I hope the minister will also tell the committee whether or not he favours and will advocate an increase of the basic rate of pension and the rates under the War Veterans Allowance Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE: In regard to the first question, I have received a report, which I have not under my hand but of which I shall be glad to send my hon. friend a copy, in regard to the Veterans Taxi Owners Association. There are two angles to the situation, with which I was not very familiar. In regard to increasing the basic pension, that is a matter of government policy which will be considered during the recess and will be further considered by the special committee on veterans affairs, I hope, which will be set up early next session.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): Would the minister say he was sympathetic to recommending an increase in the basic pension? Surely he will go that far. He can only speak for himself.

Mr. QUELCH: Mr. Chairman, it is approximately one year ago that the veterans committee completed their work on the veterans charter, and I think generally speaking, we all felt that we had completed a pretty good job in so far as the programme of rehabilitation for the veteran of world war II was concerned. But the minister will remember that many members expressed a good deal of dissatisfaction with the programme for the veterans of the two wars. We realized that there was no chance of a veteran of the two wars being able to take advantage of the Veterans Land Act on account of his age, and we also realized there was not the opportunity for the older veteran to get employment today in competition with younger men. However, while we were generally satisfied with the programme of rehabilitation for the veteran of world war II, we were not by any means satisfied with the pension bill which was submitted to the house. The minister will remember that the pension bill which was submitted to the house last year did not represent the unanimous view of the members of the veterans committee. It did not even represent the will of the majority of that committee. As I said this morning it merely represented the will of the government as put forward by the Minister of Veterans Affairs. As I intend to deal with this subject at some length I shall refresh the memory of the house as to what took place at that time.

A draft bill was submitted to the veterans affairs committee, and we spent many days and weeks considering that draft. Finally we completed a bill that did receive the unanimous approval of the members of that committee on every main point. Then we held meetings in camera and the minister told us that the government was not prepared to accept the amendments we had made to that draft bill, and in view of the fact that the amendments we had moved would have involved an increase in expenditure the minister had the power to veto those amendments. It will be recalled that some of the Liberal members of the committee then substituted a number of amendments, and as there was a sufficient number of Liberal members on the committee to force those amendments through, they carried. Therefore the bill submitted to the house was a bill that represented the opinion of the government rather than the opinion of the veterans committee. It is important to keep that point in mind, because from time to time we are going to hear in this house that that bill was recommended by the veterans affairs committee. That bill did not represent the majority opinion of the members of the veterans affairs committee. I remind the committee of that, because until the amendments we originally made to the draft bill are incorporated in the Pension Act and until certain other undesirable features are dealt with I am afraid that many veterans will fail to get a square deal under the Pension Act.

Two of the main points at issue were the insurance principle, which was reinstated in the act, and the question of cases of pre-enlistment origin. There is still a good deal of dissatisfaction on that question. The figures given to us at that time were that at the end of December, 1945, 7,810 men had been refused pensions on the grounds that their disability was of a pre-enlistment origin. These men had served overseas, were classified as fit on enlistment and had been discharged as unfit. Many members of the veterans committee have come in contact with veterans who they found had been severely penalized as a result of that ruling. The great majority of the committee were of the opinion that an applicant's condition as recorded at the time of enlistment should be presumed to be his actual condition. I remember that the hon. member for Vancouver South moved an amendment along that line and it received the support of the committee but later on was ruled out. Further, in that connection we were of the opinion that any subsequent deterioration during service should be recognized as the result of that service and consequently a veteran should be pensionable for that impaired condition unless that condition had been recorded prior to enlistment. We had already struck out the words "wilfully concealed". However, as I say, the government was not prepared to accept that amendment.

A change was made in the section dealing with the benefit of the doubt, and in the present act that section is section 62, which I shall read. It is supposed to give the veteran the benefit of doubt. It states:

> Notwithstanding anything in this act, on any application for pension, the applicant shall be entitled to the benefit of the doubt, which shall mean that it shall not be necessary for him to adduce conclusive proof of his right to the pension applied for, but the body adjudicating on the claim shall be entitled to draw and shall from all the circumstances of the case, the evidence adduced and medical opinions, all reasonable inferences and presumptions in favour of the applicant.

But as I shall show later on, apparently cases still come before the pensions commission in which the veteran does not appear to receive the benefit of the doubt. Furthermore if the pension commission feel that even though they give the veteran the benefit of the doubt they are not able to award a pension there is another section under which the pension can be granted on compassionate grounds for meritorious service. I refer to section 21. Section 21 reads:

> The commission may, on special application in that behalf, grant a compassionate pension, allowance or supplementary award in any case which it considers to be specially meritorious, but in which the commission has decided that the applicant is otherwise unqualified to receive such an award or supplementary award under this act.

With sections 62 and 21 one might argue, surely the interests of the veterans are fully protected. When we were discussing this matter in the committee we were asked to wait and see how these sections, or section 62 as redrafted, worked before going any farther. But section 62 does not appear to carry very much weight with the pension commission, and the commission seems to be loath indeed to use section 21. It seems to me that the Department of Veterans Affairs invariably uses the war veteran's allowance to take care of such cases. It must be remembered that the war veterans allowance does not provide anything like the same amount of protection that the pension does. In the first place the amount is less; in the second there is a means test applied to the war veteran's allowance, and in the third place the dependents of a pensioner are protected to a far greater extent than under the war veterans allowance.

When the veterans committee sat in 1945-46 its whole time was taken up with work on the charter. We knew very well that if we started to deal with individual cases we would have so much work on our hands that it would bog down and we would never complete the charter. Therefore it was agreed that at that time we would not deal with any individual cases. But as I have already mentioned, when dissatisfaction was expressed the minister suggested that we should wait for a year to go by and see how the charter as it is now constituted worked out in the interests of the veterans. A year later many feel that there are certain sections of certain acts that should be amended, and at the present moment I have especially in mind the Pension Act. I should like the minister to say whether it is his opinion that when the veterans committee is set up next year—I understand that he is going to try to set up the committee next year—it would not be possible for that committee to make a new departure. I think that committee could act as a kind of board of review to deal with individual cases to see just exactly how the veterans charter is working out in actual practice. I suggest that the various veterans' organizations throughout the country be allowed to bring forward their strongest cases. Then we could act as a kind of board of review to see whether or not the charter is working in their interests, and if we were satisfied that it was not, the government should be prepared to pass the amendments which are necessary to make it work better.

The minister knows that in the past it has never been my practice to recite individual cases in the house. Personally when I brought cases before any branch of the Department of Veterans Affairs I have received every consideration; but on the other hand the number of cases with which we can deal are limited, as the minister knows. I think he will agree that it should not be necessary for any veteran to bring his case before a member of parliament. He should be able to receive the same satisfaction by bringing up the case himself as when he brings it to the attention of a member of parliament, and it does not seem to me that that was always so. Therefore at this time I wish to cite the case of one old veteran who I believe has failed to get the benefit of the doubt or to be dealt with as a meritorious case. While I do not like to take up the time of the committee at this stage of the session, I think I am justified in taking a fair amount of time to recite the case of John V. Thom, M.M., 21st battery, C.E.F., in the war of 1914-18. His regimental number is 86684. I may say that this case was referred to me by Mr. Walter H. Kirchner, M.C., D.C.M., a veteran of 1914-18. Whem Mr. Kirchner brought that case to my attention I asked one or two people just what kind of organization the Canadian Combat Veterans Association was. They stated that it was not a very strong organization and did not represent a very large number of veterans.

Therefore I mentioned that fact to Mr. Kirchner and I received this letter which in fairness to Mr. Kirchner I think I should place on record to show what backing Mr. Kirchner has in bringing forward this case and others at this time.

Dear Mr. Quelch:

In view of the fact that the representations I am making concern the well-being of certain classifications of the disabled men of two generations of combatants, may I cite other more powerful numerical groups who by their actions vouch for my bona fides. The Canadian Combat Veterans Association Incorporated was formed in the year 1937, and we are now in the eleventh year of our history as an organization whose work is confined to one particular sphere, namely, the implications of the Military Pensions Act where its democratic administration is concerned.

Our charter is granted under the Societies Act of British Columbia. Our membership under the charter is confined definitely to the men (and women) of world wars I and II, who have actually seen service in the forward areas of war. We have no "honorary" membership, neither do we canvass membership. Those whom we admit have to be recommended by our membership, and we are very particular in this regard to see that our charter is not violated.

Regarding funds from other sources: In the year 1941, when I gave evidence before the parliamentary committee on veterans affairs, the dominion command of the Canadian Legion, through their president, asked if they could make a donation towards the expenses of our representations, which was accepted and acknowledged by letter. The dominion command of the Army and Navy Veterans' Association, Inc., also made fairly substantial donations at the same time, and subsequently their provincial command, in British Columbia. Donations have also been received from units of the Canadian Legion, both in Vancouver and throughout the province. Donations have also been received from other responsible veteran groups—all unsolicited, as our records will testify. Copy of the letter passed to you, from the pension adjustment officer of the Army and Navy Veterans Association, in British Columbia (Mr. J. H. MacLeod), is a more recent contribution from one of the numerically powerful veteran groups. The latter donation is important because the representative of the unit concerned is undoubtedly one of the ablest advocates in the dominion on the military pensions legislation.

The donations which have been made to us as an association from the two senior and numerically strong veteran groups is due to the fact that some of the vital matters I have presented to the membership of the House of Commons require specialized knowledge of the legislation in certain spheres, and my position in this regard, as the secretary of the Canadian Combat Veterans Association, is generally accepted among veterans' associations throughout the dominion.

As to my personal status, the brochure of April, 1947, which is in the hands of the membership of the House of Commons, makes this clear.

Thanking you, . . .

[Mr. Quelch.]

And so on. I want to refer to the letter which he mentions as having been written by Mr. J. H. MacLeod, secretary of the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans' Association of Canada. This letter reads:

Dear Comrade Kirchner:—I have for acknowledgement your letter of the 12th, with enclosures, for which many thanks.

It is pleasing to note that your latest crusade has reached its culminating point. Let us hope that you will again be successful in extracting further concessions from those in the seats of the mighty for the amelioration of our deserving comrades in distressed circumstances.

The necessity for drastic revision of the Pension Act and treatment regulations becomes more apparent every day.

We now have on our hands worthy veterans of both wars: men with meritorious front-line service, in many cases pensioned for wounds, who are refused treatment for neuro-psychosis, epileptic and other conditions which, on any reasonable construction, must be referred to the stress and strain of war. These men are being thrown on relatives, or on the community at large, for treatment and maintenance. All too many are finally relegated to mental hospitals (insane asylums) because of the department's obstinate stand in these matters. Surely the time has arrived when something must be done to remedy these obvious defects in our Pension Act and in its administration.

I quoted that letter to show that Mr. Kirchner, in bringing forward these cases, does not represent merely the Canadian Combat Veterans' Association, but has a great deal of backing from the Canadian Legion and the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans' Association of Canada.

Coming back to the case of Mr. John Thom, this man enlisted on November 12, 1914 in the artillery and served overseas in the 21st battery, C.F.A. He went to France on January 18, 1916 and served in France until December 29, 1918. He saw action for the first time on the Ploegsteert front, was awarded the Military Medal for action on Vimy Ridge, was buried by the explosion of an ammunition dump, and saw service at Passchendaele, Amiens, Arras and on the Drocourt-Quéant line. He was discharged in Canada on April 5, 1919, after three years service in France and four and a half years altogether.

I would like to read to the house Mr. John Thom's medical history as given by himself. I could put it in my own words but I think it is better to read his own statement so that no one can accuse me of having distorted it in any way. Here is an example of a man who enlisted in a good state of health, having a strong physique. He had a splendid war record and then failed to get a square deal. Let me read the medical history of Mr. Thom, from 1919 onwards:

First I want to point out that at no time has there been any dispute regarding the extent

of my sickness, and that since November, 1928, I have been regarded as 100 per cent disabled; in fact, when my financial circumstances, six years ago, made it necessary for me to apply for the war veterans' allowance, it was only a matter of form granting me the same. (2) At my date of discharge, April 5, 1919, my medical history sheet shows that I had defective hearing of the right ear, caused by my being in an explosion in the summer of 1917—which left me unconscious for hours, and damaged my inner ear. (3) One month after discharge I went to work with the C.P.R. dining car department, running from Vancouver to Winnipeg. On these trips I began being bothered with severe headaches and dizzy spells; and of course my hearing was bad. As these spells became more frequent I called at the Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment (S.C.R.), and asked them to check over my ear. The doctor's report was that there were scars on the ear drum, but that not much could be done about it. As time went along these spells became more frequent, and much more severe, until in the summer of 1925—after one severe attack, in which I became unconscious, the ear became badly infected and started to discharge. When I reported to Dr. De Muth, the C.P.R. doctor, he sent me to Dr. Grant Lawrence, the ear specialist. As my ear was in such a bad state it eventually affected my eyes. (I have now almost lost the sight of my left eye.) (4) By this time I found I was unable to carry on with the C.P.R., so I got leave of absence and went into the hotel business, in Vancouver, for myself. Although I was making a nice return out of the business I eventually had to sell out as the noise and excitement connected with the hotel business seemed to aggravate my head condition.

(5) About this time (1927), I was still attending Dr. Grant Lawrence, with my ears and eyes. As the trouble seemed chronic I decided it was a matter for the pension board. My complaint was headaches, dizziness and deafness. In a very short time I was granted a 10 per cent pension for otitis media, retroactive to my date of discharge.

(6) By the spring of 1928 I thought I was a little better and took a job as sales manager for the Dominion American Industries Limited, but as soon as I started to work I began getting worse again, having to miss every other day at work; and although the company was very nice about it, I could see that it wasn't fair to them, so I resigned in November, 1928. It was at this time, on applying to the Pension Department that I found out my mistake: in my ignorance of medical terms I thought that otitis media included my whole head condition, but I was informed that it was only the hearing, and that was what I was pensioned for, and not the headaches, etc.

(7) Eventually they decided to give me a hearing, at which they decided to give me a five per cent increase for otitis media—but that the cause of the headaches, etc., was neurasthenia. As I had been in Shaughnessy hospital several times, and nothing seemed to be done for my head, a friend of mine made arrangements for three of the leading specialists to examine me and find out the source of my trouble; the three specialists were: Dr. Des Brisay—Diagnosis specialist; Dr. F. Emmons, brain specialist; Dr. Grant Lawrence, ear, eye and nose specialist.

(8) As their report made it clear to me that my ear condition was the cause of my headaches and eye trouble, and that it was the headaches that were the cause of the neurasthenia, I asked the department to give me a hearing in front of a quorum.

(9) Eventually the hearing was held with Colonel Cy Peck, V.C., and another gentleman sitting on the board. At the hearing, as you will see by the evidence on file at Shaughnessy, the three doctors when asked if the otitis media was the cause of the headaches, etc., they definitely stated, "Yes"; and Dr. Emmons explained in detail how the headaches were caused.

Colonel Cy Peck, V.C., seemed so convinced that when we asked to cross-examine the departmental doctors he said that would be unnecessary—as there was no room for argument. You can imagine my surprise when I received the decision from Ottawa, when they did not even mention the specialist's evidence, but stated that some Doctor Baillie of Christie street hospital, Toronto—who had never seen me, or examined me—had decided that my headaches were not caused by my ear trouble—and so the board decided not to give me any increase on my pension.

As I thought that the court reporter might have made some mistake in taking down the evidence, I went up to Shaughnessy, and as I am not allowed to see my file personally, I asked Mr. Derby, district administrator, if he would mind reading the evidence, as I was sure there was some mistake somewhere. But the evidence was correct, so the slip must have been somewhere else. Of course, knowing Mr. Derby's official position I didn't embarrass him by asking his opinion, but I could see he was just as surprised at the board's decision as I was.

After that, I applied to the appeal board, and asked to be notified when it would come up at Ottawa, so that I could have someone to represent me. They agreed to do so, but the first thing I knew, the case was over, and as far as I know I wasn't represented by anyone.

There is just one more item that I would like to draw to your attention: it is regarding the War Measures Act, which doesn't allow any pills which contain any ingredients required for war purposes given for non-pensionable disabilities. As I get the pills for my headaches, I was notified; but as soon as I showed Doctor Jones at Shaughnessy, Doctor DesBrisay's report, he immediately notified the dispensary that I was entitled to the pills, and to fill my prescription. Now, I don't think that if a man of Doctor Jones' standing, after reading Doctor DesBrisay's report, comes to the decision that my head trouble comes from my pensionable disability, that a Doctor Baillie of Toronto—who has never seen me—is qualified to pass an opinion in the negative with the same evidence in the matter of my pension.

The whole point that I think is so unfair is that the board took the evidence of one doctor, who had never seen me, against three specialists, who had thoroughly examined me. And, if their evidence hadn't been as conclusive as it was—I was still entitled to the "benefit of the doubt" clause in the Pension Act, which my war record certainly entitled me to.

I should like to refer to the evidence of these three specialists to whom Mr. Thom refers in his statement. The three specialists

mentioned were: first, Doctor W. F. Emmons of Vancouver. According to the evidence given to the Canadian pension commission in 1938, Doctor Emmons was a graduate of McGill, 1924; three years on staff of McGill, physiology, and five years at Mayo clinic studying neurology. Practised in Vancouver for past six years—that is, years prior to 1938. Examined patient J. Thom in 1935. I shall read only the opinion of Doctor Emmons at the end of his statement. It is as follows:

It is my opinion that this man is suffering from intermittent attacks of severe vertigo due to inflammatory irritation of the right vestibular apparatus, which are a definite and integral part of the former right otitis media, for which he is already being pensioned. It is quite probable that the neurosis and headaches are attributable to the fear of the attacks of vertigo which, in turn, are definitely connected with his otitis media.

Then, Doctor Grant Lawrence, Vancouver, according to the evidence submitted to the Canadian pension commission in 1938, was a specialist, eye, ear, nose and throat; graduate McGill, 1917; post-graduate work, New York, Vienna, London; sixteen years' practice Vancouver. In his statement, and again I will just give the final paragraph, he states:

All hearing tests indicate a chronic otitis media, probably involving the inner ear and bony labyrinth. His attacks of iritis and headaches are suggestive of a foci of infection, and I would consider his ear as the probable cause.

The last specialist was Doctor DesBrisay of Vancouver who, according to the evidence submitted to the Canadian pension committee in 1938, is a specialist in internal medicine; graduate McGill, 1917; after overseas service in 1919, one and a half years' internship at Vancouver and Chicago; two years in Mayo clinic in medicine; three years Lockwood clinic, Toronto; five years assistant professor of medicine at Dartmouth, New Hampshire; practised internal medicine, Vancouver, for past eight years—that is for eight years prior to 1938. Here is his statement, and again I just read the opinion at the end of it:

Opinion: Chronic otitis media, with labyrinthitis and associated headaches.

I believe that this man's headaches are due to the ear condition. I would advise extraction of the questionable tooth, because of the history of iritis. I do not think that the tooth could have any bearing on the headaches.

There you have two of the doctors saying that the headaches are due to the condition which is pensionable, and the other doctor saying that in his opinion the headaches are probably due to that cause.

It is interesting to note that the appeal board which granted Mr. Thom's application to have his case reopened drew special attention to the evidence of these three specialists. The decision handed down by the appeal board in January, 1945, states:

The appeal board doth order that this application be granted.

The members of the appeal board were J. K. Matheson, H. A. Bridges and R. J. Gordon. Then under the heading of "Reasons for decision" we find this, and I will just read the last paragraph, unless the minister wants me to quote the whole statement. The last paragraph reads:

While, in some respects, this application is one which might be dealt with on a "consequential" basis by the Canadian pension commission, the board has finally decided that a prima facie case for leave to reopen has been made out, particularly having regard to exhibits 36 and 37, in the summary of evidence, and the evidence of Doctors Grant Lawrence, H. A. DesBrisay and W. F. Emmons, at the quorum hearing.

The application for leave to reopen is therefore granted.

Then the pension commission wrote this letter to Mr. Thom after his case had come before them:

Ottawa, August 9, 1946.

Mr. John Thom,
3852 West 29th Avenue,
Vancouver, B.C.

The commissioners have reviewed your application for entitlement in respect of Nervous Condition.

After careful and sympathetic consideration of the evidence and record before them they are regretfully of the opinion that the condition has no relation to your service, and therefore, it is not pensionable. Their decision follows:

The applicant served from November, 1914 to April, 1919, with service in France.

He is in receipt of pension at the rate of twenty per cent for chronic suppurative otitis media, incurred during service. He is now claiming in respect of nervous condition.

There is no reference to any nervous condition during service, or post-discharge, until 1927. The commission is not able to find evidence to connect this condition with service, and rules—

Nervous condition—not attributable to service.

R. Simpson,
Assistant Secretary.

The commission apparently completely disregarded the evidence of the three specialists giving his nervous condition as a pensionable disability. I think it is of special interest in view of the fact that the appeal board definitely drew the attention of the pension commission to the evidence of those three specialists. I have in my hand a letter which seems to have a bearing on this matter. It was written by J. Z. Taylor, chairman of the Canadian pension commission, dated Nov-

ember 27, 1934, and addressed to the present Minister of Veterans Affairs. The letter reads:

Dear Captain Mackenzie, —
re Lieut. Walter H. Kirchner, M.C., D.C.M.—

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member is taking up an individual case which, of course, is his right. But I am advised that in this case the pension commission has granted entitlement for neurasthenia incurred during service. The pension is to be effective twelve months prior to the date of the decision; and the actual degree of disability from the neurasthenia is to be assessed as quickly as possible.

Mr. QUELCH: When was that decision made?

Mr. TUCKER: The decision has been made, and this just brings up the question of what little progress we can make if we take up individual cases. This gentleman was given the right to apply for a second hearing, and these things naturally go ahead in the ordinary course of events. If we are to try to review every single pension case I do not know when we shall get through. The hon. member has already spoken for forty minutes. I do not want to make any complaint about that, but I suggest that other hon. members know of cases which they have an equal right to bring up and read to the committee at much greater length. The hon. member also knows that these matters are confided to a judicial commission, and that this has been done with the idea that there should be no interference on the part of the government with the commission. He also knows that the minister has said he will recommend that a committee be set up next year which can look into all these individual cases. In the light of all this; in the light of the decision rendered in this particular case, which shows that these matters are going through in the ordinary course of events, and since the hon. member has taken forty minutes to deal with a case in which entitlement has been granted in the ordinary course of events, I appeal to the hon. member to let these items go through. Then, if he does not think these matters are being dealt with properly he may take them up before a committee which can deal with them much better than they can be dealt with in this house.

Mr. QUELCH: I have been in the house since 1935, and this is the first time I have brought up an individual case. We spent two years in drafting a charter for the veterans. Many members of the committee expressed the opinion that the Pension Act was not satisfactory, and that veterans would not get a square deal under it. We were told to wait for a year to see how it would work out. I am giving as an example a case in which I consider a man has not received the benefit of the doubt under section 62. It is all very well for the parliamentary assistant to say this case has now been dealt with, but this matter has been under consideration since 1927. How long does a veteran have to wait to get justice? This case was first brought up in 1927, and now we are told the man may receive a pension. The granting of entitlement does not necessarily mean he will get the pension he should get. It does not necessarily mean he will get a pension for the full disability; we have to wait and see the attitude of the pension commission. I realize that since I have spoken for forty minutes I can continue only with the unanimous consent of the house.

Mr. ABBOTT: No; we are in committee.

Mr. QUELCH: If I cannot go on now I shall have to rise again in a few moments and continue my presentation of the case. Therefore I ask that I be allowed to conclude now, because I can finish in a few minutes and save a good deal of time.

Mr. TUCKER: You have the right now because I made an interjection.

Mr. QUELCH: I should like to read this letter from Mr. Justice Taylor, because it seems to imply that when an appeal board directs the attention of the commission to certain specific evidence they should give every attention to it. I forget just what point I had reached in reading the letter, so perhaps I had better start it again:

Captain The Hon. Ian A. Mackenzie, M.P.
Vancouver, B.C.

Dear Capt. Mackenzie:

re Lieutenant Walter H. Kirchner, M.C., D.C.M.

I have your letter of the 16th November.

I have just had an opportunity of reading the reasons given by members of the pension appeal court for setting aside the decision of the quorum of the commission. I presume a copy of these reasons have been sent to this officer and that you have had the opportunity of seeing them.

The decision, as I know you thoroughly understand, is binding upon the commission and while the court has granted leave for us to entertain a fresh application, in the hearing of that application we must carry out the suggestion offered by the court.

In the event of the case reaching the appeal court for a second time we would be subject to rather severe criticism if we reheard the case without trying, at least, to obtain the evidence which they suggest is available.

In this case the pension commission had the evidence before them, but it did not seem to carry very much weight with them, though that evidence was given by three outstanding specialists. I realize that some of the statements I have read into the record may be questioned, so I should like to put on record a number of questions which perhaps the minister could answer when we come to the item dealing with pensions. In addition to placing the questions on *Hansard*, I shall send a copy to the minister, because they are lengthy. In order to complete the history and clarify the whole case, these are the questions I should like answered:

Did John V. Thom, M.M., No. 86684, 21st Battery, Canadian Field Artillery, enlist in the 1st great war, November 12, 1914, at Regina, Saskatchewan, classified physically A.I., with no mental or physical defects; age twenty-two?

Was he discharged April 9, 1919, completing four and a half years of service?

Did he spend three years of this time in France as a combatant, in the forward areas of war, identified with the great battles of the Canadian army corps, and decorated with the Military Medal for bravery?

Was he wounded May 12, 1917, but remained on duty in the line?

Did he suffer attacks of dysentery in September, 1918?

Was he blown up and buried by an exploding ammunition dump, from the direct hit of a German high explosive shell?

Was he dug out of debris and earth by his comrades, in a semi-conscious condition, sick and vomiting and subsequently evacuated to a rest camp for several weeks to recover?

Does his medical and military record and personal narrative of events show he never has recovered from that experience, although carrying on again in the line until the war ended?

Did other members of his battery suffer similar injuries from the exploding ammunition dump?

Were several men of the battery killed by the same explosion?

Are sworn affidavits of eye witnesses to these events recorded on John Thom's departmental file and in the files of the Department of National Defence?

Was he certified by departmental specialists, February 24, 1919, as suffering from deafness in the right ear as a result of a burst ear drum from the ammunition dump explosion?

Do not departmental files record a discharging right ear, with increased defective hearing, from demobilization in 1919 to April, 1927, at which time John V. Thom was granted a ten per cent pension for C.S.O.M. (deafness), as incurred on service?

Did John V. Thom claim pension for the following medically certificated conditions, arising out of his head injuries, as symptomatic of a general condition of total disability?

(a) Persistent, severe headaches
(b) Dizziness and vomiting
(c) Nervous prostration
(d) Labyrinthitis and

[Mr. Quelch.]

(e) "General Neurosis" associated with chronic suppurative otitis media. (Neurasthenia)

Does John V. Thom also suffer from the complete loss of sight in the right eye, as part of his head injuries, but for which he is not pensioned?

Did the Canadian pension commission arbitrarily rule out of his claim all organic conditions of disability for pension consideration, and did they compel John Thom to apply for one condition, specified by them, without the organically related symptoms to support his claim?

Was this condition, specified by the Canadian pension commission, classified as "neurasthenia"?

Was it arbitrarily related by representatives of the commission to a functional (presumptive) instead of an organic basis?

Was the functional condition of neurasthenia related by the pension medical examiner (Dr. B. F. Keillor), Shaughnessy Hospital, Vancouver, B.C., to alleged (presumptive) economic conditions and as unrelated to the injuries sustained by John Thom in service?

Did Doctor William Baillie, departmental psychiatric consultant, who has never seen John Thom personally, submit as "evidence" to the Canadian pension commission his opinion based solely on a statement alleged by Doctor B. F. Keillor to have been made to him by John Thom?

Did John Thom submit evidence to the Canadian pension commission denying the statements attributed to him by Doctor B. F. Keillor and submitting documentary evidence in proof they should have been expunged from the records as falsities?

Did the Canadian pension commission accept Doctor William Baillie's opinion, based on Doctor B. F. Keillor's challenged statements, to outlaw John Thom's pension claim as a total war disability?

Was John Thom described as in the "psychiatric" classification by departmental medical personnel (psychiatric services), and was this classification used for several years to effectively deny either John Thom or his legal representatives access to the departmental files to secure definite information as to the liaison between Doctor B. F. Keillor, pension medical examiner, and Doctor William Baillie, departmental consultant, regarding the outlawing of his pension claim?

Did three British Columbia medical specialists, including a brain specialist of Mayo Brothers standing namely Doctors R. Grant-Lawrence, H. A. DesBrisay and Dr. W. Frank Emmons, certify John Thom's condition of the total disability as directly related to his departmentally-recognized war-disability condition?

Is Dr. H. A. BesBrisay, one of the three mentioned specialists, a recognized specialized departmental consultant?

Has John Thom been a total disability since the year 1927?

Was he subsequently compelled by economic circumstances to accept the war veterans allowance to supplement a 15 per cent disability pension award in lieu of a 100 per cent pension as of right?

Was the case of John V. Thom finally outlawed by an appeal court of the Canadian pension commission in the year 1939 after repeated

court findings, and subsequent appeals of the legal representatives of the applicant refused to re-open the case?

Was the case again re-opened by his subsequent legal adviser Walter H. Kirchner, M.C., D.C.M., pension adjustment officer, Canadian Combat Veterans Association Incorporated, on representations based upon proved irregularities, as cited?

Did the appeal court commissioners granting leave to re-open John Thom's case direct the attention of the Canadian pension commission to the medical evidence of the three British Columbia medical specialists, the "instructions" of the appeal court being, in part:—

"Canadian Pension Commission"
Appeal Board, January 9, 1945.

"The present appeal board has made a careful study of the complete details of the application, and has also had the advantage of the report prepared by members of the appeal board, who heard the applicant, as stated above. The board has also carefully noted the communication from the pension medical examiner, Vancouver, dated October 22, 1940.

"While in some respects, this application is one which might be dealt with on a 'consequential' basis, the board has finally decided that a prima facie case for leave to re-open has been made out, particularly having regard to the evidence of Doctors Grant-Lawrence, H. A. DesBrisay and W. Frank Emmons, at the quorum hearing. The application for leave to re-open is therefore—granted."

Will the Minister of Veterans Affairs instruct the Canadian pension commission to abide by the appeal board's findings of January 9 and adjudicate on John V. Thom's case accordingly?

In view of the file I have read—I have a very full file here from which I have just read briefly—it does seem to me that section 62, giving the benefit of the doubt to the veteran, apparently means nothing. Further, it seems to me that section 21, which provides for compassionate grants in meritorious cases, is not being observed by the pension commission. Surely the minister must admit that this would have been a splendid case where section 21 could have been used to give a man a pension when the pension commission had found that they did not think he was justified to receive one as of right. Surely he should have been awarded one on compassionate grounds.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I shall take only a minute of the committee's time. My hon. friend raised four points. The first point which dealt with section 62, which is the benefit of doubt section, and section 21, which is the meritorious award section, will be dealt with briefly by my parliamentary assistant. May I point out to my hon. friend that dual war veterans have all the rehabilitation treatment and pension entitlements available to world war II veterans. In addition they have special entitlement under the War Veterans Allowance Act whereby service anywhere qualifies them. They have class 6 treatment or domiciliary care under the meritorious service clause.

There is a special officer at D.V.A. head office to render service and advise on any problems affecting them, and there are special counsellors and interviewers in each D.V.A. district office. There are special officers who pay attention to their employment needs at each regional office of U.I.C., Department of Labour, national employment service. There has been a dominion-wide campaign under way to obtain reserved jobs in industry for older veterans and they also receive a preference in the corps of commissionaires by virtue of age.

I should like to say a further word about the second point raised by my hon. friend, that of employment for older veterans. In order to assist older veterans to obtain employment, the Department of Labour and voluntary agencies throughout the country were asked to support a campaign for the employment of veterans of fifty years and upwards. Full cooperation was obtained.

Now for the figures. Veterans with service in both wars who were registered as unemployed on April 1 numbered 9,262. New registrations in April and May were 7,611. This gave the aggregate registrations to May 31 as 16,873. Those who found employment in sixty-eight points only through our activities and those of the Department of Labour numbered 9,399. Since this last figure of those placed in employment does not cover all registration points in Canada, it is evident that approximately 10,000 older veterans successfully found employment during the first two months of the campaign. The number now registered as in search of employment has been materially reduced, notwithstanding the 7,611 new registrations.

We are greatly indebted to the many agencies, mostly voluntary, who set up this amazing record by successfully attacking the myth that older veterans are not a good employment investment. We intend to continue our work along these lines, because large numbers of the veteran population of Canada will reach the over forty-five age mark each year for the next twenty-five years. I think we are travelling along the right lines.

The third point mentioned by my hon. friend was the question of the charter. We shall be only too glad to examine how effective has been the work of the great committee which sat last year in bringing about re-establishment reform for our ex-service men. That can easily be included in the terms of reference to that committee.

As his fourth point he raised the case of John Thom. This veteran's champion has abused me pretty bitterly, and he has abused one of the best friends the returned soldier ever had, the hon. member for Vancouver South. I do not think I will say any more about that. I should like to get the advice of the medical men in this house, because I know nothing about medicine myself except what I take occasionally. This is a most involved case. The hon. member's long dissertation has been rendered unnecessary by the fact that entitlement has been approved and assessment will be established. I think I have dealt with all the points raised by my hon. friend.

Mr. QUELCH: I think the minister will agree that it has taken a long time because the case was first raised in 1927. It should not be necessary for a veteran to have to wait for eighteen years in order to get a square deal. I am very glad to hear that even at this late day the case is going to be dealt with satisfactorily; at least I hope so.

Mr. BENTLEY: I shall not be as long as my hon. friend because he said a great many things with which I agree, neither shall I attempt to deal with everything in the veterans estimates with which I should like to deal. I am sure that other hon. members will be dealing with some of these matters and there is no need to repeat. I should like to deal with something that specifically comes under this administration item.

Before I do that, I want to refer to a statement which the minister made today. I want to assure you Mr. Chairman, that while I am physically hot and uncomfortable there is no emotional heat in me. I am not going to be critical or set myself up as a judge. I am simply going to state a case and ask that something be done about it.

I want to remind the minister that while what he said was substantially correct, that the veterans committee did agree on the final draft bill and agreed at that time that this was the report of the committee, we also agreed with the minister that when the matter came up in the house one member from each party would state his party's view briefly. I at that time was chairman of the caucus committee of the C.C.F. and made the statement on behalf of our party. The statement I made was this, that we would not offer any further criticism of anything that was done by the committee or the government, but we would watch the operations of the veterans charter and reserve the right to bring to the government's attention at the next session, meaning this session, any things that we felt were not working out properly. I am proud of the humble part I had in the preparation of the veterans charter and I want to give credit to the government and to the minister, who has, I believe, an expansive sympathy and a good heart for the veterans, for the things that they have done. He and the government deserve a tremendous amount of credit, and I am proud of being a humble citizen in a nation that is willing to subscribe to these things.

I assure the minister that I shall make no comparisons between Canada and any other country. I am not interested in a comparison between what Canada is doing for her veterans and what some other country may be doing. I am simply interested in what Canada can do for her own veterans as well as her own citizens and do it willingly and gracefully, as she has done these things willingly and gracefully, and I am proud, as I say, to be a humble citizen of such a country.

Before I go further, I want to pay a tribute to the minister and his departmental officials. In the few individual cases that it has been necessary for me to take up with the department on behalf of some veteran, I have received nothing but courtesy and help, and in every case where the condition complained of could be corrected within the framework of the act, that was done. Unfortunately one or two could not be corrected and, when the next veterans committee sits, amendments will have to be made to the act to permit the officials to correct these conditions.

Having said that, I think everybody, including the minister and his officials, will recognize that we would not be a human society if, no matter how carefully our veterans legislation or any other legislation were drafted, certain individuals at some time, in fact quite frequently, who claimed benefits under the act did not feel that they were not getting the treatment they should get, and the officials would be less than human if they claimed that in every case where dissatisfaction arose the applicant was wrong and the official was right. That would be a kind of society we cannot yet visualize. So I want everybody to realize that in what I say this afternoon I am speaking in no spirit of criticism whatever. I am not being critical and I shall not attempt to judge. I am simply going to state a case.

I shall give an individual case, but it is a key case typical of a small group of people who were prisoners of war in Japan. I shall not read the whole deposition. In order to save the time of the committee, I shall summarize it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Would the hon. member be kind enough not to give names, but to give the initials and regimental numbers.

Mr. BENTLEY: I am sorry I have not the regimental numbers. This is the case of Armourer Sergeant T. O. Jacobson, of the Royal Rifles of Canada, first battalion, C.A.S.F. The case was submitted to me by Mr. Walter Kirchner, secretary of the Canadian Combat Veterans Association. I also have the letter written by Mr. Kirchner to the hon. member for Acadia, which has already been read to the house and which it is not necessary for me to read again, except to say that in the citations which Mr. Kirchner makes as to the veterans organizations which have supported him, I cannot entirely overlook the evidence submitted by Mr. Kirchner on behalf of his organization, even though that evidence may conflict with that of the officials of the veterans affairs department. I am not judging who is right or wrong; I am simply saying that the evidence has sufficient weight to merit attention.

Briefly, this is the history of Armourer Sergeant T. O. Jacobson's case. He joined up in the summer of 1940 at military district No. 12 in Regina. His medical examination was thorough and proved him to be in the highest medical category. He went to Saskatoon for training and from there to Valcartier and then to Quebec city. In October, 1941, he had completed his training in the Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps and was attached to the Royal Rifles of Canada as Armourer Sergeant. He left with the Royal Rifles of Canada for Hong Kong shortly afterwards. I am sorry I cannot give his regimental number.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I have it here on file. It is L-50094.

Mr. BENTLEY: At Hong Kong he took part in the resistance battles at Suymun, Tai Tam Yap—we heard something about yapping the other day—Wanchai, Chek-i-wan, Chico, Pal, Villa, Stanley Village, Repulse Bay and Fort Stanley. I am a little more at home with the last three names.

On December 23, 1941, he was wounded in the right leg and left wrist and, while trying to reach an ambulance service, he was blown over a ridge by shell fire, landing on a rocky ledge twelve feet below. If you fall twelve feet onto a rock you do not have to be wounded or blown by shell fire to be hurt. You are badly shaken, even though you are in the best of health. Two days later, along with other survivors, he was made a prisoner of war of the Japanese. From then on, his history was one of disease, hard work, ill treatment by his captors, and near starvation, with little medical attention. In his deposition he goes into that in greater detail, but I am trying to save the time of the committee and I assure hon. members that what I am stating is in line with the soldier's deposition to me.

Mr. TUCKER: I wonder if I might interrupt the hon. member. This is a case very much like the last one in which the pension commission carefully considered the symptoms and came to the conclusion that the man was very likely suffering from amoebiasis—I may not have pronounced it right, but everybody knows what it is.

Mr. BENTLEY: Say it in English.

Mr. TUCKER: Amoebic dysentery, a tropical disease which naturally is not common in Canada and which, if the diagnosis is definitely confirmed, entitles the man to pension according to his degree of disability. This is another case that has been going through the ordinary course of procedure by the pension commission, and demonstrates again that we can, if we wish, spend a great deal of time in discussing these matters on the floor of the house. But it does not have so very much effect, because these matters are being considered as best they can be by the commission under the ordinary machinery and procedure which are set up by parliament. I mention that because it may shorten the hon. member's remarks.

Mr. BENTLEY: I will be just as brief as I can. Unfortunately the parliamentary assistant did not touch on the exact point I want to get at, because I cannot do it until I go a little bit further into this history. That is the reason I am making the summary. However I am glad to be assured by the parliamentary assistant that this man's case is actually being dealt with. I am afraid that, while it may not be too late, it is later than it should be.

I want to go on with this little summary. After the war, this man was repatriated, of course, and landed in Victoria in the fall of 1945. That was nearly two years ago. He was given his first forty-two days debarkation leave, but had to go back to the hospital at the end of thirty days. From then on, it has been a succession of in and out of hospital and on and off work. Late in October, 1946, a year afterwards, he went back to Shaughnessy Heights hospital and was given check-up tests by a psychiatrist. In this particular check-up—I must refer now to the man's actual statement and point out the things that are objectionable—the features that appear to be objectionable to this man and his

sponsors—and, if true, I think they would be objectionable to most of us—are these. He says:

I was given to understand that it was more a case of what he—

He is referring to the psychiatrist.

—described as emotional instability; that we Hong Kong men more or less imagined we had these pains, aches and feelings of numbness, and that by now we should be well recovered from our past conditions and ailments. That is not only happening in my case but in other Hong Kong prisoner of war cases. We are told now that we are only suffering from a case of nerves, and that, in spite of our complaints to the contrary, our condition is good, in spite of our sore backs, stomach upsets, sore, burning, and aching feet.

He goes on a little bit farther, but I shall not give it all.

These same doctors do not seem to realize that the Japs spent four years doing everything in their power to break us down by starvation, exposure, brutality and beatings, and aided by all kinds of diseases and plagues; and, under those conditions we are supposed to have made a comeback to physical fitness in the period of twelve months.

That is the key part of the objection that this man is making, and if he is correct I think he is making a justifiable complaint. That does not indicate to a layman like myself that, now the commission have discovered he has this particular type of disease which was mentioned a few moments ago by the parliamentary assistant, that can be the only disability from which a man who went through that experience would be apt to be suffering.

If the man's statements are true, I feel, and I am sure other hon. members must feel, that there is something more which can be done for this man than to treat him as he claims he is being treated. He goes on to say further:

About the middle of January, 1947, I was approached by Dr. Margetts to take the pynthotol test . . .

This, I understand, is a truth serum, and he claims now that he did not want to take it. He claims that he insisted that that particular kind of test was given only to murderers or suspected murderers who are being given a severe examination. He claims that, by refusing to take this test, he was cut off immediately from insulin treatment. If that is true it is a serious charge.

Mr. MACKENZIE: By whom, by our department?

Mr. BENTLEY: Yes, by the hospital authorities at Shaughnessy Heights or wherever the psychiatrist was doing his work. That is what he claims. He goes on to say:

I was boarded by Dr. Palmer.

[Mr. Bentley.]

Then he goes on to say:

I was weighed by Dr. Palmer, wearing at the time full army battle dress, boots, underwear, shirt and heavy socks.

He claims that the doctor put down his weight without counting the weight of his clothing, and told him that he was gaining in weight, although he had not gained nearly as much as he should have. At that time he claims he was also told by Doctor Palmer that he had recovered from all the ailments and vitamin deficiency, beri-beri, pellagra, malaria, dengue fever, dysentery, diarrhoea, jaundice, back ailments, bad eyesight, loss of weight, sore, aching and burning feet; tightness of muscles and cords; lack of sense of balance. He says he was discharged from hospital and pronounced cured in April, 1947, but still claims he is unfit.

The parliamentary assistant has just told us that the case is being considered, but something must have happened to get the case considered if the man concerned states the case correctly up to April. As I say, I am not trying to judge whether he has stated it correctly or not, but I am saying the case is too serious, and the charge as made in the long depositions is too serious, to be lightly passed over. Even if there is a partial element of truth in it, the man should have more sympathetic treatment from the departmental, medical and other men who are working in that particular hospital.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I interrupt for a second. Is it not more important to get entitlement and assessment at once? We could then have a committee of this house go thoroughly into any suggestion of impropriety in regard to treatment.

Mr. BENTLEY: In the main, I think I can agree with what the minister suggests there. I could cite a lot of other cases, but I am not going to do so because I do not think it would be fair to the committee, and I do not think it is of any use. I just want to mention this to the government. In the light of these and many other charges which have been made by Mr. Kirchner, secretary of the Canadian Combat Association, I suggest to the government that they should be investigated. When I say that I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, and the minister to know I am extremely jealous of the honour and position of the officials of the department. I would hate to have a false charge made against them by anybody in this country. But as I said, the weight of evidence here indicates that a lot of people feel there is something in these charges, and some veterans—

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am sorry to interrupt, but I think Mr. Kirchner came before our committee in regard to certain other statements that he had made. I did not say a word in regard to these, but the committee dealt with them.

Mr. BENTLEY: I am trying to be helpful and not take too long. I have a great admiration for the work that is being done by the department. I do not want to see any official or the minister himself charged unfairly, but when we get the kind of statements that have been made in these charges it is bound to have an effect on a lot of citizens and veterans in this country and raises a certain amount of—if not actual doubt—of question in the minds of some of the rest of us. I believe that some kind of investigation or hearing should be held so that these people who are charged would have an opportunity publicly to state their position and to clear themselves of these charges.

I am simply anxious to have the minister look into the matter at once. I do not think it should be left to a parliamentary committee next session to bring these people here. The matter should be cleared up immediately, either by a small committee composed of all the parties in the house or by a completely independent committee, so that we can get the public denial properly. The minister and his assistant have the denial, but I have not got it where I can take it to a legion branch and lay it before them. I think the public should have it. I am not making charges, nor am I spreading charges on the record. I think that, in the interests of all concerned, the matter should be cleared up, and if there are guilty parties they should be isolated and removed from positions where this kind of thing can be done.

Mr. MACKENZIE: As far as we are concerned, I would welcome a committee of three doctors from this house to go into the suggestions that have been submitted, and I would suggest the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. McCann), the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Blair) and the hon. member for Inverness-Richmond (Mr. McGarry). They could meet sometime between now and the next session and call in whom they want and submit a first-class report.

Mr. BENTLEY: That is quite a concession for the minister to make and I appreciate it, but I would ask him to go one step farther and include a member from this end of the house—because we have no doctors—to consider the layman's point of view.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Absolutely, yes.

Mr. BENTLEY: If the minister says he will do that, I have nothing further to add except thank you.

Mr. TUCKER: I appreciate what the hon. member for Swift Current has said about clearing up the charges that have been made, and the minister's suggestion is a good one because it would enable us to have the matter clarified. The department is determined that these prisoners of war shall be properly looked after, and they are called in every six months for examination, whether they apply for pension or not, to make sure that there is nothing wrong with them, for which they might be entitled to pension. In this particular case, the reason Mr. Jacobson has obtained his entitlement is attributable not to complaint, but to that policy. Regarding all these cases of Mr. Kirchner, the investigation head of the Canadian combat association, and the Canadian pension commission has taken up thirty cases with him. He has intimated that there are twelve others he wishes to take up. Whenever he wants to take them up with the pension commission they are prepared to go into them with him.

Mr. HERRIDGE: As a war veteran and a former member of the veterans affairs committee, I take a great and particular interest in the Department of Veterans Affairs. I wish to say a few words on this item this afternoon. In fairness, I think I should say that the Minister of Veterans Affairs has a warm heart, which occasionally, perhaps, causes him to commit verbal indiscretions in the house, but at the same time it has been responsible for his taking a broad, human and sympathetic interest in the welfare of the veterans of the country.

In my opinion, the Minister of Veterans Affairs, during his term of office to date, has rendered a great service to the veterans of Canada and has been a great credit to the office he holds as well as to the present administration. In addition to that I should like to express my appreciation of the courtesy I have received from the officials of his department, and of their great interest in the cause of the veterans. There are some departments of the government that could well take a course in human relations from the officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs. I have had occasion to take up a number of cases with the various departments, and I have found the officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs most cooperative and painstaking and given to the examination of questions in the greatest detail in order to find a satisfactory solution of the problems that confront them.

I am not going to take up the time of the committee this session to go into details regarding the many matters I should like to discuss. I support whole-heartedly the proposal made for an increase in pension rates and for increases in war veterans allowances, the arrangements with respect to widows, and further advantages to merchant seamen. I support whole-heartedly all the proposals made today and on previous occasions.

I believe the Canadian people are willing to pay for these increased benefits that are being advocated at the present time, but we must at the same time be prepared in this house to support a budget that will pay for these increased costs to the government of the country. Might I suggest what I would do if I were minister of finance; because, of course, I could never be minister of finance. My wife says that I am a poor chancellor of the exchequer. If I were minister of finance, however, I would bring down my budget with alternative proposals.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I think you would make a very good minister of finance.

Mr. HERRIDGE: I would place before the house a budget to provide for the payment of old age pensions, war veterans allowance and pensions on the present terms, but I would also have alternative proposals that would allow for the payment of pensions on a scale advocated by the members—in some cases advocated by the members of all parties—and then we should have in crystallized form something that could be placed squarely before the house so as to ascertain whether the house was willing to vote a budget to pay these increased costs.

I am happy to hear there is to be established next session a committee on veterans affairs to deal with these problems. I am sorry it was not set up this session, but if it is set up next session and these various proposals are brought before that committee, evidence should be heard from those advocating them, and I am sure that in a cooperative, non-partisan spirit, such as has been shown in these matters in the past, a satisfactory solution can be found which we can place before the house and the people of the country.

Mr. LENNARD: There are one or two observations I should like to make, one of them being in connection with the overseas fire-fighters. Last year I had something to say on this question. To me it is stupid that the overseas fire-fighters are denied the civil service preference. I know of several cases where these men have applied for positions with the government as fire-fighters and have been denied the chance to secure them because they had not the overseas civil service preference. That is not businesslike. I do not think it is either economic or sound, from a business point of view, that a professional fire-fighter should be denied a job with the government in his chosen profession on such a ground as that.

There is another matter I wish to take up. I refer to girls who served overseas with the Canadian Red Cross. If my memory serves me correctly, nearly every member of the veterans affairs committee was of the view that the Red Cross girls who served overseas should receive all the privileges accorded other auxiliary services. The presentation of a brief representing their interests was done without their knowledge and was grossly inaccurate. That was presented on July 15, 1946, I think it was, last session before the veterans affairs committee. On that occasion, Major-General Browne and Mr. Norman S. Caudwell, K.C., presented that case. I believe Mr. Caudwell presented the case. He seems to have greatly misinformed the committee. I presume the department have received this brief. Mr. Caudwell stated that many of the girls, especially in the first period of enlistment, were from well-to-do families. As a matter of fact, of the draft of eighteen girls to go overseas, fifteen gave up positions from which they earned their living. There was another thing which Mr. Caudwell stated which was not accurate. He said they served as voluntary workers and that, while overseas, for pin-money they received from the Canadian Red Cross $30 a month. They did not receive $30 a month. They received twenty-five shillings a week, which amounted to something less than $30 a month. They received $260 a year in Canadian funds.

Mr. Caudwell also stated that they received $150 allowance to buy civilian clothing, which they did not receive. Actually each girl was given thirty days' leave with pay on her return to Canada, and that is all.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I interrupt my hon. friend, just in order to be helpful?

Mr. LENNARD: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If and when the committee is established next year the cases to which he refers—the Red Cross and the others—will be considered by the committee.

Mr. LENNARD: That helps things a good deal. I shall now be through in about a minute. I am pleased to hear that statement from the Minister of Veterans Affairs, and I am sure that these people will receive justice.

Mr. LOW: I just wish to take three or four minutes to put before the minister a particular case. I do not intend to go into any detail, but there is a point which I should like to make. This is the case of Frank W. Connorton.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What is his number?

Mr. LOW: Regimental No. V-52017. This is a case of spinal fusion which appears from the evidence to have resulted from a technical error in administering a spinal anaesthetic at the time of an appendectomy performed in June, 1943, while Connorton was in the naval service. He had evidently enlisted in January, 1943. The claim is made by the department that Connorton's condition is of pre-enlistment origin. The validity of that claim has not been established so far as I have been able to determine by scrutiny of the evidence. The details of the evidence, together with two affidavits which I have in my possession, completely refute the department's claim and seem to substantiate the contention of the veteran that his injury was sustained while he was in service; and further that his present helpless condition is a direct result of the medical bungling at the time of his appendix operation. I should like to read this one short affidavit which was supplied by the Vancouver Engineering Works. It reads as follows:

To Whom It May Concern:

Re Frank Connorton

I wish to state that Frank W. Connorton worked with me in his capacity as an apprentice machinist, from the year 1941 up until the time he left the employ of the Vancouver Engineering Works to enlist in the R.C.N.V.R.

His duties as a machinist called for the physical stamina of an able-bodied man at all times; in fact, from his activities here I have always considered him physically well above the average fellow employee engaged in this class of heavy lifting work.

Frank Connorton was a cheerful, willing and able worker, well liked, as those who were his fellow employees can testify.

Yours very truly,
Vancouver Engineering Works, Ltd.
William Dalglish,
Machinist.

That certainly testifies to the physical condition of the man prior to his enlistment. Within months after his enlistment, an appendectomy was performed. At the time of that operation a medical student jabbed his back eight times with a needle before he could achieve anaesthesia, and the man suffered after effects; at least, that is his claim. Evidently he feels aggrieved. This is the point I should like to make. The Minister of Veterans Affairs has been eminently fair in handling the situation here this afternoon; and I believe I must compliment him on some fine work done in his department. But if a man such as Connorton feels he has a case for damages, I wonder if it would not be possible for the minister to grant him a fiat to sue the crown and establish his case in the exchequer court where evidence can be taken under oath. It seems to me that would be a good way of disposing of a case such as this. I would ask the hon. minister if he would not take that suggestion under consideration and possibly give this man a fiat to sue.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I ask my hon. friend a question, for information purposes?

Mr. LOW: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Has this man appealed his case to the existing organization, the Canadian pension commission?

Mr. LOW: Yes. I understand that the disabled veterans association has taken up the case.

Mr. MACKENZIE: But has he appealed to the pension commission?

Mr. LOW: I do not know that.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That procedure would not cost him anything. I should be glad to recommend to my colleague, the Minister of Justice, a fiat to the exchequer court, but I think the other procedure should be tried first.

Mr. LOW: I think that is wise and that, if he has not tried it, he should.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Would my hon. friend be kind enough to check that?

Mr. LOW: I will check that.

Mr. TUCKER: I have a report here, according to which there apparently was one Canadian pension commission ruling on May 10, 1947. Of course he would have the further right of appealing, and so on. There, all his expenses would be paid and everything like that. That would be much better than going into court.

Mr. LOW: Very well.

Mr. WRIGHT: I was sorry when earlier today, on the amendment which I introduced, the Department of Veterans Affairs was brought into the discussion. It was not my intention to bring it into the discussion at that time. I must say that as far as the Department of Veterans Affairs is concerned, and as far as the minister is concerned I, like all other members of the house, have always received every consideration.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much.

Mr. WRIGHT: The cases which I have brought to their attention have been dealt with promptly; much more promptly probably than cases are dealt with in a great many other departments of the government. I think the minister has his department well organized. I do not altogether agree with him in his argument with regard to there not being a necessity for the raising of our pension basis at this time. He quoted figures from 1920, showing that the cost of living at that time was as high as or higher than at the present time. I agree with that. The cost of living was higher at that time.

Mr. MACKENZIE: When pensions were stabilized in 1925, they were slightly higher; but I think the figures which I gave here—I have not them in front of me at the moment—show that there was a tremendous increase in the cost-of-living index between 1939 and 1947. I was trying to make out my hon. friend's case for him.

Mr. LOW: I must have misunderstood the minister. I thought he was arguing the other way.

Mr. MACKENZIE: When my hon. friend reads *Hansard* tomorrow, I think he will find that what I say is correct.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am glad to know that the minister's argument was as he has stated it. I would also bring to the attention of the committee that today our whole Canadian standard of living is higher than it was ten, fifteen or twenty years ago. I think we all enjoy a better standard of living today. We have more cars, more radios, more refrigerators and more of the other amenities of life than we had then, and it is only fair that the pensioners and others should enjoy these things with us. So I think there is a good argument for increasing certain of these pensions.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I be permitted to interrupt to repeat what I have already said today. According to the information given me, the cost of living index in 1919, at the time of the first bonus of twenty per cent, was 126·5. In 1920, at the time of the second bonus of thirty per cent, it was 145·4. In 1925, as my hon. friend knows very well, the bonus was included in the scale of pay, and the cost of living index was 119·8. From 1935 to 1939 it was around 100. On March 1, 1947, it had gone up to 128·9. The increase from 1925, when the consolidation of the bonus was accomplished, to 1947 was 7·6 per cent. Then these are the figures I want to emphasize. The increase from 1939 to 1947 was 28·9 per cent. The annual pension liability, based on this year's estimates, is $80,750,000, including both wars. The cost of an increase of 7·6 per cent would be $6,232,000, and the cost of an increase of 28·9 per cent, representing the increase in the cost of living from 1939 to 1947, would be $23,698,000. Is that quite clear now?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, it is; and I think the people of Canada would be quite willing to spend any additional amount necessary to give our men and women who went overseas the same standard of living that is enjoyed by the rest of us. I think that is the principle behind all the veterans legislation, to deal fairly with them and see that they may enjoy the same things we enjoy.

I should like to say just a word in regard to the setting up of the veterans committee. I have been one of those who believed that should be a standing committee of this house, not a committee just set up at the pleasure of the government from year to year, or in certain years when they might feel it necessary to do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I again interrupt my hon. friend, in a desire to be helpful? There is another virtue in that suggestion. In addition to reviewing legislation from year to year, that committee could deal with the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs. There was some criticism this morning to the effect that those estimates were too long delayed. They could be considered by the committee and completely disposed of, as they were practically disposed of last year. That is another virtue to the suggestion made by my hon. friend.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am afraid the minister is making my arguments for me on most of these matters. As I was saying, I have been one of those who believed there should be a standing committee of the house on this matter, and I think probably the government are going to move in that direction. I hope so, anyway; and I hope that when we come back next year this committee will be set up. From what has taken place in the house today, the need for such a committee is quite evident. I think the Department of Veterans Affairs have exercised genuine care in trying to secure suitable personnel, but today they have some eight thousand people working for them in all parts of the dominion, many in executive positions. It would be humanly impossible for them to be able to choose that number of employees who would reflect the opinion of the department itself. People are bound to come into the department with ideas of their own, ideas at variance with those of the members of this house and the

members of the veterans committee which drafted this veterans charter. So in a standing committee of the house those matters can be talked over, and I believe that committee can be of great assistance. I do not think it should be a committee to criticize. This morning the minister more or less accused me of introducing a resolution for political purposes. That has not been my object since coming here, and I do not think I can be accused of doing that either in this house or in any committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I interrupt again? I have the highest respect for my hon. friend, as I think I said this morning. What I stated then was that the possibilities and implications of the resolution were such that it might be construed as being possessed of political purposes or political motives, because it was a straight vote of confidence on a matter affecting the veterans.

Mr. WRIGHT: I can assure the minister that the motives were perfectly honest as far as I and this group were concerned.

The minister has been agreeing with me so much that I think I shall introduce another subject and see if he will agree on that. In my estimation there was perhaps one weakness in the veterans charter. It is not a matter of vital importance at the moment, but it will become such within a few years. That is the matter of the education of the children of deceased veterans. No doubt many of these widows will marry again, and the time will come in the not too distant future when the matter of the education of these children will have to be dealt with by this parliament. I hope that in the veterans committee next year the matter can be discussed and some measure provided under which the children of deceased veterans will be able to take advantage of what would have been the rights of their parents had they lived. I believe that suggestion is only fair.

When the minister was dealing with the operations under the Veterans Land Act and the small holdings scheme he gave certain figures. Here again I believe there are conditions which could very well be discussed in a committee. I am not going to introduce individual cases here. I do not think this is the time for that, because it is late in the session, and when the committee is set up next year we can probably deal better with these matters.

However, there is one point in connection with veterans' reestablishment in regard to which I think something should be done before next session. That is the matter of grants to veterans who undertake cooperative farming. There has been one little difficulty in this regard which I think should be ironed out. I refer to the case of a veteran who, after joining a cooperative, finds himself unable to agree with the others engaged in that undertaking, and wants to withdraw. I believe provision should be made whereby the land of the veteran will remain in the cooperative, because the whole business of that organization, the machinery and equipment the cooperative possesses, is acquired on the basis of the total land in the unit. If one member is allowed to withdraw his land another may do the same thing, and the result may be that the equipment will not be of the value it should be to the organization. I believe the minister is going to agree with me again.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I point out to my hon. friend what we have already done in his own province in the matter of cooperatives? On February 19 of this year the provincial legislature passed the following resolution:

> That this assembly, recognizing that veterans' land settlement is an urgent problem which, while primarily a federal responsibility, is nevertheless the concern of both federal and provincial authorities urge:
>
> (1) that the dominion and provincial governments give special assistance to communities in which veteran settlement of a pioneering nature is taking place;
>
> (2) that the government request the dominion government to bring in legislation to amend the Veterans Land Act to provide for:
>
> (a) The payment of grants to veterans' cooperative farming units in lieu of the V.L.A. credits of the veteran participants;
>
> (b) The purchase of land by V.L.A. for the purpose of establishing veterans cooperative farm units.

Similar proposals were considered by the House of Commons committee on veterans affairs, of which my hon. friend was a member, in 1946. That committee declined to agree to the principle embodied in paragraph 2(b) of the resolution passed by the legislature. In December, 1946, and January, 1947, there were negotiations between Hon. J. H. Sturdy, minister of reconstruction and rehabilitation of Saskatchewan, and the Department of Veterans Affairs. As a result, regulation 39 under the Veterans Land Act was adopted by order in council, permitting the director to advance up to $1,200 per veteran for the purchase of farm or forestry equipment for the joint use of veterans cooperatively developing adjacent individual holdings under lease from the province, provided that the veteran had a right to purchase his holding and was not obligated to farm cooperatively.

The Hon. Mr. Sturdy, on behalf of the Saskatchewan government, signed an amendment to the agreement between the director

and the Saskatchewan government giving effect to this regulation. Subsequently, further representations were made asking the dominion to make grants to cooperative farming organizations of veterans sponsored by the province.

On June 16 the director addressed the Saskatchewan convention of the Canadian Legion in Moose Jaw. He referred to the Saskatchewan government's proposals and said:

1. The agreement between the dominion and provincial governments provides—

(a) the province to make land available to a veteran under 33-year lease with right to purchase or not to purchase.

(b) the director to grant up to $2,320 in chattels and equipment per veteran.

2. Under this agreement 537 veterans have been established on provincial lands in Saskatchewan up to April 30, 1947.

3. The province has made representations asking that the director make grants to cooperative farming societies whose by-laws provide that land chattels and labour be pooled and that if a member withdraws or is expelled he cannot withdraw his land.

4. Such grants are not permissible under the Veterans Land Act, and consequently provision for them cannot be made in an agreement between the two governments.

5. Hence, if in the agreement between the province and an individual veteran there are provisions which conflict with the terms of the Veterans Land Act, the director could not legally make grants to such veterans.

I understand from my deputy minister that further applications came in yesterday from cooperative organizations in Saskatchewan and are being considered at the present time.

Mr. WRIGHT: It was the last provision the minister has read in which I was particularly interested. I realize that the minister and his department have gone a long way in this matter. However, there is the final point where six, eight or ten men wish to form a cooperative and to get a grant of $2,520. The veteran is guaranteed that, upon his withdrawal from the cooperative, he will get out anything he has invested. It is considered that it is not fair that such a person should be able to withdraw his land, and it is urged that the land should remain in the cooperative. Otherwise, as I have said, this action completely breaks up the unit, and it becomes impossible to operate it in a cooperative manner because a particular piece of land may be one which is essential to the cooperative as a whole.

I would ask that the department give serious consideration to this. If it cannot be done under the act as it now stands, then I suggest that the act should be amended at another session of parliament. The department may not agree with what is being done in Saskatchewan; but we are part of Canada. We have decided we want to do things in a certain way; the veterans themselves have decided too, that they want to do things in a certain way. No veteran is being forced to go into cooperative farming, and it is only upon request that this type of unit is being set up. Where it is being set up at the request of veterans, and where the people of Saskatchewan have decided they would like this particular way of farming and way of life, then, when there is a guarantee that the veteran will suffer no loss, I say the Department of Veterans Affairs should give consideration to meeting their request.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I can assure the hon. member that the department will review most carefully the entire situation.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): The minister and his organization will remember the difficulty they had in Toronto back in 1943 and 1944 in connection with the handling of soldier patients. At that time some 12,000 subscribers had just completed a million dollar asset in the form of a hospital extension, which they were good enough to turn over to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

It has been the privilege of the subscribers who put up that million dollars to give service during the time when it was so badly needed when Sunnybrook was under construction. That time has now expired, and it is found necessary to evacuate the premises formerly occupied. One of the finest hospital buildings in Canada has been occupied by the patients of the department, numbering at times up to 240, and it has given service to the extent of over 100,000 patient-days a year. It not only gave hospital service, but there was added the service given by the community by serving four meals a day when only three were required, and other matters of that kind.

The entire community took a great interest in this work, and did what we believe was a good job for the veterans who came back at that time from overseas. On July 1 those buildings were evacuated. The buildings have been subjected to four years of heavy wear and tear. On behalf of those 12,000 subscribers who put their private funds into that investment, I believe I need only mention that these buildings must be rehabilitated, and I feel sure the department will put them back into proper condition.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I interrupt the hon. member at that point? In the first place, the department is under a deep debt of gratitude to the hon. member, personally, for making available to us the facilities of

the Toronto East General Hospital at a time when we needed hospital accommodation badly for our returning soldiers. Second, may I say to the hon. member that the condition of the hospital at the present time is being investigated by the Department of Public Works, and the proper conditioning will be done.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): I have one other observation, and it is this. In the rush of getting equipment to service this building, certain equipment was received from the Department of Veterans Affairs. It is now subject to four years depreciation, and I would ask the minister to see to it that the department does not declare this equipment, of all kinds, as surplus, and turn it over to War Assets Corporation to be traded out or sold out. I suggest that he leave as much of it there as possible, in the economic interests of Canada, rather than advertise that partly used equipment as surplus.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at seven o'clock.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are on item 454, departmental administration.

Mr. CHURCH: By leave of the committee, may I suggest that consideration be given to an honorarium for our present Deputy Chairman. He has worked very hard in hot weather for five or six weeks. I know he refused one before, but I should like to have this suggestion given consideration again.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I know you feel embarrassed. I am very grateful to the hon. member for Broadview for his suggestion. As a matter of fact an honorarium was suggested to the hon. member for Huron-Perth, but he declined. I think it could be done under the estimates for legislation if that is the committee's wish. I think that this time a measure of coercion and compulsion should be used which would be agreeable to all concerned.

Mr. MacNICOL: I agree with the hon. member and the minister that our Chairman should be compelled by the house to accept what the house is so willing to grant. We never had a better chairman and if we could just keep him here all the time we would get through much sooner.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I shall be very glad to take the matter up if that is the wish and will of the house.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I just associate this group with the suggestion that has been made, and thus make it unanimous.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much. I shall be very glad indeed to see that the suggestion of the hon. member for Broadview is brought to the attention of the government when we reach the items under legislation.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, there are two or three questions I should like to place before the minister. This afternoon most of the subjects having to do with this department have been covered, and, I think, covered effectively, but I should like to have a statement from the minister with regard to these points. The first one has to do with a suggestion which was made by the Canadian Legion. Some weeks ago they presented a brief to the cabinet, and on July 7 they sent a copy of the brief to the members of the house, or possibly only to the members who served on the veterans committee last year. I think they have put their finger on one of the most important problems at the present time, and that is whether or not further consideration should be given to that group of Canadians who have suffered the most as a result of war service, or certainly have suffered as much as anybody else and perhaps more. The two groups to whom they refer are, first of all, pensioners who are so severely disabled that they are unable to do any work at all; second, the widows with young children to support who have no other means than the pension and family allowance.

These proposals were put forward to the committee last year, but it was more or less a new thought at the time and probably there was not as much consideration given as there should have been. The legion are suggesting that the pensioner who is unable to work should be given a supplementary grant or pension of $25 a month provided that he is certified as unemployable by a competent medical authority.

With regard to the widows and children the legion asks that, while the children are growing and receiving an education, either the widow's pension be substantially increased or the children's allowances doubled. I believe that under the present rates the widow of a man who was killed overseas gets a pension of $60 a month, and if she has one child, an additional $15; for the second child, an additional $12, and then $10 for each subsequent child. In addition to that she gets the family allowance. The legion suggests that during the period when the children are growing up and receiving their education the widow's pension should be at least at the present single man's

100 per cent rate, $75 a month, if the rates payable for the children remain the same. In such a case a widow with one child would receive an annual pension and child's pension of $1,080. The other suggestion would be to double the children's allowance. There again the annual income would come to $1,080. These figures are where there is only one child.

That submission is made with a tremendous amount of public opinion behind it. The legion does not make recommendations of this type without having had them thought over carefully by their branches from coast to coast, and I think that, by and large, they represent public opinion on veterans affairs. I understand that the other soldier organizations which are also doing a splendid work agree with this submission. The suggestion is that something should be done without delay, that it should not be left over for another year. The brief concludes with these words:

> We are also convinced that the tax-paying public of Canada, of which veterans form a very substantial part, will wish this obligation undertaken in behalf of those who have suffered most as a result of war services.

I can add nothing to that submission. Will the minister answer it?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, as far as I can. I am very grateful to my hon. friend for his constructive suggestions. I did have an interview with the Canadian Legion some time ago, and they also interviewed the Prime Minister and the cabinet with reference to the very points my hon. friend now raises. I received notice that my hon. friend was going to ask a question with reference to pre-enlistment condition not aggravated during service.

Mr. GREEN: That question is coming later.

Mr. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend asked with reference to those pensioners who are unable to work. We are doing a lot of constructive work now under Eddie Dunlop, a blinded ex-service man himself, who, as my hon. friend, who is a front line soldier himself, knows, is in charge of the casualty and rehabilitation section and is placing many of the heavily disabled men in employment.

Mr. GREEN: These men to whom the legion refers are pensioners who are certified by a doctor to be unable to work.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes. Of course that is a special case, different from what I had in mind. I was talking of the men who are seriously handicapped and who can get placement in employment.

The next question had to do with widows of men who were overseas, with young children to support. I think there is a terribly strong moral appeal, and also a national appeal on their behalf, and I can assure my hon. friend that we shall give it—I do not like the word "consideration" because I think there is a parliamentary falsification to it—anxious attention and assiduous care, as much as we can and as soon as we can.

Mr. GREEN: Is there something that can be done before next session? There can be no legislation now for perhaps nine or ten months.

Mr. MACKENZIE: As I understand the difficulties, it affects the whole basic pension scheme and may require legislation at the next session of parliament, but we shall look into it most carefully and sympathetically and see if anything can be effected by regulation, because I know my colleagues are sympathetic to the last point mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver South. Whether we can do it by regulation I am not sure, but in any event it will not be forgotten but will be carefully remembered.

Mr. GREEN: The second question has to do with war veterans allowances. There is a principle that must be settled with regard to war veterans allowance, and I think it is this, whether or not the government accepts full responsibility for the recipients of that allowance. Mention was made earlier in the day of the fact that the position is now such that in some of the provinces war veterans allowance recipient cannot get as much as the old age pensioner. In Ontario they get $9.59 a month less. In British Columbia there is the difference between $30.41 and $38.75, and there is a difference in several other of the provinces. Personally I have always understood that the veteran getting war veterans allowance is solely the charge of the dominion government. We are entitled to know whether or not the government is still acknowledging that responsibility because, if it is, there can be no doubt that war veterans allowance recipients should be put in the same position as the old age pensioner. The allowance was originally intended to be an old age pension for the veterans. It was made payable at age sixty on the basis that he had become pre-aged because of his service. It is now in a most unfortunate position, because I can assure the minister that in our own city of Vancouver there are many of these war veteran allowances recipients who are not able to exist on the present allowance. Here again the time element is of the utmost importance.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I say at once to my hon. friend that there is no question whatsoever—

Mr. GREEN: I also include the widows who come under the War Veterans Allowances Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE: They have been fairly well treated in the last two years as a result of the advocacy of the hon. member for Davenport. I think the vote is $2,100,000 this year for widows and children, which can help quite a lot; whereas they were not getting a single cent two or three years ago. That is what this parliament did for them. I think that is a real improvement. In regard to the general basic rates for veterans allowances, I agree at once with my hon. friend that it is entirely a federal responsibility; it was a federal act when enacted in 1930. The improvements were all made by the various federal parliaments and federal governments from that time until now. What the ultimate plan may be with reference to approximate equalization with old age pension rates I am not in a position to say. It is a matter of government policy to be decided but I can at least assure my hon. friend that the question will receive the most careful attention of the administration as soon as possible.

Mr. GREEN: The dominion government is accepting full responsibility?

Mr. MACKENZIE: It always did.

Mr. GREEN: For the war veterans allowance recipients?

Mr. MACKENZIE: It always did.

Mr. GREEN: And still is?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Certainly.

Mr. GREEN: A word with regard to the pension payable to merchant seamen. I hold in my hand the last edition of *Veterans Affairs*. This is a semi-monthly publication got out by the minister's department and an interesting publication it is. This issue is dated July 15, 1947. I find practically half of the front page taken up with an article entitled "Schooner Thought U-boat Victim". It describes an appeal to the appeal board of the Canadian pension commission against the adverse decision made by the pension commission in the case of a Canadian who was on a Newfoundland schooner which was lost en route from Newfoundland to a point, I think, in the West Indies. His widow's claim for a pension was disallowed on the ground that it had not been shown that the death of her husband was directly attributable to enemy action. This case shows more clearly than any argument a member could make on the floor of the house that the present law with regard to paying pension to the dependents of a merchant seaman who lost his life or to a merchant seaman who was disabled is far, far too strict. First of all, it requires that the injury must have arisen from the direct result of enemy action. The second thing is that there is a time limit of one year for the application to be made. I will just ask the minister to read his own magazine, and when he reads that story I am quite sure he will be convinced that there must be an amendment made to the act. I think it is called the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act. I will not go into the matter any further this evening, but the whole story is in the minister's own paper. I hope that there will be no further opposition from the government to having that act amended.

Another group whose position should be further considered are the men who flew transports across the Atlantic. They do not get the benefits recommended last year by the committee. I believe it has now been clearly established that they were treated by the British government as though they had been in the forces and that they were given medals for their service. I would ask the minister to give us the assurance that their case will be placed before the committee when it sits next year.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Certainly.

Mr. GREEN: Finally, I should like to refer to the ruling that men are not entitled to pension because they had a pre-enlistment condition. When the committee sat last year we were given figures made up by the Canadian pension commission, which showed that up to December 31, 1945, there had been 7,810 men refused entitlement on the ground that they had a pre-enlistment condition which was not aggravated by service. That number comprised men who actually got abroad. They had gone to Great Britain or some other theatre of war, subsequently were discharged as unfit, and yet it was held that because they had a pre-enlistment condition they were not entitled to pension. The same statement gave the figure of 54,207 for men who had service only in Canada. They had enlisted as fit, served in Canada and were discharged as unfit, and yet were ruled ineligible for pension because it was found that they had a pre-enlistment condition. That made a total of about 62,000.

Tonight I am not going into the fight we had last year over the question, but I still think the government was wrong in refusing to make a change and write a presumption into the Pension Act. I should like to get the figures from December 31, 1945, until the present time. I wish to know the additional

numbers who have been ruled against on the ground of a pre-enlistment condition, divided into those who served overseas and those who had service only in Canada, so that the figures given to me tonight can be added to the figures given to us by the pension commission last year.

Mr. TUCKER: The pension commission were so taxed in giving effect to the various amendments put through, and in the new applications they had to deal with, that they have not those figures available, but they will be obtained as soon as possible and given to the hon. member. Of course this is also a matter that will be of interest to the committee when it is set up next year.

Mr. GREEN: Have I to wait until next year for the figures?

Mr. TUCKER: No. They will be obtained and given as soon as we can get them from the records division.

Mr. BRACKEN: I wish to thank the hon. member for Fort William for permitting me a minute at this time. I wish to raise this matter now in support of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Vancouver South. It relates to veterans allowances. I can save time and make my own point clear by reading a brief extract from the letter of a world war I veteran that has been on my file for some time. If I read it the position will be clear. It supports the position which the hon. member for Vancouver South took and which those on this side took in this morning's debate. It states:

> I am calling to ask you to try and clear up a somewhat ambiguous situation which has arisen out of the recent amending of the old age pension provisions. A war veteran who is in receipt of veterans allowance is placed on the Indian list as far as old age pension is concerned. That veteran cannot qualify for old age pension benefits. His veterans allowance is at present $30 a month. If nothing is now done we will have an unjust discrimination as between the ordinary pensioner and the aged veteran, particularly in Ontario. There before another year rolls around we will have the ordinary pensioner with a monthly income of $40 and the aged veteran with an income of $30 a month. Surely if there is to be a difference the veteran should be the favoured one.

He goes on to refer to a statement supposed to have been made by the Minister of Veterans Affairs, that the government did not intend to open up this veterans legislation this year. He says that if this is not done the Old Age Pensions Act should be amended so that the veterans should be assisted and not be at a disadvantage.

I present that letter to emphasize the point taken by the hon. member for Vancouver South. My understanding is that the minister says he is unable at this time to give a positive statement that any greater financial aid can be given, but that he is saying that the matter will receive consideration after prorogation.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes. I wish to thank my hon. friend for his constructive suggestion. The difficulty is that the federal authority is not aware of what the various provinces will do by way of supplementing whatever grant is made in the form of old age pension, and by January next, when I hope we meet again, the situation will have become stabilized and we shall be able then to assess the contributions made jointly in regard to old age pensions by the dominion and the provinces and to meet the point raised in the communication the hon. member has read.

Mr. BRACKEN: I have one observation to make with respect to that. The minister himself said that this matter of war veterans allowances was entirely a matter of federal responsibility. I trust that, whatever action is taken or not taken by the provinces with respect to old age pensions, it will have no bearing on the question of the dominion government dealing justly with the war veterans.

Mr. McIVOR: In the last few years I have had considerable trouble with veterans of the first war, and I speak now to give a little bit of advice to those who have been in the same position that I have been in. I have had case after case straightened out and those old veterans will agree that my plan was sound. My plan was to write to the deputy minister or especially to Brigadier-General Melville, chairman of the pension commission, and give him the particulars. Do that and you will get a reply by return mail. Not long ago an old veteran gave me language plainer than polite. I have had cases straightened out in a very satisfactory manner, and I would say to hon. members that what is even better than making speeches in the House of Commons is to get in touch with the chairman of the pension commission.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I wish to ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs if he would consult the appropriate member of the cabinet—I imagine it is the Minister of Finance—and also the wartime prices and trade board with respect to houses which have been bought by veterans, which were tenanted, and possession of which they could not obtain. Those who bought houses before July 26, 1945, are able to apply for possession of them; but the other fellows who were late in coming back, later than those who

could take advantage of that provision, find themselves in the position I have indicated. Some of them perhaps did not understand the regulations, but for one reason or another they bought these houses. I have received many letters and am going to read extracts from a couple of them to show what it is all about. I quote from one:

> Why are young Canadians disgusted? Why do they want to go to the U.S.A.? Here are some of my reasons: Housing restrictions—veteran's family, seriously disrupted by six years separation while in the service, frozen out of a tenant-occupied home. This same tenant sat quietly on civvy street during the war and still is—while my family, and hundreds like us—still scratching for inadequate accommodation. The one feature was aggravated reestablishment more than any other.

That is just one letter. I will read part of another:

> . . . my husband had joined the R.C.A.F. immediately at the outbreak of war. Our home was broken up for six years, as I followed him in Canada.
>
> After buying a tenant-occupied home because the tenants told the agent he wanted him to find them a house to move into, we find they immediately changed their mind and informed us they will not buy for several years when prices are reduced.

Those are only two examples of many letters I have received. I spoke over the radio on July 1, asking the young men and women not to go to the United States. These letters are in reply to that appeal. They all give the same reasons. The veterans cannot get the houses which they have bought. It seems to me that they deserve some attention and that regulations should be made in order that they might be able to get possession of the houses for which they have paid good money. I would ask the minister if he would not use his good auspices with the proper authorities with a view to having the regulations changed so that these people will be able to get their houses.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I wish to assure the hon. member for St. Paul's that the weighty assignment which he has placed upon my shoulders will be discharged by the officers of the department as far as possible. We have already made representations in the direction he has indicated.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I want to have some information about what is done by the department, and the question is not merely regarding the spending of money. It is as to what is done with the money which is spent. It is a simple thing I want to know. I was told today—and it was a surprise to me—that members of parliament insisted on having veterans affairs estimates brought down earlier than the others; there were some answers for that. But I remember distinctly that when the estimates of the department were brought in for the first time, they were just like a flying cloud. When I rose to ask a question—this is about a month ago; I have not looked up the record, but my recollection is clear about it—I was immediately told that there was nothing before the chair. It had all gone away—phut!—like that. I have waited for a month now, and tonight I want to get some information.

In the first place, my idea is that all the money which is spent for veterans is well spent, provided that it is spent on men who have been in the Canadian army. But that is not what is done. My fear is that most of the grants of the Department of Veterans Affairs are expended in another branch of the immigration business, and that veterans who never belonged to the Canadian army—veterans of the imperial army or some other one, or even of the home guards—are brought in and given the advantages of the legislation which has been passed to help Canadians or members of the Canadian army. I remember having seen in the press something about the visit of the minister to the estate of the Duke of Sutherland or someone else in England or Scotland; it was somewhere in the British isles. Afterwards we were told by the press that, as a result of the visit, 30,000 men of the imperial army would come to Canada as immigrants.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Oh, oh.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not want the minister to laugh, because I am serious; and when I am serious, I mean it. I want him to be polite. I gave him a lesson today and I did not use all of my repertoire which is parliamentary. But I want the minister to be polite, if not for the last time, at least for the first time this session. I mean what I say.

Mr. MACKENZIE: So do I.

Mr. POULIOT: The minister means nothing.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. member means less to me.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. POULIOT: Now, there is progress for you. We understand what the minister has said. As a rule, I cannot understand what he says and that is the reason why I object to it. When he mumbled an answer of some kind and I asked the Minister of Labour and the then secretary of state what the Minister of Veterans Affairs had said, they told me they could not understand him, and they were quite close to him. The minister can say anything to me; provided that he

speaks intelligibly I shall be satisfied. But I want him to speak the English language correctly. That is all I want him to do.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I speak it better than the hon. member does.

Mr. POULIOT: Certainly. It is the minister's own language. He took honours in college, and it would be shameful if he could not speak his own language better than I can.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is not my own language.

Mr. POULIOT: It is the language of those who burned the house of his great grandmother.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. KNOWLES: Let us rise and report progress.

Mr. POULIOT: That being said, it is only a preliminary. I want to get some information with regard to the mysteries of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Members are easy to satisfy. They hear a grunt of some kind and they say, "He is so clever; he is a nice fellow. I am satisfied." I shall not be satisfied with a grunt. I want more than that. I want an explanation and I want figures. I am not referring to figures of money but rather to figures of results. I want to know how the money has been spent. I want to know whether those who have taken advantage of this legislation are Canadians or blokes. The question is a simple one. When I use the word "blokes" I do not mean those who were born outside of Canada. I mean those who are migratory birds, those who come here just to take advantage of the money which is voted for Canadian purposes. That includes people who were born in any part of the world, but who have come to Canada to settle down and make in Canada a home for themselves, their children and grandchildren. I do not want to be misjudged or misunderstood. I want to be clearly understood. I want to know what has been done with the money which has been voted and which runs up into such high figures. I want to know how many people have been benefited by each one of the acts which were passed last session. I want to know how many people who were in the Canadian army have received advantages and benefits from any of those acts. I want to know how many others, non-Canadians, have benefited from each one of those acts. To save the time of the committee I will mention the chapters of the statutes of 1946. They are chapters 36, 43, 52, 59, 62, 63, 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74 and 75. It is just a question I was asking the first time the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs were brought in; and after I rose to my feet I had only time to begin to ask my question before I was told there was nothing before the Chair. It was gone—phut!—just like that. I want that information now, please.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Right away sir; it is all here. All beneficiaries were Canadians born or domiciled in this country prior to service in the imperial or allied forces. The beneficiaries under each act have been classified as having served (a) in Canadian forces; (b) in British forces; (c) in allied forces. Pensions, world war I: Canadians, 87,318; others, British domiciled in Canada, 250; allied, 34, or a total of non-Canadians of 284 as against a complete Canadian total of 87,318. World war II: Canadians, 87,558; others, British, 135; allied 3, or a total of 138 as against an all-Canadian total of 87,558.

War veterans allowance: Canadians, 25,112; others, British, 916; allied, 215, or a total of 1,131 as against an all-Canadian total of 25,112.

Veterans Land Act: Canadian and British, 25 188; allied, 36. The number of British were estimated at 100 to 150, and the details are not exactly available in regard to that total.

Out of work allowances, under the legislation passed by this parliament: Canadians, 156,912; others, British, 65; allied, 40, or a total of 105 as against an all-Canadian total of 156,912.

Vocational training: Canadian, 85,848; others, British 42; allied, 36, or a total of 78 as against an all-Canadian total of 85,848.

Awaiting benefit returns: Canadians, 43,227; others, British, 5; allied, 24, or a total of 29 as against an all-Canadian total of 43,227.

Temporary incapacity, one of the special benefits this parliament has arranged: Canadians, 5,178; others, British, 0; allied, 0; as against a grand Canadian total of 5,178.

University training for our young men: Canadians, 54,968; others, British, 44; allied, 37, or a total of 81 as against an all-Canadian total of 54,968.

Gratuities—and this is perhaps the most crushing reply given by these figures to the suggestion that has been adduced so unfairly in this house: Canadians, 941,311; others, British, 3,285; allied, 403, or a total of 3,688 as against a Canadian total of 941,311.

Reestablishment credits, and the only country in the world to have done this is our country of Canada: Canadians, 650,000; others, British 129; allied, 232, or a total of 361 as against a Canadian total of 650,000.

Business and professional loans, which are under the jurisdiction of my colleague the Minister of Finance: Canadians, 2,024; others,

British, 4; allied, 3, or a total of 7 as against a Canadian total of 2,024.

The Veterans Insurance Act: Canadians, 11,222; others, British 25; allied, 0, or 25 as against a Canadian total of 11,222. The few British I have mentioned as entitled to these various benefits were Canadians who served in the Royal Air Force and saved England and freedom in the battle of Britain.

Mr. POULIOT: I wonder if the minister made these calculations himself. Did he personally check the records of these thousands of people?

Mr. MACKENZIE: The calculation was made under my direction by trusted and worthy officers of the department.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, but the minister knows no more about the matter than I do. They were prepared by his staff, but he has never checked them. What surprises me is that the figures run to even thousands. It is not a case of odd numbers at all; it is 500, 1,000 and so many thousands.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Mr. POULIOT: Except for the last figures. The large ones are all that way; they are even 500's or even 1,000's. But now I want the minister to understand my point of view, and I am sure he will relish it. It will not take me long to explain it. He said that men who belonged to the British army were defending liberty throughout the world. That is true, but my point of view is that the men who served in the British army ought to be paid pensions by the British government. We are looking after our own people; why should we pay pensions to men who served in another army?

Mr. MACKENZIE: These are all Canadians, every one of them.

Mr. POULIOT: That is all right, but they are Canadians who were not in the Canadian army but in another army. The minister knows very well the number of those who served in the imperial army and who now want to take advantage of the Canadian pension scheme in order to get more money. Some of them are men who have never been in Canada but who want to come here as one wants to go to a garden of Eden, to a promised land.

This whole matter should also be considered from another angle, in regard to those who signed for overseas service and those who did not. This is the military preference as established by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the old Department of Pensions and National Health. It is to the effect that a man who was in the home guard in England, a man who was always near the gate of his garden all the time, was entitled to an overseas preference over a Canadian who had been in the Canadian army, who had followed the instructions of his superior officers, who had been to Kiska, who had been to Labrador, but who had not signed for overseas. The gallantry of a man was not to fight in battle, was not to isolate himself from his family, to suffer the cold or heat of distant parts of the hemisphere; it was to sign for overseas. I know men who suffered from paralysis, who suffered from double rupture, who suffered from heart conditions and who were completely unfit, but who signed for overseas service in the expectation of having a discharge. But at the same time they were given a button to show their gallantry when they signed enlistment papers for overseas. They were gallant, they were courageous because of the stroke of a pen.

The others were not given the same advantages as the former ones because they had not signed for overseas. At the present time there are a large number of soldiers who have done their duty and who have obeyed the orders they have received from their superior officers, but who have been guilty of the crime of not signing the form to serve overseas. It was a great crime which deprived them of the preference and even of the benefits of certain legislation.

I bring this matter to the attention of the minister, so that in the millennium some change will be made in the absurd provisions of the Civil Service Act. I am not in a hurry for my answer; I shall be satisfied if it is tabled at the beginning of the next session. But I would ask the minister to table a list of the individual names of the men included in each of the totals he gave not long ago. I want to know the true addresses of each of those men included among those thousands of men mentioned not long ago and, as I say, I shall be satisfied to have that information at the beginning of the next session. Now that the calculation is made, it will be easy to give that list, because if the work of the Department of Veterans Affairs has been well done the list is now ready; and that list will have been made in several copies so that it will be easy to table one copy at the next session.

I say to the minister that I always act in a friendly spirit and in a friendly disposition. I am not impressed by high position or high-sounding titles. That means nothing to me, because I am a democrat. I do not see what

advantage it is for Canada to have minister who is a member of the privy council at Westminster. It means only that he is an English minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE: More like a Scotch minister, I should say.

Mr. POULIOT: But I take that view, the Canadian view. I am not impressed by the fact of his being a privy councillor. One cannot serve two countries; one cannot serve England and Canada at the same time. If one is created a right honourable he might be tempted to serve England first, before Canada, and my idea is that Canada should be served first. However, that is only a matter of opinion.

I will tell the minister what, among other things, is wrong in the Department of Veterans Affairs. I do not wish to be unfair to anyone in that department. The fault is that when a decision is made it is impossible to have it reconsidered favourably. I have in mind particularly the case of a cousin of mine who served in North Africa for several years. He was there, and in that country there were tarantulas and snakes; indeed, it was like some departments in that respect. They did not have a very pleasant life over there. My cousin was there for a long time, and he had some trouble with a bureaucrat in Quebec city who went to England just for a Cook's tour. I now make a comparison between a man who served in the air force and who wanted to take advantage of legislation which would make his life more pleasant and which would improve his condition—a real soldier—on the one hand, and on the other hand a bureaucrat who went to England for two months at the end of the war and thereby qualified himself for overseas service. I find that pretty hard to digest. I have asked questions about that man; I shall not name him tonight. But I want him to bend before the authority, and that authority I would name as the superior officer in the department. I want justice for the man I first mentioned.

Some people are under the impression that because a man has been wearing a uniform he is a full-fledged soldier. I am not. I have never been in the army, and I am too old now to serve in it, but I have served the soldiers. I have been a servant of the people and of the returned men. I have petitions right here in Ottawa. There is a Victoria Cross winner right here in the building, and I looked after him. And when another Victoria Cross winner from British Columbia was in trouble he sent me an S.O.S. down the river. I must give credit to the minister for having fixed him up. Nevertheless it was a great honour for me to receive word from that gentleman who was a distinguished soldier from British Columbia and brought glory to Canada in the first war.

That man was completely abandoned. However I am not going to tell the story, because it is known to hon. members. But what I have said indicates that I am sincere when I say I look after those men. I do it for their own good and for the country's good. I do not want any fascism in this country; I do not want any communism; I do not want any subversive ideas. I want order and authority.

I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, and the minister, that if the men are not fairly dealt with, anything can be expected from them. I say that in all honesty; and I want the minister to understand well that when representations are made to him or to his most intelligent and capable parliamentary assistant, or to the deputy minister, or to the head of the pension commission, we should have some satisfactory replies.

Since this is either the last day or the day preceding the close of the session, I shall not insist any further in what I am saying. But I tell the minister again that in the future he has to be polite, and he must understand that while he is a right honourable he is still the servant of the people, just the same as are other members in the house.

Mr. McKAY: Despite anything that may have been said in debate, I feel that in many respects the minister has done a good job in the Department of Veterans Affairs. If he has not done a better job it is probably due to pressure from the treasury board. However, the government in that regard will have to accept the responsibility for anything that has not been done in the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I hope what I have to say next will not prove contentious. I feel that at this time the government should give consideration to the arranging of an excursion at substantially reduced rates to the battlefields of Europe for the next of kin of Canadian boys who are buried there. Such an excursion at reduced rates should be planned for not later than 1948, when I believe shipping ought to be available.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member to deal with this item.

Mr. McKAY: I would ask the minister if there is any other item on which I could bring this up. I shall take only a moment or two. I believe that this opportunity to visit the graveyards of Canada's sons who are buried

on foreign soil should be granted to the next of kin, most of whom I feel are financially unable to make the trip. Such an excursion under the sponsorship of the government would be a fine gesture on the part of a grateful country toward these families who have sacrificed so much for Canada.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I do not see how the hon. member can relate his proposal to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. McKAY: Where else can I bring it up, Mr. Chairman, if not here? I think it should be under the veterans affairs department.

Mr. MACKENZIE: When the Vimy pilgrimage in 1936 was arranged the present deputy minister was chairman of the committee and I was minister of national defence in charge of arrangements. Personally, Mr. Chairman, with your consent and the consent of the committee, perhaps the hon. gentleman might be allowed to speak briefly.

Mr. McKAY: I consider it the duty of the government to those who have lost their sons or husbands or fathers overseas to do everything possible to see that they have at least one opportunity to visit the graves of their loved ones who lie over there. That is all I have to say upon that subject, Mr. Chairman.

I now wish to associate myself with those who have spoken this afternoon and this evening urging the minister to give serious consideration to raising the basic pension, not only for the disability pensioners, but for recipients of the veteran's allowance and the widow's allowance. We all know that the cost of living has gone up and is continuing to rise. We also know that the United States has increased its pensions by 20 per cent. I have been informed that the cost of living in the United States has gone up so much that the veterans pensions were inadequate. I do not for one moment suggest that Canada up to now has not done as well as the United States with regard to pensions. Canada has done a good job, but the rising cost of living makes it very difficult for our pensioners to carry on. It is ridiculous to suggest that anyone can live on $30.41, which is the amount which the war veteran receives under the War Veterans Allowances Act. The widow of a deceased veteran who receives only $60 a month is receiving altogether too small an amount. If she has two children she receives an additional $27. That does not go very far these days in providing shelter, food, clothing and medical care. So I appeal to the minister to do everything he can to see that the basic pensions for these groups are raised and raised without delay.

Mr. QUELCH: The minister will recall that last year a number of us accompanied him to the veterans health and occupational centre at Billings Bridge and were favourably impressed with the lay-out, recreation facilities, treatment, meals and accommodation. This session a couple of the veterans from there came to see me. They reminded me that the minister, when down there, had told them that if there were any complaints they should let him know. They said they did not like to bother him and asked me to take their case up. I took it up with the department and it was straightened out satisfactorily. Last night one of them said that twelve others would like me to take their cases up. I said I did not think that was the right channel. I would suggest to the minister, if he will accept my suggestion, that he send one of his deputy ministers to Billings Bridge to see these men, investigate their complaints and try to get to the bottom of the trouble.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That will be done right away.

Mr. QUELCH: I can give the minister the name of the man to get in touch with. The complaint is that a man is given twelve months class 2 treatment, and at the end of the twelve months the doctor recommends that he get an additional six months, but the administration at Aylmer forces him to sign a statement that he will accept class 3 instead of class 2 treatment.

Mr. BLAIR: There is one clause in the Pension Act which should be given consideration. It is with regard to pre-enlistment disability. The way that is interpreted by the board is this. Suppose a man comes up during the war or following the war for duodenal ulcer. His history was taken overseas in hospital, and the attending doctor takes the case history something like this: "Have you ever had stomach trouble before?" "No." "Just think it over." "Well, I did have stomach trouble ten years ago, but I got some treatment for two or three weeks and it all cleared up." Then down on his history sheet goes the item; "Stomach trouble, 1935." He comes up for pension for duodenal ulcer, and the pension is refused because of that item on his history sheet. The pension board say, "We cannot do anything for you. You had stomach trouble in 1935. Pre-enlistment disability." So he is only pensionable for aggravation. I assure the minister that there are plenty of these cases happening

where the pension is refused on just as flimsy a thing as that, where the soldier overseas, with no thought of concealment wilfully or otherwise, foolishly gave one of these details which went down on his history sheet. If this debate goes on here for two or three days more everybody in this house will have nervous indigestion, but that should not preclude us from being pensioned for duodenal ulcer. I assure the minister that I have many cases where the ruling made by the pension board is pinned on just as flimsy a pretext as that. The history may show a duodenal ulcer ten years ago. There is no reason why the pension board should claim that that is a perfect history. It was not confirmed by X-ray; there was no confirmation, no diagnosis made at that time. Unless such diagnosis is confirmed, either by X-ray or doctor's certificate or by admission, the applicant should not be refused a pension. Therefore I claim that this clause is being badly interpreted by the board. I assure the minister that I am absolutely honest in this matter. There has been no attempt by me to obtain pensions under that ruling. To be honest about this matter, I assured myself that these cases were being unjustly dealt with. The presentation of these cases before the house gains nothing whatever. Very few of them are couched in language we can understand, and it is difficult to decide just what should be done when they are presented before the house.

I was interested this afternoon in the presentation of cases by several hon. members, but I could not form any opinion, and I have been over the files of some of these cases. I came to the conclusion that we are dealing with psychoneurosis, which brings me to another clause which, I think, should have freer interpretation than is given at the present time. A man with psychoneurosis, provided that it is due to battle fatigue or whatever it may be—and much has been written about it at this time—suffers the tortures of the damned, possibly worse than a man who has a combat injury. Yet it is a difficult matter to interpret, and is very difficult for the pension board. I will make an appeal to the minister and to the pension board. I think the part dealing with psychoneurosis should not be just cast aside, and say that he is just a neurotic. A person who is suffering from psychoneurosis is undergoing a worse disability than a person who has lost a leg or two legs. I ask the pension board to deal kindly with these cases, to look into them, and if there is any suspicion that it is due to war service the individual concerned should be given the full benefit of the doubt.

[Mr. Blair.]

I leave that other matter for the consideration of the committee, because I realize that we discussed it for two days in the pension committee. I do not blame the pension board, because we created that act and wrote in that clause, but I feel that many applicants for pension are not receiving a fair deal under that clause and that we should rewrite it. It should be broadened and there should be a clear way of interpreting it in order to assist the pension board. They cannot do anything with it at the present time, because they turn up the history of these cases. Every one of us has suffered disabilities or sickness. You can get hundreds of histories from any one of us if you tried. We should be very careful in interpreting that and not pick up something for which there is no proof whatever. A war disability should be proved by X-ray, a definite statement of a doctor, or an admission from the applicant himself.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I say one word? Any suggestion my hon. friend would care to offer to the department will be truly and sympathetically considered.

Mr. GILLIS: I have a few remarks to make on this item. I am going to reserve most of what I have to say for the estimates as we go through them. But there are two or three matters of an administrative nature that I should like to bring to the minister's attention at this time. First, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the last speaker. The subject he discussed was raised in the veterans affairs committee and discussed at great length. I refer to the matter of pre-enlistment disabilities and disabilities of a congenital origin. I thought we had ironed that out in 1941 when the pension committee sat, when we removed that clause from the act. That gave the pension commission authority to rule on disabilities that may have been of a congenital origin or, in other words, inherited. We removed that clause from the old act in 1940. Apparently the commission still adjudicates along these lines. I am not going into that any farther; the last speaker dealt with it effectively. I know the minister will give it serious consideration.

There is, in my opinion, one admission in the minister's estimates. There is no provision for relief for service personnel who are not in receipt of a pension and who cannot secure employment. I raise the matter now, because in my own constituency the last figures I saw about a month ago showed there were 2,600 veterans of the war just ended unemployed. Their out-of-work benefits have run out. They are not eligible for unemployment insurance.

They cannot secure employment. I think the government should accept some responsibility. Even before the war, the department did provide some unemployment relief for an ex-serviceman in that category. That is no longer in existence. I am just going to leave it at that with the minister. Here is a category which does not come within the scope of the regulations in any way, shape or form. It is a serious problem, and until such time as these men can find some gainful employment—they are registered for employment—some means of relieving their situation should be considered.

Another thought I should like to leave with the minister is this. I understand that there is still a large number of service personnel who were discharged for misconduct whose cases have not been heard. The board of review did an excellent job in straightening out what, in my opinion, was an injustice. Many of these misconduct charges were uncalled for. Gratuity was granted. I understand that the board is to be wound up.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not for some time.

Mr. GILLIS: I am satisfied with the minister's assurance that it is to continue. I understand that there are some 4,000 files yet to be examined.

Mr. MACKENZIE: They will have finished their work before they are disbanded.

Mr. GILLIS: I have another matter which is of an administrative nature. The minister and I have discussed this before, but we did not come to any conclusion on it. I refer to the department's proposal to close the D.V.A. hospital at Sydney, Nova Scotia. I understand that the department have come to a definite decision that that hospital is to close. I wish to get some further information from the minister. I should like to inform him that this business of concentrating in Halifax, in Camp Hill hospital, all veterans requiring hospitalization will, in my opinion, create a hardship and a great disservice to the service personnel on Cape Breton island. Fifty-two per cent of all the pensioners in Nova Scotia reside on Cape Breton island. To get from Cape Breton island to Halifax you must travel 360 miles. The people whom you are to continue to treat in these departmental hospitals will be those who are in receipt of pension. With fifty-two per cent of them in that end of the country, I cannot understand why there is any justification to ask these pensioners who will be requiring treatment in the years to come to leave their homes and go to Halifax, to break with their families with no chance of seeing them. A lot of these people will spend a long time in these hospitals during the next fifteen or twenty years. We still have veterans of the first war in military hospitals across Canada. The hospital at Sydney is well equipped. If the department has definitely decided to close it I am protesting, because I think we are fully justified in asking that it be maintained where it is. If it is to be closed I should like to have from the minister definitely that it is, the approximate date and what disposition is to be made of the hospital and equipment when and if it folds up.

Mr. MACKENZIE: As far as I can speak with accuracy at the moment, the number of patients on June 21, 1947, was ninety-five; the number of beds was 200. The percentage of occupancy was forty-seven per cent. The department intends to review the whole situation next September and come to a definite conclusion.

Item agreed to.

455. District administration, $5,374,160.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Before the item carries, I should like to make a remark about two topics. In the first instance, I believe the expression "pre-enlistment disability" has outlived its usefulness and should be stricken from usage in all matters pertaining to veterans affairs. It should never have been used with respect to the first great war and certainly it should not be used at the present time. It is just a means of cheating deserving men out of what they deserve and we should no longer use it. As nearly as I can make out, from the studies I have made of the matter, we are beginning to use psychiatrists. That is another way of cheating deserving men out of these benefits which they deserve. I suggest to the minister that he discontinue the use of psychiatrists, because it is cheating men out of their deserts.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I say to my hon. friend—I think I should reply to every question asked—the question of pre-enlistment disabilities is one of the most difficult in pension administration. It was enacted and reenacted by parliament year after year. I think it is a question which might well be considered by the next committee that is set up to deal with veterans affairs.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I simply say that if the soldier was well enough to be accepted into the army that is justification for his receiving a pension if anything happens to him through his service. There should be no question about the matter any further. That should be enough. If we accept men into the army we must take full responsibility

for any bit of money they might get from the state which somebody thinks they might not have earned.

Mr. PROBE: Under district administration, I wish to have a question answered by the minister. This items shows a reduced budget for the ensuing year of $674,000, which bears out the minister's contention in his preliminary statement that the activities are lessening to some extent. I notice there are also big drops in the other items enumerated on page 257 of the estimates. On the other hand, there is an increase which I should like to have the minister explain. There may be a good reason for it. Last year provision was made for six district administrators and for the next year the minister is providing seven. He has also included an administrative assistant and has increased the number of assistant district administrators from one to three and the purchasing agents from three to four. Why is it that, with a diminution in the work, there is not, as I suggest there should be, a diminution of staff, particularly in the higher-paid brackets. In the case of purchasing agents I notice it is proposed to buy $50,000 less in supplies in the ensuing year than in the year before.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am not an expert, but I understand that they are coming into permanent positions and, as such, must be shown in a different category from what they were before as temporaries. There is no change at all in the establishment.

Mr. PROBE: There is little change in the amount for temporary assistance.

Mr. FRASER: Is the department considering putting veterans who are in the district offices on a somewhat more permanent basis? At the present time they do not know whether they will be there a week, a year or what. Should they not be put on a civil service basis? How are they dealt with?

Mr. MACKENZIE: We have been pressing for that very thing for some time past, and the civil service commission is just commencing to review the situation in accordance with the suggestion made by my hon. friend.

Item agreed to.

457. Treatment services, $20,150,640.

Mr. PROBE: The minister said this afternoon—and the statement was received with much satisfaction—that, owing to an improvement in the physical condition of those veterans receiving treatment, there is a closing down of hospitals across the country. I presume the minister has some policy with respect to those hospitals that are closing down. In view of the shortage of hospitals across Canada, is some provision being made so that the hospital facilities of the department, which are admirable, as most of us know, may be leased to local authorities at a dollar a year or some nominal sum?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes. Discussions have been going on for some time. They give preference to civic or local hospitals for facilities which were available to be used by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. PROBE: The minister is to be congratulated on that.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Most of them were unsuitable for permanent hospitals.

Mr. PROBE: The minister is aware that discussions have been going on between his department and the government of Saskatchewan with respect to the treatment of veterans receiving war veterans allowances. The government of Saskatchewan has a hospitalization plan in which those in receipt of war veterans allowances receive hospitalization from the government of Saskatchewan for the nominal sum of $2.50, and there were negotiations with respect to the federal government assuming that cost. What is the present policy of the government with respect to hospitalization for those in receipt of war veterans allowances, and their families? How is that looked after? Under what conditions do they receive it? Second, what has been the progress of the negotiations between the Saskatchewan government and the federal government?

Mr. MACKENZIE: To answer the second question first, the negotiations with Saskatchewan are proceeding quite satisfactorily and, I trust, will be fruitful of success. The other question was, what is the policy of the administration with reference to the treatment of those in receipt of war veterans allowances who are hospital cases?

Mr. PROBE: And their families.

Mr. MACKENZIE: They will be hospitalized, according to the regulations of the department, in the best way possible.

Mr. PROBE: What are the regulations?

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is in the veterans charter.

Mr. PROBE: I want it on the record. Do they get hospitalization only for war disabilities?

Mr. MACKENZIE: No. If my hon. friend will be good enough to read the copy sent him he will find the answer.

Mr. ADAMSON: Is it the intention of the department to continue to use Christie Street hospital as an out-patients hospital because of its convenience to down-town Toronto?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I would not pretend for one moment to be a medical expert, but the intention of the department, as I construe it—and I must not be understood as suggesting that this is accurate—is to have Christie Street hospital in operation until we are able fully to occupy Sunnybrook. I personally made a suggestion to the mayor of Toronto, and he and the city council are anxious to avail themselves of the facilities of Christie Street hospital, once the Department of Veterans Affairs do not require these facilities. What may take place I dare not predict, but that is how the situation stands at the present time.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I wish to ask the minister a question in regard to item 458 (S), salaries of commissioners. There is a small increase. I am not objecting to that, but I presume the commissioners received an increase in salary owing to the greatly increased cost of living. If that is correct, I wonder how the minister can justify not making an increase in the basic rate of pensions and an increase in the amount of veterans allowances. I wish the minister would explain why the commissioners received this increase. Is it because of the increased cost of living?

Mr. GILLIS: You are off the item. We are dealing with treatment services and you are starting another discussion.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am informed that the salaries of the commissioners are statutory.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): What is the increase of $15,500 if it is not an increase in salary?

Mr. TUCKER: It is an increase made last year when we increased it in the Pension Act.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): An increase of what?

Mr. TUCKER: An increase last year by the Pension Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE: By parliament.

Mr. GILLIS: Can the minister inform the committee what percentage of the medical officers in departmental hospitals are part-time officers?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Speaking in broad and general terms, about fifty per cent.

Mr. GILLIS: As the minister will remember, back in 1932 we had a thorough discussion in the house about that. At that time I thought the consensus, including that of the minister, was that in so far as possible the departmental hospitals, after this war was over, would be staffed with full-time medical officers.

Mr. MACKENZIE: We changed the whole medical policy of the department about two or three years ago. We obtained the complete cooperation of the finest specialists in Canada, of the Canadian Medical Association, and of every single university medical faculty in the Dominion of Canada. We have part-time consultants there. We have three forms of treatment: one in the home, one in the office and one in the hospital. It is expensive, but it is, I believe, the finest treatment ever given to ex-servicemen anywhere. We may have to curtail. I think we shall be compelled to cut down later on.

Mr. FRASER: It is not too expensive for the job which is being done.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. GILLIS: Anyone who has had any experience as a patient in a military hospital will, I think, agree with me, that he spends most of his time sitting on a bench waiting for one of these specialists to come in; and when he does come in, he gets a cup of tea and is in a hurry to go out. I think a medical doctor who takes on the responsibility of looking after a section of patients in a military hospital for the next few years in which these men require treatment, should at least be on full time and go in there at nine o'clock in the morning. He should at least put in civil service hours. It is not a nice thing to be sitting on a bench all day waiting around.

Mr. TUCKER: Is that the way it is done at Sydney?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I have been in this for a long time. We had full-time medical officers before the last war and they were greatly underpaid. We did not get the best men. I do not say that with any disrespect at all, but they were not paid a sufficient salary. This time we have endeavoured to revise the whole policy. If anything happens in the lovely place called Sydney, and any doctor or specialist comes in there and keeps the men waiting while he gets a cup of tea, I should like to be apprised of it.

Mr. GILLIS: I am not referring to Sydney. There is a good set-up there. I hope it is retained. I am referring to Camp Hill, because I myself visited Camp Hill in 1945 just prior to the finish of the war. There I saw

young fellows lined up on a bench from nine o'clock in the morning until four o'clock in the afternoon, without lunch or anything else.

Mr. MACKENZIE: When was that?

Mr. GILLIS: Just before the finish of the war.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That condition would not be found now.

Mr. GILLIS: They went away without seeing a doctor and came back the next day.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That was quite true for a while. What my hon. friend has said is quite true; that was the situation for about six or nine months. It is not so now.

Mr. GILLIS: I am quite satisfied if the minister says everything is going on all right now. I will have a look at Camp Hill on my way home and will drop the minister a letter.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): Did I understand the parliamentary assistant to say that the act was changed last year and the commissioners' salaries were increased?

Mr. TUCKER: Yes, by section 3, subsection 7 of the Pension Act. It increased the chairman's salary to $9,000, which was formerly by order in council; the deputy chairman to $7,500 and the commissioners to $7,000.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): What were their salaries before the change?

Mr. TUCKER: They were $7,000 and $6,000.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): Then my question to the minister would be the same as it was before. I suppose these increases were given to the commissioners on the ground of an increase in the cost of living today.

Mr. TUCKER: These increases were given during the war because there was so much more work to be done. They were given during the war by order in council and confirmed by statute.

Mr. FRASER: I understand that the commission or the board, I should say, keep in touch with the children's aid societies across the country and ask them to handle certain cases in their districts, having regard to pension money. Am I right in that?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, my hon. friend is quite correct. That is in the case where a pension has to be administered and there is not a responsible parent.

Mr. FRASER: That is right.

Mr. MACKENZIE: In such case it is often entrusted to one of these philanthropic societies.

Mr. FRASER: I suggest to the board that, when they ask a children's aid society to do that, they do not just write them, telling them to look after this case, but that they give the children's aid society the details of why they have been asked to do that. I understand that in the past the children's aid societies have not been given the details of the case, and that makes it difficult and awkward for the societies.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I agree with my hon. friend. Has he a single case in which, to his knowledge, that was not done?

Mr. FRASER: The Peterborough Children's Aid Society of which I am a life member and director.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Will my hon. friend be kind enough to write me about that at his convenience?

Mr. FRASER: I will do that. I just wanted to ask that the details be sent out to these other societies.

Mr. TUCKER: The practice is to send out the full details. If there is a case in which it has not been done, if it is brought to the attention of the minister it will be looked into.

Item agreed to.

461. War veterans' allowance board—administration, $199,733.

Mr. MacNICOL: I just wish to ask for a little bit of clarification. I would ask the minister to answer the following questions: What is the maximum of war veterans allowance to the veteran? To his wife while the veteran is living? To the wife in the event of the veteran's decease? If he has a pension for disability of $22 a month, does he get that in addition to the war veteran's allowance? Is he allowed to draw pension in addition to the war veteran's allowance? Would the minister answer those questions?

Mr. TUCKER: The war veteran's allowance, in the case of a single man, is $365. He is allowed an income from any other source of $125, and then casual earnings of $125 in addition to that.

Mr. MacNICOL: That would make $250 he is allowed extra?

Mr. TUCKER: Yes, and investment income of $25. That is a total of $640. A

married man in receipt of war veteran's allowance is allowed $730, plus income from other sources of $250, plus casual earnings of $125, and the $25 unearned or investment income, a total of $1,130.

Mr. MacNICOL: And in the event of his death what would his widow receive?

Mr. TUCKER: In the event of his death, his widow gets his allowance for one year. After that, if she is qualified, she goes on the widow's allowance; and if she has dependents she gets the $730.

Mr. MacNICOL: Does the pension of $22 a month die with him?

Mr. TUCKER: No, she would carry on with his pension for one year.

Mr. MacNICOL: I mean his war disability pension.

Mr. TUCKER: In regard to the disability, if it is not due to the war—

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes, his disability is due to the war, and he gets $22 a month.

Mr. TUCKER: If he dies as the result of a war disability, the widow is pensioned. If his disability was greater than fifty per cent, she receives a pension.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am not quite clear yet. We start with a man drawing war veteran's allowance of $30 a month. The wife also would receive an allowance of $30?

Mr. TUCKER: No; as a married man he gets an allowance of $730. It is not like the old age pension; the wife does not have to be sixty or seventy years of age for him to get the full $730.

Mr. MacNICOL: During all this time he is drawing $22 a month war disability. Is he allowed to do that in addition to war veteran's allowance?

Mr. TUCKER: The additional income may, of course, be a pension. If the widow is entitled to go on drawing an allowance, owing to the circumstances under which it is being paid, then she can draw that allowance up to the amount I have indicated. That is, she can have an income of $250.

Mr. MacNICOL: In the event of the death of a man who was drawing the war veteran's allowance, what does the widow get?

Mr. TUCKER: On the death of the husband, who was entitled to the war veteran's allowance, that allowance continues with her for a year. In regard to a pension, if that pension was payable in respect of a war disability of over fifty per cent or if he died on account of the war disability—

Mr. MacNICOL: He only got $22 a month.

Mr. TUCKER: It does not matter. It might be that death would be due to the war disability.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes, it could be.

Mr. TUCKER: Then she would receive a pension after the death of her husband. Of course, if the disability was less than fifty per cent, or death was not due to war disability, the pension payable dies with the husband.

Mr. MacNICOL: As I understand it now, upon the death of a veteran drawing a disability pension of $22 a month as a result of the war, apart from the war veteran's allowance the widow would be entitled to continue to draw that $22, would she?

Mr. TUCKER: As I have said, it dies with the man unless he died as a result of the war disability.

Mr. MacNICOL: He has to die as a result of the war disability?

Mr. TUCKER: Yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: Would she not continue to receive the war veteran's allowance?

Mr. TUCKER: Yes, she would get the war veteran's allowance, but the pension would die with the man unless his disability was over fifty per cent, or unless he died as a result of his war disability.

Mr. CASE: There was a provision I should like to have clarified. A widow who was receiving $40 a month could not engage in any occupation. If she were eligible for a pension of $60 a month, however she could engage in an occupation and earn money for herself. What is the present situation in that respect? I know I had one or two of these cases corrected, and I should like the position clarified now.

Mr. TUCKER: As the hon. member will remember, that was one change we made in the War Veterans Allowances Act. A person such as the hon. member describes with no dependents can draw $125 extra income and $125 casual income. If she has dependents she may have $250 extra income, $125 casual income and $25 unearned income.

Mr. CASE: But is $40 a month the level at which she is prevented from engaging in any occupation?

Mr. TUCKER: The question is whether or not she has dependents.

Mr. CASE: She would have dependents.

Mr. TUCKER: Then she would be entitled to draw $730. In addition she could earn $250 plus $125, and have $25 in unearned income.

Mr. FULTON: Once again I should like to renew a plea which has been made every year since I have been here, in behalf of the imperial veterans, those men who served in the first world war from 1914 to 1918, who came to Canada and have lived as Canadian citizens ever since, making their full contribution to the life of this country. I am not going to speak at length on this matter, but I want to say this. I have not previously expressed myself on the matter of the many increases in salary which have lately been granted, but it seems to me that if we can grant pensions of $3,000 to diplomats after five years of service; if we can increase the salaries of the leaders in the other place, we can at last afford to pay the war veterans allowances to these old and comparatively few veterans who, in the first war, served alongside our own soldiers. Many of the benefits given under the veterans charter of Canada are generous, but I feel that the continued denial of this small concession to these men under the circumstances is narrow-minded and mean, and I renew the plea to the minister to extend the war veterans allowances to imperial veterans who have been in Canada for a specified number of years.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I find no fault whatever with the advocacy of the hon. member for Kamloops. I have frequently stated my personal policy on this matter, but perhaps the committee will pardon me if I restate it in the space of about one minute. This matter came up before the veterans affairs committee last year, and the stand I took at that time was endorsed by that committee. Very simply my stand was this. Before we extend the war veterans allowances to imperials—and I was born over there—we should give it to all Canadians who served in England, in Canada or in a theatre of actual war. That should be done before we extend the allowance to any imperial, even though he may have been domiciled here before July, 1930, which is the advocacy that has been made on their behalf. I have nothing but the greatest admiration for those gallant imperial soldiers, but I am a Canadian through and through. Many of our men could not get overseas through no fault of their own, but they served in khaki, they served in the forces; and I say it is wrong to give the veteran's allowances to imperials before you give it to every single Canadian who served in the forces.

Mr. FULTON: Then why not give it to all those Canadians?

[Mr. Case.]

Mr. MACKENZIE: We certainly are not doing it.

Mr. FULTON: I say, do it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I will support my hon. friend in that as far as I can, but that is the policy I have been trying to advocate with the government. I have made no secret of it; I have mentioned it everywhere, on every platform.

Mr. ABBOTT: Let us go the whole way and pay a pension to everyone.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I think it might be a fine scheme of social security to give it to those who served in Canada, those who served in England and those who served in any theatre of actual war, and also to the imperial veterans. But it would not be the war veteran's allowance any longer; it would be a part of the great social security system in Canada.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I should like to ask the minister a question in regard to the pensions advocates. Will he explain the information at page 261 of the estimates which places the pensions advocates at various grades. First, will he explain the way in which they are graded as grades 1, 2, 3 and 4. I take it that these pensions advocates are members of the bar and are devoting their full time to this job, with the exception, of course, of those who are operating part time. If these rates of pay are correct I say they are totally inadequate for the service these men are rendering. I would suggest that pensions advocates should be the best counsel procurable and should be paid salaries in accordance with the service they render. How many cases do pensions advocates handle in a year, and what success have they had with those cases?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am afraid I have not the information before me to answer the last question asked. With regard to the grades, I would say that it is carried out exactly the same as in respect of doctors, namely, according to qualifications and experience. I do not know what success we shall have, but at the present time we are asking for an upward revision of the salaries of pensions advocates to which the hon. member has referred. However, that is the principle underlying the whole situation. While I have not the information respecting the number of cases handled, I believe I could get it for the hon. member.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): The minister is a member of the bar, himself. What would he think of engaging counsel at the magnificent salary of $2,244 a year to handle pen-

sions cases on behalf of soldiers? I say a salary like that is disgraceful.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Is that not for part time?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): No, it is for a pensions advocate, grade 1. Yet, on the next page higher salaries are shown for pensions advocates on part time.

Mr. MACKENZIE: We are not satisfied with those rates in the department and we are trying now to have them increased. I am in agreement with the observations of the hon. member.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): What are the duties of the pensions counsel whose salary is set down as $3,720?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I thought there was no provision under that item.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): The minister is right; I was looking at the amount for last year.

Item agreed to.

462. Veterans insurance, $116,271.

Mr. McKAY: I am wondering if, in issuing these policies to veterans the age of seventy years rather than eighty-five might be considered as maturity date. Most people do not reach the age of eighty-five, and certainly veterans with disabilities may never reach that age. I would suggest that some change be made in the plan of issuing these policies so that they would retire at the age of seventy.

Mr. TUCKER: As the hon. member will find if he refers to the booklet with respect to veterans insurance, there are many different types of insurance. There is a 15-payment life policy, a 20-payment life policy, a 10-payment life policy, a life policy paid up at sixty-five years of age and one paid up at eighty-five. There are all kinds of different policies.

Mr. McKAY: I accept that explanation as far as it goes. But it seems to me that these policies are issued at somewhat lower rates than those of the line companies. It would be an additional inducement to veterans to take out these policies if the maturity date on the straight life policy were set at seventy years of age instead of eighty-five. That is out of the question.

Mr. TUCKER: They can be obtained at sixty-five or seventy, or one can be obtained on twenty payments.

Mr. McKAY: The rates are prohibitive.

Mr. TUCKER: Oh, no; I would ask the hon. member to look at the booklet.

Mr. McKAY: I have one.

Mr. TUCKER: On a life policy maturing at sixty-five years of age the premium is somewhat less than a standard company can offer for the same kind of insurance.

Item agreed to.

Payments to or for veterans and dependents—
467. Gallantry awards, $20,000.

Mr. ADAMSON: What gallantry awards carry monetary emolument or grants?

Mr. TUCKER: The Victoria Cross, the Military Cross, the D.F.C., the D.C.M., the Conspicuous Gallantry Medal and the Distinguished Flying Medal.

Mr. ADAMSON: What does each one carry with it?

Mr. TUCKER: In respect of the Victoria Cross it is $50 per annum. That may be increased if the recipient, through age or infirmity or a cause beyond his control, cannot earn a livelihood.

Mr. ADAMSON: How much?

Mr. TUCKER: The equivalent of £75, which is roughly $375, converted at the rate of $5 to the pound. Then it is $100 for the Military Cross, for the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Distinguished Conduct Medal, the Conspicuous Gallantry Medal, the Conspicuous Service Medal, the Military Medal and the Distinguished Flying Medal.

Mr. ADAMSON: Per annum?

Mr. TUCKER: It is a gratuity of $100 when awarded to other ranks. As I have said, the Victoria Cross carries with it an annual grant.

Mr. ADAMSON: Cannot the Military Cross be awarded to warrant officers?

Mr. TUCKER: Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON: Does it carry an award to warrant officers?

Mr. TUCKER: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Payments to or for veterans and dependents—
468. Widows' allowances, world war I, $2,100,000.

Mr. KNOWLES: I should like to say one further brief but earnest word on this item, in addition to what I said this morning. Before doing so, however, may I join sincerely in the compliments which others have been paying the minister upon the way in which he handles the cases which members take up with him. Now that there are so few ministers in the house, so that what I shall say will not embarrass them, I believe I express the view

of members generally when I say that the Minister of Veterans Affairs is the best minister in the cabinet, so far as dealing with correspondence is concerned. Any faults we find with him relate, not to the way in which he administers the legislation which comes within his purview, but rather to the scope of that legislation. In many instances we feel it should be widened.

This is one instance where earnest and, I hope, favourable consideration may be given at the earliest possible moment. This item concerns the special allowances paid to widows of non-pensioned veterans. Earlier this evening when we were discussing the general item replying to the hon. member for Vancouver South the minister said that this provision had been in existence for only eighteen months. He was not quite fair to himself when he said that. Actually it has been in existence for four years. Back in 1943 an allowance of $25 a month was brought in by the minister, and in 1944 it was increased to the present figure of $30.41 a month. Last year it was transferred from an annual item in the estimates to the War Veterans Allowances Act itself. I am sure that the minister recognizes the force of the argument which was made this morning and which is being made now, that with the old age pension up in many provinces to $35 or $40 a month it is not fair to ask these non-pensioned veterans' widows to live on $30.41 a month. They have been, in my view, most reasonable in the requests which they have made repeatedly to the government that the amount should be raised to $40. I think they would be well advised to be pressing for $50, but at least I hope the minister will soon find a way of increasing the present amount to one or other of these figures.

At the same time I hope that consideration will be given to some of the other requests which the organization representing these women has made. In particular, they have asked that this provision be extended to widows of veterans who, in the first great war, saw service only in England and did not get to the continent. They go farther and would like to have it extended to widows of all non-pensioned veterans of the first world war. I urge that steps in the right direction be taken in connection with this matter.

I also urge on the minister the requests of these women for consideration in the matter of hospitalization. They do not ask, as the minister, I think, misunderstood last year, to be hospitalized in the veterans hospitals, but they do ask for financial consideration in connection with their hospital needs.

This appeal on behalf of these widows is a request with which there is complete sympathy in all quarters of the house. The minister earlier this evening assured the hon. member for Vancouver South that the whole question of the War Veterans Allowances Act would be given consideration. These women are now included in that act; I hope that the minister can give us an assurance that he will do his best to have this amount increased, and when he has done so he will get still more compliments from all sides of the house. I am glad to see him nodding his head.

Mr. MacNICOL: I associate myself with the remarks just now made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and I want especially to thank the minister again for his continued support in connection with this item from the very beginning. I believe I was the first or one of the first to bring this question up in the house years ago, and from the very beginning the minister was sympathetic. In the last two or three years when we were pressing to have the amount increased, again he was sympathetic, until now it is up to $30.41 a month. With the old age pensions act in Ontario now calling for $40 a month, I hope that the minister will consider advancing the pension of these widows to at least as much as the old age pension in Ontario, $40 a month. I also wish to associate myself in supporting the other requests urged upon the minister by the hon. member.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): These widows are all getting older and they cannot work as they used to be able to work. The widow of a man with a pension of less than fifty per cent who dies of a pensionable disability receives the full amount of the pension but if he dies from a non-pensionable cause two weeks before he might have died from a pensionable disability she gets only $30 a month. I have always thought this circumstance was so very unfair. The minister has spoken in support of raising the amount which these widows will get. I hope it will not be long before they get an increased amount, because the cost of living is going up and they are all getting older.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister make a comment?

Mr. MACKENZIE: The only comment I could make is that I am deeply impressed by the kindly remarks of my hon. friend the member for Winnipeg North Centre, by the genial cooperation of my hon. friend the member for Davenport and by the concurrence of my hon. friend the member for St. Paul's.

Mr. KNOWLES: But what about the widows?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I wish to join my voice with those who have been advocating a fairer deal for the widows of veterans of world war I. Our treatment of them has been very shabby and constitutes a reflection on our nation as a whole. If there is anyone who is handicapped in making a living it is a widow and especially the widow of a war veteran.

I have a case which I think is worthy of consideration which has been brought to my attention. It is that of the widow of Archibald N. Forrest, 2043157, 74th Battery. He enlisted in 1916, was struck off strength in 1921. This man was hurt at Petawawa and spent six weeks in Sydenham hospital. His case was heard before the pension commission and they offered him an operation for double hernia. He asked if he might have his own doctor but was refused that privilege. He then refused to undergo the operation, because the doctors in charge would not promise him that he would be any better after the operation than before. Apparently, as a consequence of his having refused that operation, they changed his category from C-3 to A-1, according to the information given to me. How any doctor would be justified in doing a thing of that sort, I cannot understand. It made all the difference between this man being eligible for some sort of pension and not being eligible, because changing his category passed him as physically fit, though actually he was suffering from double hernia.

He did not try for pension again until June or July, 1937, when he filed his application through the Army and Navy Veterans. He was awaiting a medical board when he died in October. His widow has had a very difficult time and is still having an extremely difficult time, living right here in Ottawa almost in the shadow of this building. She went before the pension commission and got nothing. She tried to get into the civil service, but was told that she was too old to get in, being over thirty-five years of age. Then she set about to try to have the age limit for widows entering the civil service raised, and I understand that she had some measure of success and finally got into the service. She worked there during the war and her health broke down. She is now forty-nine years old and is unable to get any work and unable to get a pension. There she is. How we can expect a woman of that kind to live is a question to which I believe all members of the government should devote some attention. I just mention this as one case. There are many others throughout the country.

It was a beautiful idea expressed in a general way in these words, that no one should be any worse off for having participated in the war and no one should be any better off for not having participated in the war. I believe that we should strive earnestly toward that ideal, and I wish the minister to understand that he will have my complete support in every effort he makes to give the widows of our veterans of the first war a better deal, so that they will be able to pass the remaining years of their lives in something like comfort.

Item agreed to.

Payments to or for veterans and dependents—
471. **Pensions—Northwest rebellion 1885 and general, $15,000.**

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: In connection with this item which has to do with pensions for the Riel rebellion veterans of 1885, I should like to know how many of the volunteers who participated in that rebellion are receiving pensions today, and also whether consideration has been given to extending these pension privileges to volunteers who served in the rebellion but were not attached to any units? I mention in that connection the case I brought to the attention of the house the other day. In Prince Albert and also in the area immediately west of Rosthern and the Duck Lake area there are a number of old men today—because, after all, sixty-three years have gone by since that rebellion—who took part in that rebellion, who maintained law and order during that rebellion, who suffered in consequence of their loyalty to the crown, but, because they were not attached to regular units are not permitted to receive any pension allowance. The other day I mentioned Mr. Angus McKay of the city of Prince Albert, a man of eighty-nine years of age, who finds himself in extreme financial difficulties. There are others in the same position. The old guard is practically gone today. There are a few left. If the minister can do anything toward relieving their situation by having them included under this head I know he would. No great expense would be entailed by his department and a great deal of good would be done.

If the minister and the committee would allow me, because I was called out of the house, I should like to refer to one other matter as well. It does not come under this head. I ask the indulgence of the committee. It has to do with the imperial South African veterans who, following the Boer war, as a result of advertising inducing them to come

to this country, came here and established themselves. I ask that consideration be given to them so that they can qualify for veterans allowances. I am not going into a great many details in connection with the South African veterans who served in the imperial army, but I wish to quote a letter that appeared recently in the Regina *Leader*, which was written by Mr. M. C. Brown of Disley, in which is summarized the whole argument on behalf of these veterans. In part, he says this:

> If we could turn the calendar back to September, 1902, we would find Aldershot, England, cluttered up with Canadian literature, asking all discharged South African vets to come to Canada and make new homes and share in this wonderful heritage. We were told there were opportunities out here and were led to believe we would receive the same treatment as their own South African veterans. When we also recollect that Great Britain paid all Canada's expenses in this war, even to the men's pay, surely they could assume a little responsibility for our welfare out here.

Then he goes on to say:

> In 1930 the government introduced the old Veterans' Allowance Act. We were kept out again after being Canadian citizens for twenty-eight years. Whilst their own South African veterans have been provided with a pension in case of sickness, the imperial veteran has been relegated to relief. Our veteran societies have been trying for years to get us included in the Veterans' Allowance Act but without success.

I have also a letter from Mr. John Nicks of Grand Coulee, Saskatchewan, president of the South African Veterans' Association, bringing the matter to my attention and, no doubt, to the attention of the minister. When the minister replies I would appreciate his dealing with the latter question as well. I want to thank the committee and you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the opportunity of bringing these two matters to the attention of the minister although strictly speaking one of them is not before the committee at the moment.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I should like to support what the hon. member for Lake Centre has said with regard to the veterans of the Riel rebellion. The sum called for in the vote is $15,000. I do not suppose that there are more than about fifty of these veterans left. How many are there?

Mr. TUCKER: Three. Two veterans and one dependent.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: $15,000 a year for these?

Mr. TUCKER: This takes in other things besides that. It provides for disability of veterans of the Northwest rebellion, and disability incurred by members of the active militia during service prior to August 4, 1914, and compensation for death or injury resulting from a fight undertaken in the course of duty in the public service and for a person employed in the public service or employed under the direction of any department of the public service of Canada. This vote is for these three objects, but there are two Riel rebellion veterans and one dependent.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Surely if there are just these few people the plea for an increase should be granted. I know one of these chaps very well; he is a fine old chap, cheerful and interested in national and international affairs. He is a splendid citizen. He was somewhat shocked a few years ago, on the institution of these pensions, to find that when he got his pension his old age pension was cut off because, under the federal regulations, he could not be receiving the two amounts.

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member is speaking of the war veteran's allowance. This is a disability pension.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Is any special pension granted to veterans of the Riel rebellion?

Mr. TUCKER: They get war veterans allowance as well, but this vote is for pension.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: But this is a special war pension for a member of the Riel rebellion forces of 1885. They were granted a pension four years ago.

Mr. TUCKER: This is an actual disability pension, the same as other pensions of world wars I and II. The item the hon. member is thinking of is the war veteran's allowance. They get the war veteran's allowance the same as those who served in world wars I and II.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: There was a special bill put through four years ago granting a pension to veterans of the Riel rebellion. What item is that?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Item 605.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I am asking for an increase in the pension that has been given here. The cost of living has increased. These people find it very difficult to carry on with this pension. With the few people concerned I think this increase should be granted. I am sure it would have the support of everyone in the house.

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not see any vote in reference to the South African veterans. The Chairman generously and kindly allowed my good friend, the hon. member for Lake Centre to discuss this matter, about which I should like to ask this question. What is the position of the South African veterans. I know a man who is married. His wife has a small income. He himself has no income. Would he be entitled to a war veterans' allowance?

Mr. MACKENZIE: If he was domiciled in Canada before he volunteered for service.

Mr. MacNICOL: He was born here.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is not necessary to be born here; if he was domiciled here, if living here, if his home was here before he went overseas to South Africa, then he would be entitled to the war veterans' allowance under the same rate.

Mr. MacNICOL: The veteran is entitled to war veterans' allowance?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes; I think there are four hundred of them receiving allowances.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I should like to bring up a matter which does not come under this item, and I have waited all afternoon to ask the question. Instead of bringing it up again, I should like to ask the question now. What is the attitude of the government with regard to the imperial veterans of the Boer war who came to Canada in 1902, 1903 and 1904 as a result of advertising that they were to be treated as Canadians who served in South Africa? Has consideration been given to allowing them the war veterans' allowance? If so, what is the present position?

Mr. MACKENZIE: The position is the same as in regard to anyone not domiciled in Canada before he went to fight in either the Canadian or the British forces or the allied forces. He must have been domiciled in Canada before he can qualify for the benefits. Those who came from South Africa afterwards are not qualified for these benefits.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Does the government intend to consider an extension to them?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I cannot speak for the government—

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: You are the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE: —but what I envision and I hope will be accomplished some day—the Minister of Finance is not close to me—is that, first of all, we shall get war veterans allowances for all Canadians who served here or in England or in a theatre of war, and that will justify us in considering the cases my hon. friends mention, imperials and South Africans who came here afterwards in 1903 and 1904.

Mr. POULIOT: I am not surprised that there is an item of $15,000 for a rebellion which occurred sixty-two years ago, because the amount of pensions paid for the first world war amounts to over $50 million. It is in the same group of items; according to the figures that were given earlier this evening by the minister, the number of pensioners of the first world war was, Canadians, 87,318, and the second world war, Canadians 87,558, and it is only a little more than 200 more for the second world war as compared with the first. Here again I suggest to the minister that he should have a check-up made of each pensioner to see those who are really in need of a pension and those who are not; and those who are not should be struck out from the list. I do not see why the taxpayers should pay to members of the family of one who is not in need, the more so because the granting of pensions was just like the coming of fishes. There are times for herring, and there are times when all the fish come together. There were times when pensions were awarded to anyone, even to those not deserving, and afterwards there were times when the deserving ones could not get anything. Therefore I insist again on a check-up. I find, after thirty years, the number of Canadians who received pensions for world war I, 87,318, is quite high, and the British in Canada, 250, and allied, 34, according to the figures. That number seems excessive.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): The minister said he would send me a copy of the report. Can I have it before the estimates are through?

Mr. TUCKER: When we get through with the estimates I will let the hon. gentleman have it.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): It will be too late then.

Mr. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend could have it overnight.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I thought it would be a copy I could keep.

Mr. TUCKER: I will send it over.

Mr. MACKENZIE: There is nothing my hon. friend cannot see. It is a comprehensive document, though.

Item agreed to.

Soldier Settlement and Veterans Land Act—

474. To provide for the cost of administration of soldier settlement; British family settlement; general land settlement, and Veterans Land Act, including engineering and other investigational planning and subdivision expenses that do not add tangible value to real property, $6,747,046.

Mr. FLEMING: This brings us to the subject of the soldier settlement and Veterans Land Act administration. This afternoon the minister, in referring to the settlement of soldiers on the land, used this expression: "The larger operation has been tremendously

successful." I must remark that that observation would not have any application to the administration of the Veterans' Land Act, or the minister has not perused the evidence taken recently before the public accounts committee concerning the administration of that act. I must be brief. To do the subject justice would require much more time than is now available. All I propose to do, therefore, is to review, as briefly as I can, some significant features in the investigation recently made on behalf of the house by its public accounts committee.

The Veterans' Land Act scheme contemplated the construction of about 2,600 units, 2,381 of which are completed in a sense. They are completed in the sense that the contractor, we are told, has left the work. The particular inquiry of the public accounts committee centred around the project at Sarnia, but I wish to make it abundantly clear to this committee of supply that that is not a peculiar situation at Sarnia. We had the evidence of Mr. Murchison, director of the Veterans' Land Act, that it was one of the worst, but he gave a list of others which he put in this category, and those among the worst included the Braefoot project on Vancouver island, the Boucherville project in Quebec, and the project at Sackville, New Brunswick. We had evidence that there were many other projects where there were units which, though not as bad as those in the category I have mentioned, were nevertheless bad. The committee was invited to continue its inquiry by reviewing the conditions at Windsor, but in view of the imminence of prorogation and the desirability of submitting a report to the house the committee felt it could not go farther.

So far as I am concerned, as a member of the committee I have had a number of letters since from veterans settled in other projects. They have been reading in the papers about evidence taken before the public accounts committee, and they have indicated that they are prepared to tender parallel evidence with regard to the conditions in the projects on which they settled.

I summarize that part of my submission in this way. The evidence that was taken as to conditions at Sarnia, while that is a particularly bad project, is nevertheless evidence that can be duplicated to a degree in many other places in Canada.

In a word, the evidence that was submitted to the committee was shocking. There is no weaker word that will begin to do justice to the evidence brought before this committee. Again, it is difficult to be brief, and I know how precious time is at this stage.

[Mr. Fleming.]

These houses have cost Canada—there are eight of them in this project—$10,100 each. To give the committee an idea of the value of these houses, we had evidence that several builders had looked at them and said they could build the houses for $4,500 each. The plan was on a cost-plus fixed-fee basis. The contractor was from Windsor. These are small houses. The largest has six rooms. Each house is either a bungalow or one and a half stories. The figure I have given includes cost of necessary repairs undertaken within a matter of several months after the alleged completion of the houses and occupation by the veteran purchasers, and also the cost of remedial drainage work which is now in course of being carried out.

There was no drainage investigation before this work was commenced; even the most elementary precautions with regard to drainage were completely ignored. The project is located a mile and a half from lake Huron outside Sarnia, but there was not the slightest effort to ascertain the water-table.

Again, the figure I have mentioned does not include one cent of departmental overhead. That figure of $10,100 consists of outlay without any regard to overhead costs in this department of government.

The house construction is of about as bad a kind as one can possibly imagine. I am sure the evidence shocked even the most hardened members of the committee. I wish there were time to review it, but I am afraid there is not. The basement had water in it all last fall, all last winter and all last spring. There were two sump pumps in the basement pumping water out, because the level of the basement floor is much too low; and of course the cost of electricity for keeping the pumps in operation was borne by the veteran. There is a hole in the basement floor. Apparently the contractor had an idea that it would be necessary to operate the sump pump there indefinitely. The evidence concerning all the other normal features of construction is just in keeping with that. I shall just read one or two extracts for the sake of brevity. Here is one at page 516. It is from the evidence of one of the veteran owners, Mr. Cleave, who gave evidence which, I think, had a profound effect on the committee, even though he had to submit to a good deal of badgering on the part of certain members. This is one extract at page 516 of the proceedings of the committee:

Q. Can you give us the nature of the repairs?
A. Yes. For example the doors did not close. Another example, my bathroom sink started to come off the wall, so they took some plaster of paris and filled the crack in behind; and there were some cracks along the doorsills and they filled those with plaster of paris. There were

big-headed nails driven into the hardwood flooring and they attempted to countersink them and in countersinking them split the flooring; and they puttied up cracks in the chimney. In one of the houses the kitchen cupboard has started to settle, it had settled about a half an inch or more so they moved the quarter-round—they didn't move it, they hit it with a hammer and knocked it down flush again.

Here is another extract at page 518:

Q. You were cataloguing a number of things that you said were wrong with the house at the time of the exchange of the correspondence in January. I do not think you had finished when there were some other questions. A. Well, the paint job and the plastering and the taping of the joints. I mentioned that. The windows have not been fitted properly into the sashes. They leaked rain in a bad wind storm. They told one of the fellows there they did not leak with storm windows on, but he said, "Am I supposed to leave storm windows on all summer?" That was one of the contractor's workmen who said that. As to my stairway they spray-painted the house inside. The stairway is boards which have been stained and varnished, but they neglected to clean off the spray spots before they varnished. Consequently I have a lot of light paint on the stairs. It looks just like the painters had moved out yesterday and did not get around to cleaning it up. It cannot be cleaned without being sanded.

Then there were the warped doors. There was plywood that was broken in one bedroom upstairs. The bathroom sink was coming off the wall. The floors were very badly done with big-headed nails showing through which naturally you cannot resand while they are showing through.

Here is another at page 519:

A. In my house you cannot see the bathroom upstairs, but in all of the houses that have the bathroom downstairs, which I believe is in every house except one like mine, they cut off the floor joists and put in headers when they put the plumbing in. When they put the hot air pipes through in all of the houses they cut the main beam half way in two. As you know the main beam is square. They started at the bottom corner and came out at the top corner to put in the hot air pipe which means they have taken away at least half of the support of that beam.

Then a concluding one at page 520; and these are just a few samples. One could go on reading evidence of this kind interminably. At this point the witness was speaking about the condition of the floor, and saying that the floor could be moved up and down:

Q. You are waving your hands but that cannot go on the record. To what height could he move the floor? A. I do not know. He pushed his arm underneath the floor and lifted it up an inch or two inches. Since then I was talking to one of the fellows who worked laying the floors. He informed me—I do not know this—at the time the floors were laid they laid five or six boards down, pushed them together with a crowbar and then nailed the last board, and then laid five or six more and pushed them together with a crowbar.

Then I asked him a question about the septic tanks on the same page, and his answer was:

A. My septic tank shortly after I moved in stopped operating. Of course, the breather pipe off the tank is in my front lawn, and it started to overflow in my front yard. I could not have that so I went into town and I saw the veterans officer. He said, "The best thing you can do is to get a plumber to fix it and see about getting the bill paid afterwards." I went down to a plumber and had him come out and fix the septic tank. At the time he took it up he found that the tank was tipped the wrong way. It was tipped towards the house instead of away from the house, and that some of the insulation off some of the BX cable they were using in the wiring had got down when the workmen were there and plugged it.

There are other things. When they needed sand for plastering, did they go out and bring in proper sand? No, they just went out and took sand out of the backyard.

Those are the houses, Mr. Chairman, which cost the taxpayers of Canada $10,100 each, without including a cent for departmental overhead. And they are being sold to the veterans at a price of $7,800. That is the approximate or average price in this case; I am speaking in round figures. Against the $7,800 price to the veteran, a conditional grant of $1,400 is made, leaving the net price of $6,400 to the veteran. Those are houses which several competent builders had said they could build for $4,500.

What has happened, Mr. Chairman? The contractor never properly finished this work. That is quite apparent from the evidence. Not only that, but quite apart from the question of completion, the properties had not been in occupation by the veteran purchasers for more than a matter of several months before repairs became necessary. That is apart altogether from the cost of completion. And the repairs on this project alone, involving eight houses only, will cost approximately $6,000; that is roughly $780 apiece for repairs within a matter of several months after the veteran owners went into occupation. There is a situation which I say is absolutely scandalous.

What has happened since? One would have expected, of course, that there would be a substantial hold-back in cases of this kind, and that proper progress reports would have been made by competent inspectors. But what do we find? The hold-back in this case is just about three per cent of the aggregate price put in by the contractor on his cost-plus fixed-fee basis. Where are these progress reports? Well, they were not given to the committee. The director of the Veterans Land Act, who was before the committee, was

asked to produce them, and he said that he would. But the committee had to close up its business, and they have not as yet been produced. We did have the final reports. They were not dated, but they accompanied a letter written on December 17, 1946, so we know that the final inspection must have been made before December 17, 1946. The final report in the case of each of these houses carried with it a string of matters as long as your arm, which needed to be done to complete the house; in some cases there were as many as sixteen items to a house. That was the final report. That was in December, 1946, after ninety-seven per cent of the price had been paid over to the contractor, the last payment having been made several months—I think it was four months, to be exact—before the final inspection had been made. What these interim or progress reports contained, we do not know; but it would be interesting to know what they contain.

Mr. TUCKER: If I may intervene, Mr. Chairman, I am advised that those progress reports were all filed with the clerk of the committee. I am surprised to hear what the hon. member has said. Of course he was present in the committee and I was not, but I am informed by the director that he filed all those reports.

Mr. FLEMING: If they were filed, they must have been filed since the evidence was concluded.

Mr. TUCKER: No; at the time.

Mr. FLEMING: No. We asked for those. The director presented a brief and we had asked for them. This was, I think, the second time of his appearance before the committee in connection with this matter. We had asked on the first occasion for a great many things, and the reports which were presented were the final reports which are not dated, but which accompanied a letter dated December 17, 1946. If these reports were filed that was not done at the time. We did not have any opportunity of examining them, or of examining witnesses on them.

Mr. TUCKER: I am told they were filed at the second last meeting of the committee, because they had to be obtained from Toronto.

Mr. FLEMING: I was present all the way through, and I was not acquainted with that fact; and I had a good deal to do with the examinations. Whoever wrote those progress reports must have gone through these houses with his eyes shut, because the final report was apparently written some time before December 17, and the final payment bringing the total of payments up to ninety seven per cent of the contract commitment was made at the end of the summer or early in the fall.

That is a fine situation! I call it a scandalous situation. What has been done to protect the interests that parliament has a duty to see protected here? I want to deal just in a word, because I am trying to be as brief as I can concerning this matter, first, with the protection to which the taxpayer is entitled; second, with the protection to which the veteran is entitled; and third, the interest of the house—yes, the responsibility of the house—in seeing that there is efficient and competent administration in this department, as in all other departments of government. I list those points, not in the order of their importance, but because treatment in that order lends itself to brevity.

As far as the interest of the taxpayer is concerned, he is paying $10,100 for a house that, we are told, could be built for $4,500 What about the contractor? The obvious question that was in the minds of the committee was, "Well, what has the government done about the contractor to bring him to book, to bring him back to complete his work on these projects or, if he refuses to do so, to take action against him for breach of contract?" The fact of the matter is that nothing has been done amounting to a snap of one's fingers as far as the contractor is concerned. A letter was written by the director of the Veterans Land Act to one of the regional inspectors telling him that, since the contractor was apparently not going to complete the work, probably they had better take other steps. And the work of repair to which I have referred has had to be undertaken by the department on its own account since that time. Nothing has been done by the contractor. We asked if letters had been written. Well, if letters were written to the contractor demanding that he return to work and complete his contract, certainly the director did not have them. If such letters were written they must have been written from the Toronto office, because they were not produced before the committee.

What would an efficient department have done here? Certainly, Mr. Chairman, they would have been after the contractor at once. They would not have had to be goaded into action months later by a parliamentary committee. But all we are told now is that no action has been taken and that, after all the repairs are completed, it is the intention of the director of the Veterans' Land Act to go over the items and say which are considered, strictly speaking, to be repair items and which

are considered to be items pertaining to completion of the property. Those which relate to the completion of the property he proposes then to refer to the Department of Justice, and goodness knows when that will be done. There has been no follow-up worth a snap of the fingers here as against the contractor. The hold-back in this case is just a joke; a a three per cent hold-back on a contract of over $60,000, in the face of conditions like these. We are told it will take at least $6,000 to put these properties in more or less proper condition.

What about the veterans? Here are the veteran owners, who are being charged $7,800 for these properties. The country is paying the difference between the $10,100 and $7,800. In addition the country makes a conditional grant of $1,400 in the case of each of these purchases, and the veteran is expected to pay $6,400, $600 in cash and the remainder in monthly payments. I want to draw the attention of the committee to this important fact, that there is no proposal whatever for any reduction in price to the veteran by reason of the conditions of construction that have been exposed by the public accounts committee. There is not a proposal by the director of the Veterans' Land Act that a single cent be taken off that purchase price. Regardless of the fact that even after all the repair work has been completed these houses will not be worth what they would have been worth if they had been built according to the contract and in a proper manner, there is no proposal that one cent be taken off the price to the veteran.

I say the veteran has been kicked around on these projects. The veterans had a right to rely upon protection from the government. As Mr. Cleave well said, they did not check over every item in every home because the veterans—and he was speaking for the others as well as himself—felt that, since these houses were being built by the government, they could rely upon their being properly constructed. They were relying upon the government to see this job well done; in other words to see that proper construction was carried out, and also to see that proper inspection was carried on; and the results are simply deplorable.

What consideration has been given to the veterans? The answer is that, even after those conditions were exposed in the house by the hon. member for Lambton West on February 4, during the debate on the speech from the throne, nothing was done. Right here I wish to pay the highest tribute to the hon. member for Lambton West. His speech on that occasion should have received immediate attention; and if his proposal made at that time that a royal commission be appointed to investigate the construction of these Veterans' Land Act project across Canada had been acted upon by the government a real service would have been done to the country; but they did not do so. And now, even after complaint after complaint after complaint has been made by these veterans; even after as many as one hundred foremen and workmen had been through those houses looking over the subject matter of the complaints, what happened? On March 3 a letter was written by the Veterans' Land Act administration to these veterans, containing in effect an ultimatum to those who had not yet signed their contracts, though they had paid their $600 down. They were told that they must either sign their contract or get out. That was the consideration they received at that stage, after this deplorable, disgraceful condition had been fully disclosed.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Nonsense.

Mr. FLEMING: Did I hear the Minister of Veterans Affairs say "Nonsense"?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, you did.

Mr. FLEMING: Well, I want to tell the minister that he does not do himself justice by talking in that way in the face of the evidence that was given under oath before the public accounts committee by Mr. Cleave, a veteran, who spoke, not only for himself, but for the other veterans as well.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I know Cleave; I know the public accounts committee, and I know conditions across Canada, which is more than you know.

Mr. FLEMING: Then I put this challenge to the minister. If he says those conditions cannot be duplicated elsewhere, let him appoint a royal commission to hear evidence in connection with all these projects.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, and keep the boys out of their homes for a year or more. That is the Tory policy.

Mr. FLEMING: I challenge the minister. Let us have a royal commission to look into all these projects right across Canada. Then we shall get all the facts. We have enough facts before us now to put the whole country on its guard and put this parliament on notice as to the conditions that exist there. And, as we have from the lips of the director of the Veterans' Land Act, this is not the only project of its kind. If the minister is disputing any of these facts, then I say, let him appoint a royal commission, where evidence can be given under oath.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, and keep the boys from their homes for another year.

Mr. FLEMING: Let him appoint a royal commission to go into all these projects. Let him take up that challenge.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is the Tory policy; let us appoint a royal commission, and keep them out of their homes for a year.

Mr. FLEMING: I now come to the third aspect of the matter, for which parliament must accept some direct responsibility. I refer now to the administration of the department. What has been disclosed here is, I submit, negligence of the grossest variety, to use the mildest possible description. The director of the Veterans' Land Act himself admitted negligence on the part of his department.

Mr. MACKENZIE: So did I, three months ago.

Mr. FLEMING: You did not admit half enough; and I do not think the minister does know half of what is available to him if he will read this evidence. The situation reveals shocking negligence in this department. Even making the most generous allowance for the fact that the projects were undertaken under pressure, that haste was a consideration, that times are not normal, these factors fall far short of explaining the result, the shocking evidence we find here. The director undertook to try to exculpate the department by saying that three officials had been let out, two of them because of incompetence in connection with supervising inspections. But that does not affect or explain the situation here.

I have referred to this matter of negligence. What is disclosed here is incompetence in this department. Parliament is now aware of that situation. The minister is now fully aware of the situation, and responsibility rests upon him to take action to remove incompetence in this department.

Mr. MACKENZIE: He has done so already.

Mr. FLEMING: No, he has not; he has fallen far short of it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: You know nothing about it.

Mr. FLEMING: And I remind the committee that this is not an isolated situation. I spoke about repairs on the houses. The repairs at Sarnia will cost $6,000. We are told by officials of the Veterans' Land Act that the vast majority of the units constructed right across Canada alleged to be completed, numbering 2,381, will require expenditures on them for the purpose of repairs. The drainage problem abounds in many of these. And as to the director, himself, of the Veterans' Land Act, I remind the committee of this, that this report is one supported by the majority of that committee; and government members were in a majority on it. That committee has censured the director of the Veterans' Land Act. These are the words in the committee's report:

> Your committee was not favourably impressed by the way evidence was given by Mr. Gordon Murchison, Director, the Veterans Land Act.

And that evidence referred to there was given in a hostile, belligerent and high-handed manner. It did not reveal the sympathy with the veterans that this parliament is entitled to expect of the officials administering the Veterans' Land Act. If this parliament can overlook the unsympathetic administration of the Veterans' Land Act, then I say this parliament is not doing its duty to the veterans.

I conclude these remarks by pointing to what I think must be done, in the face of disclosures which have been made. It is perfectly clear that the investigation which has been made reveals such a situation, one not confined to this project—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Twaddle.

Mr. FLEMING: What did the minister say? If he cannot keep quiet and possess his soul in patience or restrain himself, then I think at least I should be allowed to hear what he has to say. I find that ministers opposite have the habit, because they sit next to the *Hansard* reporter, of saying things while we are speaking, and having them on *Hansard,* which we, who have to sit in this remote corner of the chamber, cannot hear.

Mr. ABBOTT: All he said was "twaddle".

Mr. FLEMING: "Twaddle", was it? Well, I do not know of any greater exponent or authority on the subject of twaddle than the minister who has just used the expression. If he wishes to prove what he apparently is contending for in the house, then I submit to him that the way is open to him to do so. He has within his power the means by which it can be established before a proper tribunal, on evidence taken under oath, whether the facts are as he is now alleging them to be, or whether they are as testified to on oath before the public accounts committee. They have made such an impression upon the Liberal members in the public accounts committee that, as between the director of the Veterans' Land Act on the one hand and the veteran Mr. Cleave on the other, they have preferred to follow the evidence of

Mr. Cleave and have censured the director of the Veterans' Land Act.

A royal commission for investigation of all aspects of the Veterans' Land Act administration was asked for in this house on February 4. It was rejected on behalf of the government by the Minister of Veterans Affairs. He said that he had a committee of three whom he was sending out to examine the projects. Just to show how impartial this investigating committee would be, he took two people who had had the most to do with the administration of the Veterans' Land Act, the deputy minister and the director of soldier settlement and Veterans' Land Act. They were two of the three who were given that work to do. Even the Liberal members on the public accounts committee have complained that the department is not taking proper steps to carry out the measures recommended by that committee of three.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Who was the third man on the committee? It was the director of housing of the Canadian Legion for the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FLEMING: I beg your pardon; I did not catch all that.

An hon. MEMBER: Wash your ears out.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Who was the third man?

Mr. FLEMING: The third member was Colonel Parrish.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. FLEMING: I suggested it was a fine sample of the minister's idea of an impartial inquiry that when he appointed this three-man committee two of them were people who had had the most to do with the administration of the Veterans' Land Act. That was no investigation at all into the administration of the act.

What that committee did was to go out and look at a cross-section of projects across Canada, and then make a report. And that report in considerable part condemns the construction methods and the conditions in which these contractors were permitted by the department to leave those projects.

Remember, this report from the public accounts committee is supported by a Liberal majority in that committee. Apparently they have had enough of committees of investigation, the majority of which are composed of officials of the Veterans' Land Act administration, because this time they say:

> Your committee recommends that a board of three men be appointed consisting of real estate and building experts, none of whom shall have had previous connection with the Department of Veterans Affairs, or with any other governmental building projects, to pursue the work undertaken by your committee, with a view to giving justice and fair treatment to veteran purchasers and all parties interested in this question, and to recommend to the minister any remedy it may consider fit to correct the situation.

So much for the minister's substitute for the very proper demand made in the house in February by the hon. member for Lambton West when he asked for the appointment of a royal commission.

The need of a royal commission to investigate all aspects of Veterans' Land Act administration has been proven to the hilt. The case is stronger today than it was then, in the light of the evidence taken before the parliamentary committee and in the light of the findings of that committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Nonsense.

Mr. FLEMING: The Minister of Veterans Affairs dare not allow an investigation into these projects. He dare not allow it. I submit that there is a great deal of discontent seething among these veterans.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, and you are stirring it up.

Mr. FLEMING: Just let them bring their case before a royal commission, and the minister will learn some things about the seething discontent among the veterans with the deal they have been given by the Veterans' Land Act administration.

Mr. MACKENZIE: And you are stirring it up.

Mr. FLEMING: I do not wish to be personal with the minister, at all, but—

Mr. MACKENZIE: I don't care whether you are or not.

Mr. FLEMING: Whether the minister cares or not, I do not intend to be. But I want to say this, that if he is not prepared to have a royal commission as I believe there ought to be, then certainly I think he must—because no one questions his interest in the veterans—give more personal attention to the supervision of the Veterans' Land Act administration.

The minister has a big department. While he has important duties in his department, and as leader of the house, I urge upon him that within the organization of his department this condition is so bad that it is incumbent upon him to give this Veterans' Land Act administration first claim upon his personal time, and to give it the utmost personal attention.

I urge that, in addition to the appointment of a royal commission, he give consideration to the suggestion I have just made for personal attention, if I may be so bold as to make a suggestion to a minister. I urge that, in line with the committee's report, every effort be made to hasten these repairs, so that the houses can be completed, and so that there may be a revamping of soldier settlement administration under the Veterans' Land Act, informed as we now are of the negligence which has been permitted to exist in this administration.

It is up to him to decide whether the present director is capable of clearing up this situation with his interest in the matter, in his capacity as director.

I urge that there should be an adjustment of price to veterans, because even if the required work is completed, the houses which will be turned over to them are not as valuable as they would have been if the work had been carried out according to the contract.

I urge again these points, because there is still work being carried on in connection with some other projects.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, prompt steps should be taken to bring these defaulting contractors to book. There are many things one can point to in these investigations, and the ones I have mentioned are just the highlights. The duty of the minister is, I submit, perfectly clear. If there is any doubt in the mind of any member of the house I throw out this challenge to the minister: Let him appoint a royal commission with a free hand and the widest instructions to investigate all aspects of Veterans' Land Act housing from coast to coast in the interests of the veteran, in the interests of the public and in the interests of the good name of parliament and government.

Mr. BRYCE: I have refrained up to this time from saying anything very nice about the minister, because I was afraid it might be taken as just one Scotch immigrant patting the back of another Scotch immigrant, but after what has been said by other hon. members, I make up for that omission now by saying that I appreciate what the hon. minister and the officers of his department have done in handling the cases which I have brought to their attention.

What I rise for now is to appeal again to the minister on behalf of the old soldier settlers. These old fellows are now reaching the eventide of their lives. Some of them owe as much on their farms today as they did when they got them in 1920 or 1921. When they bought the farm wheat had a value of $2 and $2.50 a bushel. Then wheat dropped to $1, and still they have to pay for the farm bought on that old value of wheat. I have been through the same thing myself and I am talking from experience. I have bought cows for $150 and two or three years afterwards they they dropped to $25, and the same thing with horses. I could talk for an hour on this. But I appeal to the minister and his department to give further consideration to these old soldier settlers. They have lived under difficult conditions in the past twenty years, contending with drought, bad times, and many other things that beset a man in agriculture. They struggled on and raised their families, and during the last war they gave their sons, some of whom now lie in lands across the sea. Some of them came back and started in under the new settlement scheme. I am an old soldier myself, and I appeal to the minister in all sincerity to give these old soldiers further consideration. In their youth they gave the best they had for Canada.

While I should like to join with the hon. member for Swift Current who said today that he was a good Canadian and was proud of what Canada had done for her returned men, I do not think that job will be complete until we do something for these old soldier settlers by wiping off that debt. I do not think there is a soldier in this land of Canada who would object to wiping off that debt and giving these old soldiers a clean sheet in the eventide of their lives.

Mr. TUCKER: I should like to say a few words in reply to what the hon. member for Eglinton has said in regard to the Veterans' Land Act. At this late hour I regret that he made the violent attack he did on the administration and on this whole housing project. I do not want to detain the committee unduly, but there were some things he said which perhaps should be replied to.

First, in regard to the cost of these houses, it is quite true that when all the drainage is done and the repairs are made and the houses are fully fixed up, the cost will average $10,100 each. Sarnia was admittedly the worst experience encountered in regard to these houses. The inspector in charge was a qualified architect, appointed through the ordinary processes of the civil service commission, but he did not keep a firm hand on the project and he is no longer with the department.

In regard to auditing, the auditing has been under the constant supervision of the cost and audit division of the treasury department, which has been in charge of disbursements from the very outset.

In regard to the suggestion of the appointment of a royal commission, the hon. member

made a great deal of the fact that the committee apparently were somewhat sympathetic; he seemed to think they went along with him in his criticism, at least to some extent. So I take it that he found that the committee was impartial in its attitude. But it is significant, Mr. Chairman, that the committee did not recommend a royal commission. So apparently the hon. member stood alone in that, even though he had a committee that was seemingly somewhat sympathetic. It seems to me that in his demand for a royal commission there is quite a bit of dramatics.

Mr. FRASER: Far from it.

Mr. FLEMING: I asked for a royal commission in the committee, but they did not go the whole way with me. The report before the house is a majority report. The committee came part of the way but not far enough.

Mr. TUCKER: If the hon. member had such faith in the committee he should have been satisfied with their recommendations, but apparently he wanted to go farther.

In regard to the committee which travelled across Canada and looked into these housing projects, it seemed to me that the hon. member was suggesting that their report could not be relied upon. I do not think there is a member of this house apart from the hon. member for Eglinton who would suggest that a report which was made by the respected deputy minister of this department would not be absolutely reliable and in the best interests of the veteran. I think the hon. member will probably stand alone in criticizing the most respected returned soldier in Canada, who now occupies the position of deputy minister. He had joined with him in that work of the committee the director of the Veterans' Land Act. Perhaps he might not be regarded as entirely impartial by my hon. friend because he was inspecting work which had been done under his department. But in addition there was Colonel Parrish, director of housing for the Canadian Legion, and an expert on housing. Surely he could be relied upon to make an impartial report.

The hon. member for Eglinton suggested that these houses could be built for $4,500. When he went that far I think the committee could pretty well decide how much attention to pay to the rest of his remarks. Actually the committee had before it evidence as to the cost of similar houses in other parts of Canada where admittedly very good work was done. For example, take Kamloops. The houses which in Sarnia, without taking into account the cost of repairs and so on, cost $9,080 to build, cost $7,674 in Kamloops. The cost in Edmonton, where admittedly some of the most efficient building was done, was $7,143 for a similar house. Yet the hon. member goes so far as to say that a house like this could be built for $4,500, when the minimum for such a house was $6,618 in Truro, $8,759 in Sherbrooke and $7,397 in Regina; and I know something myself about the splendid work done in Regina and am sure that others who know that work will agree with me.

The $10,100 includes repairs, drainage and all the rest of it. The actual cost of the house was $9,080, and in other places, $8,700, $7,300. There was nothing below $6,618. He then suggests that this house could be built for $4,500. I submit that that indicates he does not know what he is talking about.

The cost of these houses to the veterans was as follows. A very careful investigation was made, and the committee established that the average construction cost was forty-four cents a cubic foot for all the 2,381 houses. The cost in Sarnia was fifty-eight cents a cubic foot as against forty-four cents on the average. As I say, that was the worst case of this sort. On the basis of that comparison, it was recommended by our department that the Department of Justice take whatever action it could against the contractor in order to have him make full restitution. Therefore, when the hon. member says that nothing has been done I do not understand why he makes that statement. He suggests that nothing has been done for the veteran to write down the cost of these houses. I do not understand why he makes that statement. It makes me wonder whether he knows anything about this matter.

The committee had before them a statement showing the make-up of the sale price of these houses, and they used this formula. They found that the cost of these houses was fifty-eight cents a cubic foot. They found that the average cost throughout Canada was forty-four cents. To make sure that the veterans in these cases got a fair deal, they wrote down the cost of these houses to forty cents a cubic foot or four cents under the average. That was done by the deputy minister under the order in council and the director of the Veterans' Land Act.

Mr. FLEMING: Before the houses were completed or these repairs became necessary. Since then there has not been a cent taken off.

Mr. TUCKER: I did not interrupt my hon. friend.

Mr. FLEMING: You might stick to the facts.

Mr. TUCKER: He made lots of statements with which I did not agree and which I thought were wrong, but I thought I would wait and try to put the facts before the committee as quickly, shortly and concisely as I could. Goodness knows I do not want to get into an argument or a brawl with the hon. member at this late hour. I am putting the facts before the committee as best I can.

In regard to the cost of these houses to the veterans, I have a statement here. When the cost was written down, as I have said, the actual amounts payable by the veterans ran from $6,047, $6,359, $6,504, $6,056, $6,324, $6,324, to $5,493. From all of this there was the statutory conditional grant of $1,400, leaving the amount that these veterans had to pay, after making their initial payment of $600, a monthly payment of $27.11, $24.34, $28.66, $24.34, $29.39, $27.15, $28.48 and $28.48. Hon. members will see that the highest amount that the veterans had to pay for these houses was $29.39, and that the lowest was $24.34. That is not rental. When the veteran pays that over a period of twenty-five years he is the owner of the house. Comparable rents for houses like these at that time would range from $45 to $50 at the very minimum. These payments are actually far under the average rentals at that time. Therefore, when it is said by the hon. member that the veteran has not been protected in this matter; that somehow he is being mistreated, when you have these payments which will count double for the veteran as against rentals being charged under different schemes of from $45 to $50 a month, I do not understand the hon. member's attitude.

As I say, I do not want to start a controversy at this time. I am trying to give the facts to the committee as best I can. In regard to the veterans in this proposition, the price was reduced in the way I have said to a fair comparison with houses in the same district. That is the first thing. Then the veteran was allowed to go into occupation without signing any contract, and he has been in occupation since late last year. He paid his $600 down and has paid no rent other than that $600 initial payment. Some of them have been in occupation since last October and have paid no rent at all. In addition to that, all the defects which have been pointed out are being remedied at no cost whatever to the veteran, so that the veteran is getting a house that is fully fixed up, that is brought down to the average cost of 40 cents a cubic foot, which is at least equal to, if not under, the average cost of all houses around there. He will have his $1,400 conditional writeoff to which he is entitled under the Veterans' Land Act and, of course, when he signs his contract he gets all of the rights I have just mentioned.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I shall deal with one or two other items that the hon. member mentioned. Colonel Parrish mentioned, for example, that the average cost for the whole of Canada of houses like these was $7,150. He found that to be reasonable in today's market, and that is his opinion. Of course everybody in the committee will have no difficulty in accepting Colonel Parrish's opinion against that of the hon. member for Eglinton.

In regard to the cost being excessive, these houses were constructed by the Department of Veterans Affairs in an endeavour to make a contribution to the housing situation. It was known there would be a great shortage, and so the Veterans' Land Act administrator jumped into this picture and did his little bit. It is quite true that perhaps in the light of what we know now, if he had been another type of public servant who said, "I will not do any more than I absolutely have to; I will not stick my neck out; I will be very careful," he would not be under this attack today; but instead of that, being a returned soldier himself who served overseas in the first war, and having some real anxiety to help returned soldiers in the second world war, he thought he could make a little contribution in having his organization build some houses on these small holdings. It was the request of a committee of the house that he should do this. As the result of his action, over 2,000 people own nice little houses across this country. I visited a lot of them. I have talked to the people in them and I have seen how happy they were. There has been a great attempt to decry these houses. I have been in them in various parts of this country. Wherever I have gone and talked to the women and the men in the houses, I found they were delighted to be able to have a nice little home to go into on terms as reasonable as these were. Therefore I say—in spite of the break-down here and there, which is not the responsibility of the administrator, because, after all, public servants are hired by the commission; all that can be done when they break down is to dismiss them, to let them go, and that has been done in these cases—what we have today is a situation where the department went into a housing activity to try to help out the returned soldier to establish himself, with a staff provided by the civil service commission which has broken down here and there. They have worked under terrible difficulties. Anybody today who has tried to build a house knows the

difficulty. For example, they could not get glass, which meant that the houses could not be closed in. Then moisture entered into the houses and we had swelling of the lumber and the floors in the houses and continued trouble. If you could not get the material you needed and you had to let your labouring men go then, of course, you could not get them when you did get the material. These things all ran up the cost. Anybody who has tried to do any building in the last couple of years knows the difficulty that anyone was under in that regard.

It is very easy to come along now and criticize. We know of these great difficulties. There were break-downs here and there. It is very easy to come along and make a passionate appeal to the house, make out that the public servants, public-spirited servants are, in some way, deserving of censure. But I ask the committee to put themselves in the position of the director of the Veterans' Land Act, to consider his motives in trying to help out, consider the difficulties he was up against and realize that he could not personally supervise these numerous enterprises from one end of Canada to the other; that he had to rely on people who were picked—there was a shortage of skilled people—to do this work. There was a great expansion of work. Those that have broken down have been released. There has been no attempt at any time to conceal anything. There has been a complete disclosure in this house, the fullest possible disclosure. It seems to me that an attempt to make a great deal of a thing like this is really an attempt to take advantage of a situation which is, of course, pretty well prevalent all over Canada with anyone who is trying to build.

As regards this excessive feature, it was realized that costs were becoming excessive owing to uncontrollable factors, and the government, on its own initiative, provided this million right off, put on an inspection by the deputy minister and these other gentlemen, and made sure that the veterans would not suffer by the steps taken.

On the question as to whether contractor liability is being investigated, what more can be done? Wherever it was considered that anything was wrong it was turned over to the mounted police and the assistance of the Department of Justice was enlisted, so that if there was a possibility of making the contractor liable it would be established. That was done a long time ago without any demand for it by any member of parliament.

Mr. FLEMING: Does the hon. gentleman say that the Department of Justice was consulted?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. TUCKER: Before it ever came to this house.

Mr. FLEMING: That is not what was brought out in the committee.

Mr. TUCKER: Yes, it was. Anyway, that is the fact I am giving to the committee. These veterans wanted homes over their heads. It was not known what it would cost to fix these places up; they were told they could move in if they made a $600 payment, and when the time came to fix the cost they could sign a contract or, if they did not wish to do so, there was no compulsion on them to buy. I have a long list of persons who are anxious to get into houses. For every man able to get in, there are ten who would be glad to.

Mr. FLEMING: That is not true of Sarnia.

Mr. TUCKER: I know it is so in most cases. A real contribution has been made in providing 2,300 homes. The director frankly admitted that the department had been poorly served by certain subordinate officials and that was seized upon as the basis of an attack. Because he was frank and honest to admit that some of his officials had not served the department as well as they should have done—their connection with the department having been terminated in consequence—he is attacked. But what more could be done? It was undoubtedly for the civil service commission to obtain the necessary number of competent inspectors, superintendents and so on, experienced in the work. The civil service commission did the best they could. Every member of this house believes that the right way to go about the matter is to have the civil service commission do it, and if they are to do it, then it is to be expected that they will do the best they can.

The chief engineer of the Veterans' Land Act administration and 20 other officials in the branch have been permitted to resign or have been released from the department. In other words, there has been no sparing of those who have not done a good job so far as this work is concerned.

I have tried to run over these things as quickly as I can because I know that the house is anxious to get through, and I have tried my best to give some of the highlights in this matter.

Mr. FLEMING: Has the hon. gentleman read the evidence taken before the public accounts committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, I have.

Mr. FLEMING: Have you read it all?

Mr. TUCKER: I have not read the last page of it but most of it.

Mr. FLEMING: Most of it has not yet been printed.

Mr. TUCKER: I have it in typewritten form.

Mr. FLEMING: Did the hon. gentleman read the evidence of the director of the Veterans Land Act?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I did.

Mr. FLEMING: And all the exhibits?

Mr. TUCKER: I will not say I read every page.

Mr. FLEMING: I thought not, judging by some of the remarks the hon. member made, because they do not jibe with the evidence given before the committee by the director of the Veterans Land Act.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I suppose this matter will be threshed out later. I do not wish to deal with the situation in Sarnia, about which I know nothing. But there is one matter which the hon. member for Selkirk spoke of and in regard to which many hon. members have continued to ask for information over a period of years, and that is special consideration for the few noble veterans of the last war, who, under the soldier settlement board, are trying to carry on. After having lived with some of these veterans, having witnessed their efforts, having seen thousands of them finally give up in despair because they could not carry on, their homes broken, the result of years of toil, years of difficulty, having disappeared, I submit that something should be done for these people. I do not know whether it was the minister or the deputy minister who was responsible for the policy of the department and the consequent absolute failure of the board with respect to thousands of soldiers who tried to settle on the land and who apparently have failed to impress the department with the hopelessness of their situation. A plea has been made in this house for a number of years that special consideration be given these few men who are now struggling, in the declining years of their lives, to carry on with a debt over their heads. Last year the officials tried to tell us that these soldiers were now in a position to pay up and that everything would be satisfactory for them. I should like to know how many have been able to pay the balance of their indebtedness during the past year, how many have quit or have signed a quit-claim deed, either voluntarily or under pressure, and how many of these soldiers are still left in the various provinces trying to struggle on and to pay off the balance even in their declining years.

One other thing. What decision has been arrived at by the government with regard to these men in the future? Are more of these men to be deprived of their homes because they cannot pay up, or has the department come to a decision? The director of the Veterans' Land Act has been given complete control. The decision is entirely his. He is granted a seal and the contract is put in his name. He is czar of the situation from end to end. I want to know what the situation is at the present time.

Mr. TUCKER: In the five-year period ended March 31, 1947, there were 3,408 settlers who repaid loans in full and received title.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Have you the figures for the last year?

Mr. TUCKER: I will see if I can get them. There are 250 who have assigned their contracts to other purchasers, and have taken equities in cash. Soldier settlers during that period paid in cash on contracts $6,441,335. Ninety per cent of all soldier settlers made payment on their contracts in the five-year period, and the record of payment of taxes is equally good. There are 3,453 settlers left, and I am advised that they are generally in a good position. It is estimated that eighty-five per cent will have little difficulty paying off loans under the present contracts. The average age is fifty-seven, and it is, of course, recognized that there are some difficult cases. Where there is a case of advancing years or recurring disabilities or serious family illnesses, these cases will continue to receive individual and sympathetic attention. Any suggestion that soldiers have been thrown off these lands is, I am advised, absolutely untrue.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I have seen soldiers thrown off.

Mr. TUCKER: I am told that during this five-year period no one has been thrown off.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Or asked to sign a quit-claim deed?

Mr. TUCKER: In a few cases they have voluntarily turned the contract over to somebody else; but I am told that nobody has been thrown off against his will.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Nobody has been compelled to sign a quit-claim deed?

Mr. TUCKER: Nobody has been compelled to sign a quit-claim deed. If they want to make their home on that property and go on drawing their war veteran's allowance, there is absolutely no objection at all to that, because it is recognized that it is a

subsistence proposition. If a man wants to make his home there, the attitude of the department is, "That is fine". There is no objection to that at all. But I am advised that it is entirely incorrect to suggest that there is any pressure put on people who are unable to pay, where they are just getting a subsistence. The hon. member may take the opposite attitude if he wants to, but what I should like to say to him is this. If he knows of any case in which someone has been mistreated in the way in which he seems to be suggesting, or if he knows of somebody who is being pressed improperly, let him bring the case to the minister or myself and we shall be glad to look into it. I have the figures here since January 1, 1947. That is a matter of six months. Even in that short period of time 600 of these veterans have paid up their loans and obtained title to their lands.

Mr. WARREN: It is a new experience for me to be getting into this sort of argument. I have been content to represent Renfrew North without endeavouring to be a statesman. I have no ambitions along that line. I am thankful to say that in Renfrew North, as far as I know, we have nothing but satisfaction with the work of Mr. Murchison. My experience with Mr. Murchison as a government official is limited. I met him a number of times in his office in connection with his work of buying land for the purpose of settling veterans on farms; and in my opinion a splendid job was done in any case that I know of, particularly from the veteran's angle. I thought Mr. Murchison was always rather miserable about the price he wanted to pay for the farms. He might have paid more money, and would have been perfectly justified in paying a good deal more money in some cases. As an official looking after the settling of veterans on farms, I think he did a splendid job. I have not been in the habit of mixing up actively in the proceedings of any committee of which I was a member, but I did mix up in this public accounts committee on this particular question, largely because the hon. member for Eglinton kept Mr. Murchison on the mat for six hours a day, standing on his feet, and being treated as a common criminal. The hon. member for Eglinton is the type of lawyer who, when he gets his knife into a man, is not satisfied with that but must keep on twisting it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Police court stuff.

Mr. WARREN: I did work up enough sympathy to interest myself rather actively in this housing project up in Sarnia township. We heard the whole story about these houses from the hon. member for Lambton West, and I was not greatly impressed with the awful defects of those houses. Those houses had been built in the winter time. I know something about the difficulty of getting lumber, because I live in a wood country. Lumber buyers would come from Sarnia or any other district, with ten-ton trucks, if they could get a load of green lumber from any little sawmill. We could sell anything. A man could go into his swamp and cut down poplar or balm of Gilead which could ordinarily be sold only for pulpwood prior to the war. But these lumber buyers would grab up that material as good building lumber. What happens when you get that kind of lumber? Everyone knows. It must be remembered that it was green. Not a board of dry lumber could be bought. Some of our best operators of factories in Renfrew North would fairly weep about putting this green lumber right from the mill through a planer, knowing that it would go into a building. What will happen in a case of that kind? Everybody knows. The concrete is run in the winter time.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. member knows what he is talking about.

Mr. FRASER: He does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. WARREN: The hon. member the other day talked about kiln-drying the lumber. That was silly enough, and I think shows how much he knows about it. It is silly to talk about kiln-drying lumber for all the housing construction which is going on all across this country. One per cent of it could not be kiln-dried.

Mr. FRASER: The specifications did not call for green lumber.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. WARREN: No, they did not; that is true. I do not know this contractor, and I am not apologizing for the work which was done there. He probably did not do a perfect job. I do not hold any brief for that contractor, but I can easily understand how a contractor could take on the job of building eight houses in that particular district, having in mind being able to buy dry pine or spruce. There was difficulty on account of the labour situation and lack of material. A priority had to be obtained for nails. I have known times when not a farmer in the country could buy nails in any hardware store in Renfrew county. There were plenty of times when that situation prevailed. I can see how a contractor would come in and find a different

set-up from that which he had expected. Instead of getting the lumber he wanted at the time he wanted it, he would have to drive all over the country and then in many cases would have to accept this inferior green lumber. He could lose his shirt overnight at that kind of thing; and probably did for all I know. I do not know whether or not he made a dollar, but his case will be heard in court—

Mr. MacNICOL: As long as he did not lose his pants, he will be all right.

Mr. WARREN: —and that ought to satisfy even the hon. member for Eglinton. Just out of idle curiosity, during the last two or three years I have been watching a couple of projects around here. I like driving out around the experimental farm. Out the Merivale road there is a 400-family project. Then out beyond Boggs' there is another one. I think that is on what is called the Prescott highway. Two years ago this summer, the contractors were working on those projects, and it just looked like a bog hole. I saw them last fall, and they still looked like bog holes. I saw them recently, and this Merivale project is now getting around to the place where the finishing touches are being put on. Driveways are being put in. It is just a splendid, lovely community. Any person at all would be proud to own one of those houses. There is one thing we must keep in mind. Not one of these veterans is paying anything more than a modest rent, and in a period of years —twenty-five, I believe—he will own the house. The veterans pay a modest rent of anywhere from $20 to perhaps as high as $30 a month in some cases. It is a most interesting suggestion which comes from the hon. member for Eglinton who would appoint a royal commission to go around this country investigating this housing situation just because those eight houses may not have been perfect. Under the circumstances, some defects were sure to develop. Those houses could not have been so very bad. This young man Cleave who was here as a witness, who never went overseas, went and investigated the house himself. He looked it over and was satified with it. Nothing more might have come of the matter if the hon. member for Lambton West had not happened along and seen the odd crack in the wall or noticed a draught coming under a door, which is just about all these defects amount to when you come to look them over. There is a long list, of course; but in the committee I made this remark—and I think I was quite safe—that I could get two men from Renfrew county who would go into any of these houses and complete all the repairs you are talking about inside a week.

Mr. FLEMING: Then do you censure the government for spending $6,000 on these repairs now?

Mr. WARREN: If I were censuring anybody it would be the hon. member for Eglinton for making so much noise about something I do not think is worthy of it.

Here is how I regard the suggestion of appointing a royal commission. We have communists in this country; and what is the communist way of working? It is to get out and encourage discontent. If there is no discontent they go out and create it. That is the communist idea, and to me it looks as though this were just a nice communist method of creating discontent among satisfied veterans. I should like to be on that commission. It would be a grand way to spend a couple of years seeing Canada from coast to coast at the expense of the taxpayers. So I say to the minister that if he appoints a royal commission I want to be on it. We could start right here in this lovely community on the Merivale road, provided that we had an advance agent; and I think the hon. member for Lambton West would make a fine advance agent. Give him a start of a week or two; he could create a great deal of discontent in that lovely community. It is quite easy to do; go in and take a look around and say, "There is a crack in the wall of this house, and that is not fair. That crack should not be there." The first thing you knew you would have a regular hornets' nest. We could spend a couple of months right here investigating that sort of thing. They say the climate on the west coast is a little better, so that we could leave that for the winter time.

Mr. FULTON: And the houses are worse.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not in Kamloops.

Mr. FULTON: Yes, they are.

Mr. FRASER: That is right; you could spend a few months there.

Mr. WARREN: I have tried to look at this matter in a broad way. Do not think for a moment I was ever fond of the idea that the government should be forced into the construction of houses. I did not like the idea, and I was never anxious that any of my veterans should take on a project of this kind. I do not like the instalment plan. If I buy a house I want to pay for it and own it. I am the pioneer type. If I am going to build a house I want to have a woodlot where I can cut the logs, saw them up and leave them for a year until the lumber is dry; and

then do a good deal of the work myself. My wife and I started in last fall to build a house, and I am sure labour is not as difficult to obtain where I live as it is around the Windsor area. We started in and I found myself driving the horses on the scraper. Then it became hard to get labour and I found myself doing the whole job alone, not only driving the horses but guiding the scraper. However, we got that part done; we got a roof over the house, and we hope to complete that house soon. We have had to wait plenty for material, and I certainly have a great deal of sympathy for any contractor who undertook to build a block of houses, with the difficulties he must face in regard to labour, lack of materials, and all the rest of it.

The hon. member for Eglinton has certainly twisted the knife in poor Murchison's back tonight, and I do not think it was deserved. He was doing his job as well as he could, but he was encumbered with a great many duties. That man had so much work to do he should never have had to go outside his office.

Mr. FLEMING: If the hon. member would permit a question, in the committee did he vote for this report when it came up for adoption?

Mr. WARREN: That report did not satisfy me. I did not care for it.

Mr. FLEMING: Did the hon. member vote for it?

Mr. WARREN: There was not a vote.

Mr. FLEMING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am telling the hon. member he voted for this report, in which there is this sentence:

> Your committee was not favourably impressed by the way evidence was given by Mr. Gordon Murchison . . .

Perhaps the hon. member will say why he turned the knife in Mr. Murchison's back in that report.

Mr. WARREN: I did my best to have that sentence taken out, because I did not think it was a fair expression. That sentence should not be in the report.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If I may intervene for a moment, I wonder if, by agreement, we could possibly finish the estimates of this department by eleven o'clock this evening. We have had a fine discussion on them all day, from every possible angle, and I think it would greatly expedite the progress of the session tomorrow if that could possibly be done. I cannot insist upon it, but I am wondering what would be the reaction of the leaders of the various groups, so that I am making the suggestion before eleven o'clock. Perhaps we might sit a few minutes after eleven, if necessary, in order to get the items through.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is really up to the individual members.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I know; I must have individual members.

Mr. KNOWLES: As to the suggestion that we sit after eleven o'clock, I do not think it would be fair to the *Hansard* reporters and the printers to go very long. If the estimates could be finished by ten or fifteen minutes after eleven that would be satisfactory.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I would say not more than fifteen minutes.

Mr. KNOWLES: If it is agreed that we shall adjourn if we are not through by eleven-fifteen o'clock—

Mr. MACKENZIE: If that is agreeable to all parties.

Mr. KNOWLES: —I would agree to that, personally.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I think it would be exceedingly unwise to do that. After all, we have been here for twelve hours already.

Mr. FULTON: Knowing the number on this side who wish to speak, I am quite sure we could not be through by eleven-fifteen o'clock.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I wonder if the hon. member for Humboldt, who would have the floor, would allow the hon. member for Peterborough West to speak, since he wishes to catch a train at eleven o'clock.

Mr. BURTON: I have something to say along the line of what has been said by the hon. member for Eglinton, but the hon. member for Peterborough West might go ahead.

Mr. FRASER: I shall be very brief. I want to ask a few questions regarding the houses at Stratford. I understand that eight houses were built there in 1945, but that the sewers for those houses are below the level of the Stratford sewers and, as a consequence, those houses have never been occupied. I understand, further, that the department have pumps in the houses trying to keep them dry. Evidently they were built in what might be described as a sunken garden, similar to the case in Sarnia. Is that the fact?

Mr. TUCKER: We are still awaiting installation and connection with the city sewer.

Mr. FRASER: But since the sewers are so much below the level of the city sewers, it is doubtful if you will ever be able to connect up with them, and you have pumps in there now. For two years the veterans have been waiting to get into these houses.

Mr. TUCKER: Negotiations are going on with the city to have these houses connected with the city sewer. Apparently it is possible to have that done; it is just a matter of coming to an agreement with the city.

Mr. HACKETT: Are you gradually training the water to run uphill?

Mr. TUCKER: There are, I am told, ways of raising water without having it run uphill.

Mr. FRASER: During the speech of the hon. member for Eglinton, the minister said the Tories were trying to keep the boys out of their houses for a year. This is a case of keeping them out for two years and perhaps more. I could say a great deal more on this matter, but I am not going to do so. I understand that a watchman has been maintained there for over a year, who is paid so much a month by the department, until such time as these sewers are connected. How long will it be before the sewers will be connected?

Mr. TUCKER: Apparently it will be three or four months before the veterans can be permitted to go into the houses; that is, before the houses will be finished to the point where they can be occupied. Obviously there has to be someone to watch the houses until they can be inhabited, and that will not be charged up against the veteran when he signs the contract.

Mr. FRASER: This place, so far as water is concerned, is as bad as if not worse than the Sarnia situation, where there has to be drainage out to the township line, and no contract has been made with the township to take the water away from this project involving forty-three houses. The drainage system in Sarnia has not yet been connected with the township. That will cause a delay in the Sarnia scheme.

Mr. BURTON: At this late hour I have no desire to go into detail on the points raised by the hon. member for Eglinton, and the further discussion entered into by the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, and some other members on the Liberal side. However, having been a member of the public accounts committee, and as one from the C.C.F. group, I did consider it necessary to say a few words on this all-important question.

When the Minister of Veterans Affairs was asking permission to have the house sit a little longer tonight, I had intended saying to him that if he would just let me say my piece we might get through with the rest of his estimates.

The parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs has something on his hands that he cannot explain just by a wave of the hand, and there are a few things I would draw to the attention of the committee. The hon. member dealt with the cost per house at Sarnia, and the average for Canada. While it is correct that the Sarnia cost was fifty-eight cents per cubic foot and the average for Canada was about forty-four cents per cubic foot, it must be remembered that not only has the Sarnia project fallen below the requirements laid down by the contract signed by the department and the contractors, but there are other projects which have cost more money than they should have and which do not contain the workmanship they should have, in view of the money spent on them. The result is that the average cost for Canada as a whole has been raised.

I do not wish to go into detail at this time of night. However, having sat in the committee and having heard every bit of evidence given when this matter was under consideration, I must say I was amazed to see that things of that kind could be allowed to go on without having more drastic action taken by the department than has been taken.

We are now at the stage where the committee has reported. While I admit frankly that that report is not as strong in some respects as some of us would have liked to see it, on the other hand it is more or less of a compromise, as of necessity are all reports from parliamentary committees, if they are going to report at all.

That report does fairly generally reflect the consensus of the great majority of members who served on the committee. I should like to take this opportunity to compliment most members of that committee who took such great pains to be in attendance at the meetings and who took such an active interest in the hearings. I would compliment the chairman and all those who made it possible to carry on the work of the committee with the sole idea of seeing, first, that the veterans receive value for their money and, secondly, that the taxpayers of this country shall not be called upon to pay exorbitant costs for the construction of these houses.

My suggestion to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, to his parliamentary assistant and to the government is that the report tabled in the house the other day is the result of painstaking work by a standing committee of the house. I would urge upon the government and all its supporters that they read that report carefully, and especially would I urge the minister and the government to endeavour to see that the report is acted upon. After the committee has given its time and attention to this work, I do not think that at this time, in the dying hours of the session, we can thresh out this matter to the satisfaction of anyone. While the hon. member for Eglinton may not have got his royal commission, which he and some of the rest of us might have been inclined to favour, nevertheless the report does make a suggestion to the government. I say that if the government fails to act upon that report and to see that justice is done, and if it fails to see that the veterans get value for their money, and that the taxpayers get value for the money they must spend, then the government must be held accountable in the future. For the time being, however, I am prepared to let the government have an opportunity to act upon that report.

An hon. MEMBER: Eleven o'clock.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have items 474, 475, 476, 477, 483 and 484 dealing with soldier settlement, and I am wondering if we could agree to those items now.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Item 474—

Mr. BRACKEN: It is eleven o'clock.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, July 17, 1947

The house met at eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

WAR ASSETS—RIFLES, BAYONETS AND SCABBARDS

Mr. WINTERS:

What quantities of rifles, bayonets, and scabbards—broken down by provinces—have been sold to date by the War Assets Corporation?

Mr. McILRAITH: The following service rifles, bayonets* and scabbards have been disposed of by War Assets Corporation in the provinces indicated:

Province	Rifles	Bayonets	Scabbards
Quebec	3518	..	..
Ontario	718	..	..
British Columbia	236	..	..
Nova Scotia	..	16	..
Saskatchewan	..	557	561

A large proportion of the rifles listed above have been made available to recognized educational institutions on an indefinite loan basis for training purposes. All such releases are made by War Assets Corporation with the approval of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Department of National Defence.

In regard to the disposal of service type small arms in general, which is made in consultation with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Department of National Defence as stated above, such equipment is only sold or released on an indefinite loan basis when requested and the corporation does not attempt to sell this type of equipment in the open market.

INFANTILE PARALYSIS

NUMBER OF CASES REPORTED—STEPS TO REDUCE INCIDENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, of which I gave him notice. In view of the fact that this is the season in which Canadian fathers and mothers generally stand in considerable fear of the dread malady, infantile paralysis, I was wondering whether the minister could give the house some information as to the number of cases recorded at the present time. What step is the department taking in conjunction and collaboration with the provincial governments to try to reduce the incidence of this disease if possible?

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The hon. gentleman did give me notice yesterday of his question. We have established communication with each province, and periodically, three times a week as a matter of fact, we receive a report from them by telegram as to the actual number of cases in the various provinces. Of course my hon. friend will realize that constitutionally the matter of

communicable diseases is under the jurisdiction of the provinces. The last summary is as follows: British Columbia, 42, and thirty-four of these cases are from Vancouver; Saskatchewan, 5; Alberta, 6 up to July 5; Manitoba, 2; Ontario, 19; Quebec, 21. Montreal has had two local and five outside cases only since January of 1947; New Brunswick, 3; Nova Scotia, 4 and Prince Edward Island, 1.

It is early in the epidemic season for forecasting, and one can only say that few areas as yet are showing abnormally high rates. One of these is Vancouver. The incidence of paralysis as yet in the Vancouver cases is reported as being minimal.

Our role is to aid the provinces. It is thought, both by the provinces and by ourselves, at the moment that the most effective way of extending it is by the extension of information. To that end we have arranged for the distribution of a pamphlet called "Polio Facts", which contains valuable information for lay people about the disease. We are also giving attention to the mobilization, in conjunction with the provinces, of polio emergency volunteers for use in highly epidemic areas. These lay volunteers have been found useful by the national foundation for infantile paralysis in the United States, and in Canada in the Montreal health department. The basic information about this has been forwarded to British Columbia and to the other provinces within the last few months. We have accelerated what we feel to be our special field, that of research, and to this end we have strengthened the virus section of our laboratory of hygiene here in Ottawa.

H.M.C.S. "MICMAC"

COLLISION WITH FREIGHTER "YARMOUTH COUNTY" OUTSIDE HALIFAX HARBOUR

On the orders of the day:

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence): The house will have learned with deep regret of the collision that occurred yesterday about 1 p.m. between the destroyer *Micmac* and the freighter *Yarmouth County* in a fog outside Halifax harbour. Messages of sympathy, with which I am sure hon. members join, have been sent to the next of kin of the five men who were killed and the six who are missing. The collision is being investigated by a naval board of inquiry and by civil authority.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT AS TO PRESENT POSITION —CURRENCY DEPRECIATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I venture to ask the Minister of Finance whether he would at this time say something with regard to the question of United States exchange.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): I said some time ago I did not think it was desirable that there should be too frequent statements as to our exchange position. I made an extended statement on the question in the course of my budget speech about two and a half months ago. In that speech I said I did not consider that our exchange position could be appreciably improved by currency depreciation. That still holds good today. I have heard frequent rumours that the Canadian dollar was to be devalued. These rumours are completely without foundation and I think I should say now that I have no intention of recommending any such action to my colleagues.

NEWSPRINT—THE ARGENTINE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to direct a question either to the Minister of Trade and Commerce or to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, both of whom might have something to do with the inquiry I intend to make. I would ask the government whether their attention has been drawn to a dispatch from Buenos Aires yesterday in which the information came that:

> No more foreign exchange for newsprint imports will be allotted until further notice, the government announced in the Argentine yesterday.

May I ask the ministers whether any representations are being made or have been made by this government to the Argentine government in connection with this matter, and also to what extent our trade in Canada will be affected by this new regulation?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): No representations have been made either to us or by us of which I have any knowledge, and it is too early to say what effect if any it may have on our trade in newsprint between the two countries.

Mr. GRAYDON: In view of the fact that I had not an opportunity of giving notice of the question, if any further information comes to the minister's attention from now until tomorrow, if we do not prorogue tonight, will he give that information?

Mr. MacKINNON: I have been quite familiar with the point raised by the hon. member, and as a matter of fact I have had conversations with the press at its instance, but nothing official has transpired. If there are further developments I shall be glad to give them.

Mr. KNOWLES: Don't forget our own needs.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Soldier settlement and Veterans Land Act—

474. To provide for the cost of administration of soldier settlement; British family settlement; general land settlement, and Veterans Land Act, including engineering and other investigational planning and subdivision expenses that do not add tangible value to real property, $6,747,046.

Mr. FULTON: Last night a discussion was initiated on the subject of small holdings projects under the Veterans Land Act by the member for Eglinton, who dealt with the report of the public accounts committee which had been considering the matter. There are certain things referred to in the reply given by the parliamentary assistant which I would like to discuss now. For one thing, he mentioned Kamloops in the course of that reply, in which he said:

> Actually the committee had before it evidence as to the cost of similar houses in other parts of Canada where admittedly very good work was done. For example, take Kamloops.

I for one cannot admit that only very good work was done at Kamloops. I have been bringing this matter to the attention of the minister and of the department ever since December, 1946 and I intend to refer this morning to some of the details of the complaints that have been made. Before I do so, however, there is one portion of the remarks made last night by the parliamentary assistant which I think should be examined in its true light.

In defence of the director of the Veterans Land Act he said that, after all, these things were done in a hurry to enable the soldiers to get some sort of a roof over their heads, and I think it would be correct to say that he apologized for the fact that there was faulty construction because, after all, the thing was done as a special concession. I do not think that this apology compares very well with the election promises and platforms which the government presented to the veterans in 1945. When one compares the offer held out to the veterans, of a small holding for a maximum of $6,000, of which $1,400 would be written off, so that a satisfactory house on an acre or more of land would be provided, the apology does not jibe very well with the promises and the inducements. And even the apology itself was delivered in a belligerent tone as though we had no right to criticize the department for these failures or for any shortcomings.

Another hon. member remarked last night that we were making a great cry about nothing, trying to stir up discontent. If the members of the committee think discontent would otherwise not exist, I suggest that they visit some of these projects around British Columbia, such as Braefoot, Lulu Island, Kelowna and Vernon. You do not get a report like this from the public accounts committee, on which the majority of the members are from the government side, unless there is a basis for it.

Reference has been made to that portion of the report that criticizes directly the evidence given by the director of the Veterans Land Act. I wish to refer to another part of the report, at page 909 of *Votes and Proceedings* for July 15. The report says:

> Your committee feels that the facilities given by Canada to veterans under the Veterans Land Act and other measures are such as to compare favourably with the treatment granted veterans by other allied countries. It therefore all the more regrets the inconveniences suffered by some of the veterans who have in good faith purchased houses on projects where faulty construction has been encountered.

That is the finding of the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I interrupt, with regret? Is the hon. member aware that twenty-nine out of the thirty settlers in Kamloops have signed their agreements and the other will sign as soon as repairs are effected to his house?

Mr. FULTON: I do not know why the minister should regret the interruption. I do not know that twenty-nine have signed, but I am aware that a large number have signed forms saying that when the repairs are completed to their satisfaction that will complete the matter.

Mr. TUCKER: Twenty-nine have signed the agreement.

Mr. FULTON: That is since the last information I had from the department. I will refer to some of the letters from the veterans themselves about these agreements, and indicate the difficulties they caused and the manner in which repairs have been carried out.

Mr. TUCKER: When the settlers themselves have signed an agreement, and when they are satisfied, why should the house be delayed by the reading of letters having to do with past history?

Mr. FULTON: The letters I shall read have not to do with past history. The complaints I have to make are live complaints on behalf of veterans. I shall deal with the whole matter if the parliamentary assistant will just wait a minute.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Just a waste of time.

Mr. FULTON: If it is a waste of time it will be because the department does not take the action which should be taken.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The men themselves have taken action by signing an agreement. My hon. friend is trying to stir up trouble.

Mr. FULTON: The report continues:

> Your committee is of the opinion that the repair programme, although extensive, has been conducted in a haphazard manner and that such repairs as were considered urgent by the special departmental report . . . be completed at once.

Now I wish to deal with the matter, but not in the order I had first intended because of the statement just made by the minister. I have here a letter which I have received. It is dated July 3 and I received it the day before yesterday. It is from one of the veterans. I will disclose the name if necessary.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Mr. FULTON: It reads as follows:

> Since receiving your letter of May 27, the work has now been completed to my satisfaction with the exception of the drainage system, as the men who did the work say it is not satisfactory and would not pass city approval.

There is one case in which there in an allegation that these conditions are unsatisfactory. I have letters on file from four veterans. I did not write to all. I wrote to a cross-section. In them they say that although they have signed a list of defects stating that if those defects were taken care of the matter would be adjusted to their satisfaction—

Mr. TUCKER: When did the hon. member write about those complaints?

Mr. FULTON: The minister knows.

[Mr. Tucker.]

Mr. TUCKER: I should like to have, for the record, when the hon. member wrote to get these replies.

Mr. FULTON: It does not matter when I wrote. The point at issue is that I did receive these replies, and the date of the replies.

Mr. TUCKER: When did the hon. member write and when did he get the replies?

Mr. FLEMING: Order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FULTON: I have just given the parliamentary assistant the date of this reply. If he would listen instead of having his mind so much made up in advance, he might obtain some enlightenment.

Mr. TUCKER: I am trying to get some information as to when the hon. member was looking for trouble.

Mr. MACKENZIE: When was the hon. member looking for trouble?

Mr. FULTON: As I have said, the letters are from a cross-section of veterans. In three of the replies which I have received, it is stated that the drainage system, which is one of the major subjects of complaint, is not completed satisfactorily and that the installation being put in will not give satisfaction. When these lists of defects were prepared, Mr. Chairman, the veterans agreed that these were the obvious defects and that if they were completed satisfactorily, that would settle these matters. But since those lists were prepared, and in some cases as a consequence of the repairs themselves, other defects have appeared and these are not being dealt with satisfactorily. I am informed by the veterans that the sewage disposal system is not satisfactory. They have obtained the advice of the city water works engineer to the effect that the type of installation being placed there cannot give satisfaction in view of the great load it will be called upon to bear; and other farmers with practical experience of this type of installation have confirmed that impression. Of course the veterans signed the list. They wanted to get the repairs done.

Mr. TUCKER: What date is it that the hon. member says this was?

Mr. FULTON: Just a minute.

Mr. TUCKER: Will the hon. member give that information?

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. FULTON: They still insist that this sewage disposal system is not of an adequate type. It is all they are to get. Their old system

was overflowing and running all over the ground. They wanted it replaced so they agreed to accept these new ones. Let me read what the report submitted by the department itself says about this matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE: When?

Mr. FULTON: The report submitted—

Mr. MACKENZIE: When?

Mr. WARREN: Give the dates.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, give the dates.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. FULTON: The hon. member obviously does not realize that in dealing with the department one has to write so much and one accumulates such an amount of correspondence that it sometimes takes a moment or two to turn up the date. I will give the date if he will be patient enough until I turn up the actual letter on file.

Mr. MACKENZIE: When was the report?

Mr. FLEMING: Order, Mr. Chairman; can you not keep order?

Mr. FULTON: I am reading from a report or memorandum from the regional building inspector of February 24, 1947.

Mr. TUCKER: February!

Mr. FULTON: It deals with the installations being put in.

Mr. MACKENZIE: How about last week?

Mr. FULTON: And these installations are still being put in. It reads as follows:

From invoices rendered by Giddons & Son—

That is the local contractor.

—it would appear that they are not constructing the rock pits correctly, and are using too much time and material.

Enclosed is a sketch showing the correct method of building a rock pit, and it is believed that this will be a lot cheaper than the rock pits they are now building.

This is the report from the department's own regional building inspector telling them that they are using too much time and material and ordering them to use a cheaper type of construction. It continues:

A rock pit should not be filled with stone, but the side of the pit should be lined with boulders and a three inch cedar top put over same as shown.

It goes on in paragraph 4:

Enclosed with this letter is a sketch showing the construction of rock pit and in future, rock pits should be made according to this drawing.

That is the type of pit which is being installed now. The letter was dated February, 1947, and those instructions are still being followed; and it is that type of rock pit which is not giving satisfaction—

Mr. MACKENZIE: What about July 12?

Mr. McILRAITH: Is there another letter somewhere?

Mr. MACKENZIE: We have the evidence in reply. It is all just antediluvian stuff, before the flood.

Mr. FULTON: —in which the veterans say that veterans land act engineers have assured them that the rock pits were too expensive a system; that by the time they get through playing around, taking one out and putting another in, they will have spent enough money to install two or three rock pits and to put in a complete sewage disposal system.

The truth of the matter is that although $1,200,000 has been authorized for those repairs, the correspondence I have on file and the fact that this less expensive type of rock pit is being installed, and the way in which only the obvious major defects are being repaired—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Oh, no.

Mr. FULTON: —indicate that the officials on the spot had been instructed to carry out repairs on only those major defects—

Mr. MACKENZIE: And the men have signed.

Mr. FULTON: —ascertained on first inspection, and that—

Mr. MACKENZIE: The men have agreed.

Mr. FULTON: —from there on it becomes extremely difficult to get any consequential damage repaired.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Mr. FULTON: I have a case on file and I certainly accept the veteran's word for it. I had the matter investigated back there as well, and I told the minister I was doing that. He says that when his house was built two support posts which should have been there were left out of his basement. As a result the wall in his kitchen sagged and a great crack appeared in the plaster. At the time the inspection was made it was agreed that this crack would be fixed, the support posts put in and the basement joists jacked up. That was done. The crack in the kitchen wall was closed but, as a consequence of the

raising of the floor, two other great cracks appeared in other rooms in the house. But because those cracks had not been listed on the first list at the first inspection, the veterans land act officials took the position that they had been authorized by the department to repair only those defects which were obvious and which were agreed to on the list. The very fact that the repairing of one structural defect caused other damage, and that this other damage was not to be repaired, indicates clearly that the thing is not being handled as it should be. That is to say, a one hundred per cent authorization should be given to repair all the defects now apparent or which may appear as a result of structural defects.

Mr. TUCKER: So that I may follow what the hon member is talking about, will he give me some idea of what house he is referring to?

Mr. FULTON: Yes. I would have thought the hon. member would have had that from his Veterans Land Act officials out there, because this is a unique case. I know what the parliamentary assistant will say; that this veteran is a trouble maker.

Mr. TUCKER: How do you know what I will say? I am just asking you for information so I can give the committee the facts. I don't know why you should talk in such general terms.

Mr. FULTON: Because that is the tone of the correspondence I have had with the department. I will give you the description of the house. It is lot No. 27 in the Valleyview project, and I am going to give the list of repairs which were required in that house, because I want to get on to that part of the matter and the responsibility of the contractors for it. There were fourteen defects listed in that house, of which the major items were as follows: "No. 6: check disposal lines, which means the sewage disposal lines, and repair if required. 7: check level of house and shim up posts where required; (kitchen wall and sitting room floor); additional support posts, and replace two floor joists under sitting room; relocate furnace pipes as required." What happened here was that the blueprints called for the furnace to be put in a certain position, which called for the pipes to go in a certain way, and they left out two of the support joists in order to accommodate the furnace pipes. Yet that is supposed to be what the parliamentary assistant said was the admittedly excellent work done at Kamloops. I do not admit that; in fact I say the very contrary, and I will refer to the amount paid the contractor. Then the next item is:

"8. Repair plaster throughout and redecorate where required". That sounds generous, "redecorate where required", but after that in brackets are the words "kitchen and bathroom." Then, as I have said, when the support posts were put in and the floor jacked up, other cracks appeared in other rooms, and the veteran was told he could not have these further repairs made.

As a result of my correspondence and my urging of the department the V.L.A. officials paid a further visit to the house and finally agreed to do some work on these new cracks. That is, they agreed to give it one coat of kalsomine, but that did not cover up or remove all traces of the new cracks. So I say what we need is an authorization to do a one hundred per cent repair job. Heaven knows we are spending enough money; $1,200,000 has been authorized so far, and these veterans are entitled to expect a one hundred per cent repair job to their houses.

I could go on through the whole list of these houses. They show lists of defects ranging from nine, the lowest, to nineteen, the highest, in each house. These were the lists of the obvious defects. The average is about fourteen or fifteen per house; and the veteran signed the inspection report, which states:

> After final inspection of the above mentioned property it has been agreed that repairs and alterations as listed below will be completed in satisfactory building manner as soon as building materials and season will permit.

Then they listed the defects; the veteran signed and the local officials signed. Now the veterans are being told that because they signed this report it means that when these repairs are completed the house is one hundred per cent satisfactory.

Mr. TUCKER: Who said that?

Mr. FULTON: That is my information from the veterans; that they are told, "You have agreed that these are all the repairs you require. How can you come back and ask for more?" Then when they give the reasons they want more the departmental officials say, "Well, we are not authorized to do anything but what is listed."

Mr. TUCKER: Is the hon. gentleman aware that this very house was inspected just a matter of four or five days ago, and that complete satisfaction was expressed with it? That is house No. 27. The hon. member is talking about conditions as they existed three or four months ago.

Mr. FULTON: Oh, no. I have other letters, and perhaps I should read more of these comments.

Mr. TUCKER: Let us stay with the veteran you started with.

Mr. FULTON: Let me read some of the other comments.

Mr. TUCKER: Let us stay with the one you started with.

Mr. FULTON: I am presenting my own case, Mr. Chairman, in my own manner.

I know the parliamentary assistant wishes I would present it in such a manner that he could lay a trap for me, but I am presenting it in my own way, and I would be obliged if he would save his comments until I am through, because the more he interrupts the longer I will have to be.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member for Kamloops has not objected to interruptions up to the present time. He now objects, so I would ask hon. members not to interrupt.

Mr. FULTON: This is what the veteran in question, the owner of house No. 27, says:

The contractor has tried to do all that was listed in the list of defects—

Mr. MACKENZIE: What is the date of that?

Mr. FULTON: Before I go on with this I would ask the date of the report to which the hon. member for Rosthern has just referred. When was the house inspected?

Mr. TUCKER: The letter is dated July 12 and is signed by the district superintendent. Just so that my hon. friend may not be taken by surprise, since I may have indicated that the veteran was interviewed personally, let me make it plain. The letter says:

...I was in a couple of these homes, one being that of M. L. Murphy. He is the man who made the statements at the provincial legion convention at Vernon a few weeks ago. Mr. Murphy was not home, but Mrs. Murphy kindly showed me through the house, and I asked if everything had been done to their satisfaction. She expressed herself as very pleased.—It is understood another coat of paint is going on some of the walls, and what is called a webbing is showing through on the plaster.

So it was Mrs. Murphy who said she was very much pleased.

Mr. FULTON: I am obliged to the hon. member for that frank statement. In view of the previous comments by this veteran and other letters I have on file I say that letter goes no further than to say they are satisfied with the repairs which have been carried out. That is my whole point. The repairs set out in these lists are carried out; and with the exception of the sewage disposal system, which I still say is not satisfactory to the veterans, they indicate that they are satisfied with the repairs as far as they have gone. That is all that letter means. Let me read what the same veteran says—

Mr. TUCKER: May I ask my hon. friend another question, just to clear this up?

Mr. FULTON: I would prefer to continue for the moment, in order that I may maintain the continuity of my statement. This is what the veteran himself said about the list of defects:

...the contractor has tried to do all that was listed in the list of defects which . . . had me state before the repair work was started. That is where the trouble comes in. We should never have tried to put in writing the defects that were visible before they started this repair work. The department should have been prepared to go ahead and make the repairs and put the houses in a good state of repair, and then ask us to sign an agreement saying that we were at least satisfied with the condition of our houses. But with the method they have adopted we have not had a fair deal at all.

That letter is dated June 17. And I must say this, too, that following a further investigation which I told the minister I was having made I sent him a summary of the further complaints which were made. So I did not hold them up my sleeve. I sent them to him on June 25, three weeks ago. Since that time I have not had any further word from him, except to say that he was himself having the matter brought to the attention of the director of the Veterans Land Act. If he had a subsequent report I say it is unfortunate he did not communicate with me further. This morning the parliamentary assistant accused me of wasting time, and of talking about a lot of previous complaints. On this particular point, I emphasize that I had no further word from the department as to this report on my subsequent letter.

I repeat that in spite of what has been read the sewage disposal systems are not satisfactory. I take my stand on the information I have received from the veterans. As I have already said, these lists do not mean anything more than to say that the repairs which have been listed have been completed satisfactorily. But I have yet to be told of any veteran who has signed a statement saying; my whole house is in 100 per cent satisfactory condition.

Mr. TUCKER: Will the hon. member permit me to make a statement so that we may not waste time? I have tried to—

Mr. FULTON: I would appreciate it if the parliamentary assistant would wait until I have finished, because I do not wish to take too long. One further point, and I shall have finished.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I interrupt in a friendly way? My instructions in the department are that every letter must be replied to on the day it is received. If it is not possible on that occasion, then a second letter is sent. If the decision is unfavourable it is sent in the most sympathetic possible way to any person in Canada who may write.

Mr. FULTON: I agree with what was said last night as to the promptness with which the minister's office acknowledges correspondence. But I am pointing out that I reported my further investigation, after which I received these further complaints, to the minister on June 25. Since that time I have received no further information from him.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If that is so, then my hon. friend has a proper complaint.

Mr. TUCKER: May I just say a word, while we are on the point. I see this letter is dated July 12 and was received in the director's office on July 14. This, as the hon. member knows, is only July 17. So that there was not time to send information to the hon. member. The reason I mention that is so that he will not go on talking about things which have already been fixed up.

Mr. FULTON: That is not even a partial explanation, since three days have gone by since that time. However, I repeat my former statement to the effect that that listing means nothing more than that the repairs which have been made have been done satisfactorily. I remind the committee and the minister again of the statement contained in the veteran's letter, and confirmed in other correspondence. They should never have signed these lists in the first place, because other defects have developed since, with the result that they say to the veteran: Well, this is the list you gave us; this has been done, so you are not entitled to anything more. I repeat that the proper way to approach the matter is to say: We will repair these houses and put them in 100 per cent shape, as for new occupancy. Then we will get a statement from the veterans, if they are willing to make it, that the houses are now in satisfactory condition. But it is not fair to hold them up on lists which were obtained before some of the other defects showed up.

I say further that the sewage disposal system requires further repairs, and that is not satisfactory.

Mr. WARREN: How long would the hon. member suggest that the government should keep these houses in order, and properly decorated? Should it be for ten years?

Mr. FULTON: I do not think that question requires answering, because it does not refer to any part of my remarks.

Mr. WARREN: Yes, it does.

Mr. FULTON: The other comment I wish to make, in respect of one matter, is that $1,200,000 has been authorized so far for repairs to these houses.

In a return I received on June 30 information is contained that Bennett and White, who built all the projects in British Columbia, obtained fees over and above their costs to the extent of $104,000. That amount of money has been paid to Bennett and White for this construction in British Columbia. British Columbia is now having to pay its portion of the extra $1,200,000 for repairs after this work has been completed. The position is, then, that Bennett and White got $104,000 for work on which the Canadian people are having to pay an additional $1,200,000, because it was not satisfactory.

As I have pointed out, the lists of complaints signed with the department show in each house from nine to nineteen major defects. I have given one instance where two support posts were left out of the basement to make room for furnace pipes. They had to be put in subsequently and caused further damage to other rooms in the house consequent upon raising the floor level. That is atrocious construction work. The taxpayer is being asked to bear the cost of putting it right. That is one of the matters which was referred to, and one of the things which leads us to call for a royal commission—I should say not "call" for it, but to demand it. Last night when dealing with this matter the parliamentary assistant—

Mr. TUCKER: May I ask a question? Is the hon. member not prepared to leave it to the Department of Justice to decide whether Bennett and White are liable for damages?

Mr. FULTON: That, of course, is not a proper question. The parliamentary assistant said last night that the Department of Justice had been consulted earlier. So far as I know they have not been consulted as a result of the evidence given before the public accounts committee.

What I am asking for is a royal commission to investigate the matter. It could table its report and then the Department of Justice could give consideration to it. The parliamentary assistant said last night that the matter of requiring the contractors to bear the cost of these repairs is being considered.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I ask a question, with all respect?

Mr. FULTON: No, not now.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Is the hon. member questioning the integrity of Bennett and White? If so, we will have an additional inquiry.

Mr. FULTON: I wish the minister would not interrupt me further.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is typical of your mentality.

Mr. FULTON: The hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt) asked whether or not the contractor would be required to pay the costs of the repair work. The official answer from the department on this matter, in a return tabled on July 12 is as follows:

> As mentioned, in some instances responsibility for the cost of repairs is to be the subject of discussion and arrangement with contractors.

I suggest that indicates no proper effort to guard the taxpayers' money and to hold these contractors responsible for the damage which I have just set out. As I said, the list indicates faults running from nine to nineteen per house. These are major structural defects, one of which, as I said, was the leaving out of two posts, and other defects of equal importance. I shall not go through the list. But I could mention that in nearly every case the sump pits have been defective and have had to be re-cemented. Cement on the walks around the houses has had to be replaced, and there have been inadequate foundations.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Sheer politics.

Mr. FULTON: The whole matter requires a great deal more positive action on the part of the department than is indicated at the present time.

Mr. HERRIDGE: I shall be only a moment or two. My complaint is on entirely different grounds from those taken by the previous speaker. Without doubt some mistakes have been made in connection with the construction of some of these houses. We have had a parliamentary committee investigating these mistakes for months. That committee has made a report to the house, and I support its conclusions and recommendations and trust action will result to give effect to those recommendations. The parliamentary assistant has mentioned that there will be adjustments made in the cost of certain houses and that repairs are to be made in the case of others. I do not think the time of the house should be taken up discussing details as to whether the sewer pipe is short or faults of that kind. Let us keep these things in the proper proportions.

The hon. member for Eglinton very forcefully placed the views of his party before the committee last night, and I think that should be sufficient. Only recently I was speaking to a friend who is building a house somewhat similar to the ones being built by V.L.A. That house was built under careful supervision. He visited it every day to see what the builder was doing, and checked cost, but it has cost him about thirty per cent more than he expected to pay when he began last year. Recently I read in a Montreal paper a report about a hotel being built there. The president of the company stated that regardless of the most careful computation of costs made only eighteen months ago the hotel will cost thirty per cent more than was anticipated. Private builders are finding the same difficulty. So I say: Let us keep our criticism in proportion. Let us make it having in mind the work of the Department of Veterans Affairs as a whole. Let us not forget the large number of men who have been benefiting by this scheme.

The director is human and no doubt he and his officials have made mistakes. But if the director had not taken any action there would be hundreds of veterans still living in hovels and the like. This scheme has been of great benefit to the veterans of this country, and I believe that if the veterans were consulted the great majority of them would say that the scheme has been worthwhile. I think they appreciate the efforts of the department to do something for them under the difficult building circumstances existing in Canada today.

I come now to my own complaint. There are between 125 and 150 veterans in my riding who are anxious to come under this scheme. Under the changed regulations it is now necessary that a minimum of two acres be obtained, whereas formerly a small holding could consist of not more than half an acre. I ask the minister and the officials to give consideration to these complaints. My constituency is mountainous and land is scarce. For that reason I think special consideration should be given to these men, and they should be permitted to build houses in the vicinity of

Trail and Nelson on sites smaller than the two acres now required. Two acres are not required in my constituency because you can grow as much on half an acre there as can be grown on two acres in most other parts of Canada. I do hope the minister and his officials will give my veteran constituents consideration in this respect.

Mr. TUCKER: The very constructive suggestion of the hon. member certainly will be given consideration.

Mr. McKAY: I wish to associate myself with the hon. member for Selkirk and the hon. member for Yorkton in appealing to the minister and the government again to consider the granting of clear titles to those veterans who were settled under the Soldier Settlement Act of 1919 and who are still indebted to the government. Some of these men are now older citizens and I understand that there are only 3,400 in this category. We owe a debt to these war heroes of 1914-18. I am informed that the actual cancellation of this debt would not involve a large sum of money as far as the government is concerned.

These men were put on the land after the first world war when prices were high. In some cases they were settled on land known as sub-marginal land in the west. It was a most expensive undertaking for them to get started in the purchase of machinery and other equipment. The minister is also aware that when these contracts were originally signed they provided for interest charges of seven per cent on arrears. I know that today under the Veterans Land Act a rate of three and one half per cent is charged and I am glad that is being done. I know also that adjustments have been made in the case of old settlers who settled under the settlement act of 1919, but in making these adjustments there is one which has been overlooked. The most important adjustment of all would be the granting of clear titles.

Those whom I know have worked as hard as their neighbours but they have been the victims of circumstances in the way of poor crops, illness and that sort of thing. For that reason they deserve better treatment. Most of them are men of advanced years and they would like clear titles to the places they call home. They have laboured for over a quarter of a century. This parliament has cancelled war debts and on occasions we have made gifts and granted loans bearing interest of only two per cent. I am not quarrelling with that; I would be the first to support such action, but the fact is that these veterans are not yet rehabilitated in the strictest sense of the word. We are spending millions to help in the rehabilitation of Europe and yet we have not yet completely rehabilitated these men who in most instances are the victims of circumstances. I urge the government to give more consideration to the cancellation of these debts and the issuing of clear titles to these veterans. I believe the hon. member for Yorkton asked how many veterans had paid up their indebtedness in 1946-47 and I do not believe he got a complete answer.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I say with regard to the first part of the hon. member's representations that they will certainly receive very careful attention. With regard to the second question, I doubt if we have figures available for the last year. We gave them for the last five years.

Mr. TUCKER: We gave the figures for the first six months; are they not satisfactory to the hon. member?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: What about the last six months of last year?

Mr. TUCKER: I can get those and send them to the hon. member. We had them for the five years and I thought that would give a better picture.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I would like to know what they are for the past year. Can that information be given by provinces?

Mr. MACKENZIE: We will get that right away.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: The minister said that he is going to give favourable consideration to these boys, but that is what they have heard for the past thirty years.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I never used the word "consideration", because I hate the word.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: The minister said he was going to take it under advisement or something. These boys deserve a little better treatment than that, because they have been asking for this for years. The officials of the department realize that the deal given to these men was quite different from that which has been given to the men of this war, and yet they still fail to take that necessary step. Only yesterday the officials of the department told us that there were about fifteen per cent of these men whom they figured would never be able to make the grade.

Mr. TUCKER: That is hardly correct. They said that they felt that eighty-five per cent would have no difficulty in meeting their

obligations, which meant that fifteen per cent might have some difficulty. They did not say that fifteen per cent would not be able to make it.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: They are going to have some difficulty in making it. These men are now sixty to sixty-five years of age. How many of that fifteen per cent suffered disabilities as the result of action in the last war?

Mr. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend knows the details of the land settlement far better than I do. Does he not think that it would be better to deal generously with individual cases where a veteran is in danger of being dispossessed from his land, extend every possible consideration to those cases, but that those men who are able to make payments properly to the crown should make them as a matter of equity and justice? I think a blanket policy of cancellation would be unjustified.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I agree with that. I have seen men who have done their best for years and years, and lose the whole thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is my point.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: It is a little bit too late. The fact that the department forecloses and puts men off the land is an injustice.

Mr. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend can rely upon the sympathetic consideration of the department in a case such as he has just mentioned so long as I am there anyway.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Consideration came much too late for most of them.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I do not think so.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): It seems to me that the estimates of this very important department which were brought before the house yesterday should have been brought in much earlier in the session. Many of us felt that it was going to require some time to iron out some of the difficulties. By leaving the estimates to the last days of the session is not giving us the opportunity to deal with the matter in the way in which we should like to deal with it, nor is it giving the veterans who are depending upon the action of this parliament a fair chance.

In my riding I have a hundred Veterans Land Act houses in the county of Middlesex, townships of Westminster and London. I have taken the opportunity to visit many of them. I am going to be frank and fair. I would say that they are very nice little homes but they are far too high in price. There are a few defects. The defects are not as great as you will find in many of the farm homes of this country; yet these farmers are expected to carry on under these conditions. I met many of the young veterans who have purchased these places. They are a fine type of young Canadian. I am proud of them. I am going to suggest to the minister and to the government that the whole thing be reconsidered and that $500 or $1,000, or whatever it is, be written off the cost to give these boys a good chance. They have lost five years of their lives which were spent in the defence of the country. It is going to take them ten years in these years of peace to accomplish as much as they would have accomplished in the five years they lost while the rest of us were getting established in the country. These boys were fighting for us. I doubt whether there is anything that we can do that the country will criticize so long as we give these boys a fair and square deal.

In the particular houses in which I am interested the contract was let to an outside firm, a firm at New Liskeard, Ontario. In the city of London, county of Middlesex, we have as fine contractors as there are anywhere in the country. I am not going to mention any of them, but I believe a firm in the city of London could have built these houses more quickly and done the job better, and there would not have been the criticism that you had to bring in some outside unknown contractor to build these houses. The work was done wrong end first. The land was fairly heavy clay and needed drainage. They excavated for the basements and the basements remained full of water for weeks and weeks. They then pumped them out and built the foundation. Is it any wonder that these foundations are cracking, that there are defects? I am not going to go into that. I have a list of defects in several houses, but I shall not go into that now. Some of them have been repaired. Hon. members have mentioned some of these defects.

If the places had been drained at the beginning instead of at the end after the houses were erected, they would have had a good dry foundation and the work would probably have been done better. I am going to say a word about drainage. I have a return which shows that it cost $16,000 and some odd to do the work. I am not saying that it was excessive, but it sounds like a lot of money back home to the farmers who have done some drainage work of their own. I inspected the drains and the outlets, and they were working satisfactorily. But what is happening is this. All

that water that used to take probably a week to run off now comes down on the farmers' lands in a very short period of time, and they are hoping that the drainage act will be so used that the Veterans Land Act home owners will be required to pay their just share for the rest of the drainage in that area.

I understand that the parliamentary assistant mentioned the fact that this Veterans Land Act home plan was done in a hurry to accommodate these young men who were returning. I do not think it was done in any great hurry. The operation was started prior to the 1945 election. They have built a hundred houses in the area and they are not completed yet. If that is building in a hurry I do not know what it means.

I am going to refer for a moment or two to farms for veterans. I have one particular case in mind; I have done considerable work on it. This young veteran was born on a farm in Manitoba and has had life-long experience. He knows what he wants and how to do it. After he returned he took a job as a hired man on a farm so that he could get some experience in Ontario ways and so that he would have the opportunity to look around the province of Ontario and get a farm that was suitable. I think he was very wise in that—not to jump at the first place that was offered to him. After some months he decided on a farm in Huron county. I took the opportunity on occasions to discuss this particular farm with the present chairman of this committee, who knows farms. The proper deposit was made and routine inspections were made, but the officials and the committee decided that too much money was being asked for it. This took considerable time. The price that was agreed on between the veteran and the owner of the land was some $4,300. The farm consisted of fifty acres of land. The department turned it down. Opportunity was taken to discuss this matter with the officials in London, and they suggested that it would be handled from the Guelph office. This young veteran went to Guelph and saw the officials there. They suggested that they had other farms that were available and would be more satisfactory. He went out to see one of these farms which consisted of 100 acres. I do not believe it is going to cost $4,300, but a railway crosses it one way and a gully crosses it another.

Mr. TUCKER: Will the hon. member give us the name of the gentleman either now or later?

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): Yes, I will give the name. A lot of the land was not workable. This 100 acre farm was offered him as an alternative to the 50 acre farm. He went to the farm this spring. It will be realized that it rained nearly every day this spring in Ontario. There was a foot and a half of water in the basement of the farm home. You could see the clouds roll by through the kitchen roof. The barn roof leaked. In other words, it was not worth anywhere near $4,300 which the other farm that I mentioned was worth. I understand that a veteran had given this farm up after a trial, yet they tried to saddle this young lad with this poor farm. I venture to say that it will cost in the neighbourhood of $3,000 to put that farm in a habitable condition, on top of the price at which it is being sold. I said to the young lad, "You ask them to give you a better farm in Huron county, more acres for less money, and you will quickly take it." But they had nothing like that to offer. The price was too high. Get a better farm for less money and this young man will quickly take it. They have not done that. Some of these young lads have become discouraged because there is so much red tape. I do not know how you are going to get away from it.

As a result of inquiries I have made, I have found that for every ten veteran farmers there is one official of the department in the London district. If this is applied socialism I can see how under a socialist government there would be no unemployment. It is the best advertisement there could be against socialism in the county of Middlesex.

Mr. TUCKER: Under the C.C.F. it would be much worse.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): I agree with that.

Mr. KNOWLES: The parliamentary assistant is admitting it is bad, then.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): I think that is all I need say about the Veterans Land Act in regard to small holdings. I would not care to repeat what one veteran said about it. He said he could have bought a farm in Lambton county. He had been waiting all summer to make a deal and the whole thing was washed up.

Under the Veterans Land Act, where there are homes scattered through the townships, I think there should be some arrangement between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Post Office department so that there might be a rural mail delivery. Rural routes could easily be extended because there are enough homes to justify it, and it would be a service to some areas. I do not suggest that it would apply to all areas, but in the north

area of London the mail route should go down the centre of the holdings to deliver mail to these people.

Now I want to say a word about Westminster hospital, which is located in my area. I understand that this is the largest military hospital in the British empire, and I am proud that it is in my riding. I am well acquainted with many of the doctors and the officials and have seen the work they are doing not only with mental patients but with those who have lost a leg or an arm or have suffered other disabilities. They are doing fine work. I am also acquainted with many of the staff and I can say that they are very loyal. I have no word of criticism except this, and I find that it applies in all departments. There are some who are employed temporarily and some are permanent. I know one or two men who have worked since the last war and are still temporarily employed. That does not tend to build up loyalty, because such men do not know where they stand. I have taken this matter up with the civil service commission, and my opinion of the relationship that exists between the civil service commission and the various departments of government is that the commission should be jacked up and overhauled. In fact, a whole new commission should be put in, because there is too much red tape now.

Westminster hospital is situated on a highway, a paved road, and a great many people who are on that road are walking back and forth between the hospital and their homes. There is a bus service, I admit, but ninety per cent of the people who walk up and down that highway are going to or coming from the hospital and sooner or later someone is bound to be killed on that highway. Recommendations have been made to have a sidewalk extended, but as it goes out past township property and the hospital authorities have intimated from time to time that they would not participate in any expenditure of that kind —and perhaps it would be setting a precedent —I suggest that the municipality and the hospital get together and provide a sidewalk. To some extent the sidewalk would go past farm property, and no farmer wants to pay on a frontage basis.

Before I conclude I would like to bring to the attention of the minister the circumstances of a soldier who was and is now residing in Canada but who served in the British forces in Africa in the first world war. He was disabled there and he is now living in my riding. He is totally disabled. I have taken this matter up with the Canadian and British pension authorities and this is simply one of those cases where each passes the buck. Lately this man's wife had had to get employment to maintain the home, and I was informed only last week that the job in which she was employed under the unemployment insurance commission has terminated. All he gets is $13 a month. According to some of the regulations there is an alternative pension but he does not seem able to secure it.

Mr. TUCKER: How old is he?

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): Sixty-six.

Mr. TUCKER: He should be able to apply for the war veterans allowance without difficulty.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): I wrote a letter to the British pension authorities and to the Canadian pension commission, but, as I say, each passes the buck. I will give this man's name. His name is Ronald McBain.

Mr. TUCKER: Was he domiciled in Canada when he went into the British army?

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): He was here in 1913-1914.

Mr. TUCKER: Have you the regimental number?

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): I have it in my files.

Mr. TUCKER: Will you send it to me?

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): Yes. I know that sometimes there is chiselling on the pension commission, but I have seen this man personally and I can assure the minister that he is worn out. He will never be able to work and how he will exist I do not know. I may say that the British pension commission were indignant with me that I should have approached them in the way I did. Apparently the British authorities are more interested in getting money from the taxpayer than they are in taking care of their injured veterans. I am wondering if that is true of all socialist governments. I have taken it up with the Canadian pension authorities and the British and, as I say, each tries to shift it onto the other, and so I am now leaving it with the minister. I realize that he is fair and I know he will give it his personal consideration. I hope these things will be taken care of.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I say a word with regard to the three points raised by the hon. member for Middlesex East. In the first place he mentioned certain projects in London. I can assure him that the write-off committee have not yet visited the London area for that

purpose. But I can assure him that the interests of the veterans in the London area will be amply protected, according to equity and justice.

The second point he mentioned had to do with the Westminster hospital and the question of temporaries and permanents. The reason why it is only on a basis of approximately fifty-fifty is that we are using, in cooperation with the Canadian universities and the Canadian Medical Association, the finest specialists in Canada to give the ex-servicemen the very best services they can get, as temporary consultants charging specialists' fees for specialist operations or visits. That is the reason for that at the present time.

The third point raised by the hon. member was in regard to the civil service. I can assure him that the question is now under active review by the civil service commission.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): I understand that the health centre which was constructed there recently is now to be used as a hospital for tubercular veterans. I hope they will have every success. It is an ideal location. I just wanted to mention that because it was brought to my attention when I was home that this was to take place.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes; because of crowding in other adjacent areas we were compelled to use that for tuberculosis cases. That may be a temporary expedient, but for the time being it is necessary.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There are a couple of non-controversial matters that I wish to bring to the attention of the minister. In my opinion the stand taken by the Veterans Land Act administration in arbitrarily denying to certain areas settlement under the Veterans Land Act is something which must be brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I ask the hon. member to repeat that? I was interfered with.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am referring particularly to certain areas in Saskatchewan which have been denied settlement under the Veterans Land Act. I refer to one area in particular, namely, the rural municipality of Dufferin; two areas immediately north and south of Bethune, and also the areas in the central part of the province west of Long Lake, in which there has been settlement for many years and in which there are large numbers of successful farmers. The Veterans Land Act administration has refused various veterans the opportunity to take up lands in that area. I wish to place before the committee a resolution which summarizes the matter for all these areas. It was passed by the rural municipality of Dufferin, No. 190, on November 7, 1946, and a copy forwarded to the Minister of Agriculture. It reads:

> We, the ratepayers of the rural municipality of Dufferin No. 190, go on record as condemning the action of the department administering the Veterans Land Act, in not giving assistance to veterans in establishing themselves on land in this municipality, especially to sons of resident farmers who could be assisted from the home farm.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Which area is that?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is the area immediately west of Long Lake. Farmers have been in that area for many years. Their sons come back from overseas and desire to settle near home. While on occasions there has been a drought, as in other areas within the Palliser triangle, a ruling once made by the Veterans Land Act administration has been adhered to and these young men who desire to settle adjacent to their own homes have been denied that opportunity.

The second matter has to do with machinery for veterans. On occasions I have brought to the attention of the minister the cases of veterans endeavouring to purchase a tractor, in which they could get no further assistance than a certificate of identification. Certificates of identification do not give any assistance to veterans. The veterans go to the various implement companies or to their local agent and they find that they have no priority. In fact, the department itself admits that it grants no priorities to veterans establishing themselves in agriculture. To use the words of the Veterans Land Act administration, all it does is give the veteran the "breaks", whatever that may mean. I suggest even at this late date that something be done to grant those veterans a priority. I can name four instances of the situation I have described. I do not intend to go into particular cases.

Mr. MACKENZIE: How recently was that?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Within the last six weeks. I brought one case to the attention of my right hon. friend last December. Last week he was able to advise me that this man could now secure a tractor.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I interrupt, just in order to help?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE: My information from my officials—and it can be checked up, of course—is that all the machinery companies now give priorities with regard to machinery not only to veterans coming under the Veterans Land Act but also to other veterans—that is, if they have the machinery available.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: When was that ruling made? It must have been within the last three weeks.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Then it certainly is not always applied to the veteran.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I should like to help my hon. friend to kick up some trouble about that if it has not been followed out, because that has been the policy for over a year now.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes, I appreciate that it has been the policy. It has been an objective, but in several instances it has not been attained.

I now bring a third problem to the attention of the minister. It has to do with veterans who do not get land under the Veterans Land Act, but who reestablish themselves on their own land. Veterans who get land under the Veterans Land Act receive a discount of seven per cent on purchases. Other veterans are denied that discount because of the fact that they are not going to borrow money from the government. I think the discount should apply to all. Certainly we should not penalize the veteran who does not need to borrow $4,000 to $5,000 from the people of this country, who ask for no advance. He should be entitled to the same consideration as the others.

I come now to the next matter arising out of the treatment of those who take land under the Veterans Land Act, and that is in the matter of awaiting-returns benefits. Sufficient attention is not paid to the granting of these awaiting-returns benefits among young men who turn to agriculture. Within the last few days I have received three letters in that connection, and I feel a very close check-up should be made, because from time to time technical excuses are offered for the delays when individual cases are brought to the attention of the administration.

I am going to preface what I desire to say further by stating that I have found this, and I think it has been the experience of members in all parts of this house; that when matters dealing with veterans have to do with pensions or allowances every sympathetic consideration is given by the officials. I think it only fair to make that statement; I say that, however, subject to this: that the sympathetic consideration which characterizes officials of the pension board and war veterans allowance board seems in so many cases to be denied as far as the administration of the Veterans Land Act is concerned.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If I may interrupt for a second in regard to the awaiting-returns benefits mentioned by my hon. friend, there are more paid in northern Saskatchewan than in any other part of the dominion.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am not thinking about the amounts or the numbers. I am thinking about the fact that men have been waiting since they applied as far back as last February and March.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Delays.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes. I do not ask for action forthwith after application is made, but I do find that in this branch there is too much delay.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I assure my hon. friend that will be looked into right away.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Thank you very much. I now come to a subject which perhaps will not be received as favourably. I mentioned the administration of the Veterans Land Act. I am not going into a lot of details; I am not going to point out individual cases and refer to the structural defects or the negligence displayed by contractors in regard to individual houses. But I would be remiss in my duty as a member if I did not point out the situation in regard to the general administration of the Veterans Land Act. I am going to say that I do not think the minister is able to control this, because in this administration there seems to be set up a control distinct and apart from the Department of Veterans Affairs as a whole. The veterans at Normandy Park in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, were promised their houses at certain definite prices. They took possession of those houses and later were advised that a mistake had been made, or that the houses cost more than the department thought they would, and that they must either pay the additional amount or get out. They received an ultimatum from the director of the Veterans Land Act; they received letters that ought not to be written by government departments or by officials however powerful they may be for the time being. As far as Prince Albert is concerned I took up the matter and pressed for consideration, but I did not get any action. Finally the provincial command of the Canadian Legion took it up, and they were able to have action taken by the director, with the greatest of hesitation, however,—to use the friendliest word I can think of.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What was the nature of the action?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: An agreement was arrived at after very considerable argument; but there would have been no fairness shown the veterans in those houses if their case had not been taken up and fought. Then in Saskatoon the same sort of thing occurred at Montgomery Place. I have here a letter written by the secretary and president of the ratepayers' association of Montgomery Place. Apparently the veterans there organized themselves into an association, and they wrote the minister on April 5, 1947, saying:

. . . we are living in houses in a V.L.A. project known as Montgomery Place near the city of Saskatoon. The floors in these dwellings are of fir and other soft woods and have already shown signs of serious deterioration. The shrinkage in many cases is so severe that the tongue no longer fits into the groove of the adjoining piece.

Then later they said:

You can understand our concern and dismay when, contacting the local construction branch of the Veterans Land Act, we were informed that such was not to be the case, and a letter from the director was quoted stating that the floors in the project which we occupy would not be replaced.

All the way through the piece the attitude of the director, as I see it, has been arbitrary, and in too many cases he has shown a cavalier disregard for the rights of these veterans. I hope the director now realizes that when members of parliament bring up these cases they do so with no political purposes in mind at all but in order to get action; and that these veterans are entitled to consideration of a different type from that which he has seen fit to show heretofore. I took no part in drafting the report of the public accounts committee; but, sir, that report shows not only that the committee was overwhelmed by the evidence given but also that when a serious situation is revealed action will be taken. To me one finding of the committee is one of the most strongly worded I have heard of, and I hope it will mean that hereafter, as far as the administration of the Veterans Land Act is concerned, sympathetic consideration will be shown by the minister, the deputy minister and the officials of that administration. This is a severe castigation, and it is the result of an accumulation of instances of injustice or arbitrary conduct. The committee came to the conclusion that they were not favourably impressed by the way evidence was given by an official, namely, the director. Without going into any individual cases I hope this will mean that no longer will any official feel that when cases are brought to his attention in connection with veterans he can simply brush them aside with total disregard for the rights of those involved.

Mr. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend would never say that about the minister, would he?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, the minister has been his most pleasing self for the last day and a half. He is totally unsusceptible to any suggestions of approval from this side of the house, but I have noticed that when his work is approved he has the same human feelings we all have and appreciates what has been said. I would point out that as far as the administration of the Veterans Land Act is concerned there was only one case where the minister—I do not want to use a colloquialism—spoke without due regard to the facts. That was when we were considering the sale of lands in British Columbia that had been taken over from the Japanese. One newspaper referred to the fact that some of these lands had been sold by the director at a higher value than they were taken at, and the minister said there was no foundation for such statement. In that case he acted on the instructions of his director. Later the evidence taken before the committee established that the statement of the director was somewhat removed from the facts.

I am going to read a series of answers which, to me, support the view I have expressed. On March 19 the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard asked a series of questions regarding the Veterans Land Act. He received no answer for four long months. They were not difficult questions; that is, they were asked in a fair and reasonable way. If there had been an efficient administration of the Veterans Land Act those questions would have been answered long before July 12, 1947.

For four months parliament waited—not just the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard. The questions were passed as an order for return. I am going to place on record the kind of answers that the administration believes it can give and, if I may say so, get away with. Perhaps with the consent of the house I shall place the questions on the record instead of reading them.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. member consent?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Agreed.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: They are:

1. How many houses constructed under the Veterans Land Act small holdings project have been found to contain (a) defective workmanship; (b) defective materials; (c) a combination of (a) and (b), and (d) unsatisfactory drainage.

2. How many contracts or arrangements have been entered into for repairs and/or redrainage of the defective houses or properties.

3. In how many cases have the repairs or redrainage been undertaken by (a) the original contractor; (b) other contractors.

4. In how many cases have the repairs or redrainage been undertaken (a) at the expense of the contractor; (b) at the expense of the taxpayers; (c) at the joint expense of contractor and taxpayers.

5. (a) In how many cases has the veteran been required to bear any part of the cost of repairs; (b) in how many cases in which the original contractor is being employed to do the repairs, or redrainage, and the cost thereof is being borne by the taxpayers, is any profit, management fee or allowance over cost being made to such contractor.

6. If there are any cases in which the cost of repairs or redrainage is not being charged to the contractor, what is the reason for failure so to do.

7. In how many accepted cases of bad workmanship, materials, or drainage have the necessary repairs or redrainage not yet been arranged or contracted for.

8. (a) What is the total estimated cost of repairs and redrainage necessary to date; (b) what is the division of such cost between the veteran, the taxpayers and the contractors concerned.

9. (a) How many inspectors or other officers employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs for the purpose have been passed or approved work, materials or land subsequently found to be below standard; (b) How many such persons are still in the employ of the department; (c) How many persons have been discharged for cause; (d) If any such persons are still in the employ of the department, why have their services been retained.

10. (a) Are any prosecutions or actions for damages pending against any persons for bad workmanship, for the supplying of bad materials or for breach of contract in respect of any of these houses or projects; (b) If the answer to (a) is yes, how many prosecutions or actions are pending, and in what locality or localities are such proceedings being brought.

It will be noted that the first question is not a difficult one to answer. But they took four long months to evolve this answer which, if I may be allowed to say so, is a remarkable example of circumlocution and evasion. This is the answer:

As was foreseen at the time the notice of motion appeared in *Votes and Proceedings*, the wording of this order is such that in fairness to the hon. member in whose name the notice of motion appears; in fairness to the veterans occupying these homes; in fairness to the contractors who built them; and in fairness to the Department of Veterans Affairs, a concise and clear-cut answer cannot be given.

to everybody. After four long months—and I notice it does not mention the people of Canada—but "in fairness", after four long months it is stated that it would be impossible to give a concise and clear-cut answer.

Mr. TUCKER: May I say, in fairness, in respect of that answer, which I did not know had been given, that it might be correct to say that there would be a great difference of opinion as to what constitutes defective material and workmanship.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, yes. That indicates the parliamentary assistant did not draw the answer. There must be some mind-reading in the department, because the next paragraph is along that very line.

Mr. TUCKER: It is a very natural answer, I should say.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The answer continues:

There is no precise definition of defective workmanship or defective materials and no known standard of what is perfect for comparison.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Is that not an answer?

Mr. TUCKER: Is that not reasonable?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It continues:

Every house, no matter by whom or for whom built, could be found to contain some defects, depending upon the opinions of those interested.

Did not my hon. friend assure the hon. member for Eglinton or the hon. member for Kamloops that where there was defective workmanship consideration was to be given to the matter of having prosecutions where it was deemed proper they should be taken?

Then we turn to question 5, which is broken into paragraphs (a) and (b). That is a simple question, which asks about the expense to the taxpayer. Surely the department knows which contractors failed to do their work properly and had to do it over again. The answer was that in only eight cases were the original contractors employed to do repairs or redrainage.

Then the answer to question 6 is:

In many cases defects and deficiencies are not attributable to contractors.

That is the statement in this answer although they say earlier in these answers that they do not know what was attributable to the contractors.

Mr. TUCKER: Where does it say that earlier in the answer—that they do not know where it is attributable to the contractor?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My hon. friend said that except for one case at Boucherville there were no cases in which proceedings had been taken against the contractor.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is different.

Mr. TUCKER: Others are being looked into by the Department of Justice.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, if it takes as long to look into them as it has taken to bring down these answers, in order to evade answering, so far as the director is concerned—

Mr. MACKENZIE: On a point of order, the hon. member has used the expression, "to evade answering". That is an absolute fabrication of the fact. We had to investigate the situation all across Canada, and the questions of the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard were answered as soon as possible, as soon as the facts had been ascertained. I deny that as a responsible minister of the crown I have sought to evade answering anyone.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Chairman, I have already—

An hon. MEMBER: Withdraw.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Withdraw what? Withdraw fact?

Mr. TUCKER: The suggestion was made that those answers were made for purposes of evasion.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: They were not made to evade; that was the result of them.

Mr. TUCKER: That is a matter of opinion; that is what you think.

Mr. MACKENZIE: A pretty clever police court answer.

An hon. MEMBER: Police court.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that we get on with the discussion of the estimates.

Mr. TUCKER: There is no use hoping to do that. We might as well sit down for the summer.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: So far as interruptions are concerned, if hon. members get any pleasure out of making personal references in order to answer arguments, I am not asking for any withdrawal. I never make personal allusions to any hon. member.

Mr. TUCKER: That is a feeble protestation, in view of the allegations you made against me a couple of days ago.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What was that?

Mr. TUCKER: You do not wish to remember it. Look it up in *Hansard* in your speech the other day on redistribution.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would ask hon. members to keep to the item.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Then I would direct the attention of the committee to question 8 (a) and (b). This is the answer: It is stated that the total cost to date is $350,000; and the answer to the second part of the question is:

Veteran nil; taxpayers and contractors, information not available, for reasons already given.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is quite evident.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Surely one can find out which contractors deliberately deceived the department and took unfair advantage of the officials.

Mr. TUCKER: It is hard to say how much we will be able to recover; that will be a matter for the courts to decide. Some of these firms may be bankrupt and it may be impossible to recover from them.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not think any of these firms would be bankrupt after having some of these contracts.

Mr. TUCKER: They lost money on the one in Alberta where they had made a firm bid.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Was that a case of defective workmanship, and were the houses not properly built?

Mr. TUCKER: No, their costs went up and they were bound by their firm bid.

Mr. FLEMING: How could they lose money on a cost-plus fee basis?

Mr. TUCKER: I said they had made a firm bid.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Does not the hon. gentleman know what a firm bid means?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes, but you do not.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There was one case in Alberta where the contractors lost money, but there is no suggestion that there was any wrongdoing there. Apparently there have been some investigations made because a number of employees of the department have been dismissed. I should like to find out whether the twenty-six men were dismissed because they had not properly discharged their responsibilities in so far as inspection was concerned.

The last question in the return is: Are any prosecutions or actions for damages pending at the present time? That was on July 12, 1947. The answer was that one case is before the courts connected with the construction of 17 houses at Boucherville, Quebec. I can understand that you cannot get perfection, but when there is wrongdoing the only thing to do is to take action, and that action should be taken with the utmost celerity. These cases

involve $350,000 worth of repairs but only one case is before the courts. In so far as the answer reveals, no other proceedings have been taken or are in any way indicated.

I hope that this discussion will bring about an aroused public opinion which will demand that these people who have defrauded the Veterans Land Act administration, these contractors—there is only a minimum of people who will do wrong—should be proceeded against, and at once. Parliament has a right to ask from the parliamentary assistant more than an expression of hope that something will be done. The demand has been made from this side of the house by the hon. member for Eglinton and the hon. member for Kamloops that a royal commission be appointed, but the government has indicated that it is opposed to that. I am not going to press that, but the government should proceed either in that way and get an unbiased report or take action in other ways. The government already has a recommendation for the setting up of a commission in connection with Japanese lands, and that commission could investigate these cases as well.

If the government will not set up a commission, then to a greater extent the responsibility rests upon the Veterans Land Act administration to go ahead against these people who have done wrong, to prosecute them immediately and if they have done wrong, to assure that they are punished. If you continue in this haphazard way, while you may not be inviting other contractors who hitherto have been honest to do wrong, you certainly are penalizing them for doing right. I realize the difficulties in connection with a vast work of construction such as this. We are not asking for perfection, but we have a right to ask on behalf of the taxpayers of Canada that punishment follow wrongdoing.

Mr. TUCKER: In connection with Boucherville, where it was felt there was wrongdoing and perhaps some criminality, when this was made known to the minister he immediately communicated with the mounted police and assured them of the fullest cooperation by all departments of government. He told them that they should make a searching investigation and be ready to call on the government for any assistance they needed. That was a case where there was some wrongdoing indicated. In the vast majority of cases the contractors have been the victims of circumstances. We have honest contractors in Canada and any suggestion that there has been any widespread criminal defalcation is entirely wrong. There has been only this one case where there was any suggestion of anything in the way of criminality. When you enter the realm of civil responsibility you cannot launch a lawsuit until all your accounts have been audited and everything has been looked into. The committee has been assured that every step will be taken to protect the country against loss where any contractor is civilly responsible. That assurance has been given before and I repeat it.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at two o'clock.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. When the committee rose at one o'clock we were discussing item 474. Shall the item carry?

Mr. CHARLTON: I want to make a few remarks on this item. Over a year ago the size of a plot on which a veteran was allowed to build a house was increased from a half to three acres. I understand, and I should like the minister to correct me if I am wrong, that on a Veterans Land Act division where several houses have been built by the government a veteran can still build a house on a half-acre lot. Is not that correct?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes. May I explain to my hon. friend. In 1942 when the committee met and formed the act—I forget whether my hon. friend was a member—the essential idea behind small housing was land settlement and not housing. Unfortunately, as a result of the emergency conditions that developed, the idea was diverted into becoming rather a housing, not an urban housing but an outside urban, idea. These are the projects which have caused some trouble, as my hon. friend is aware. The basic essential idea of land settlement is land settlement, and housing is only an incident. So far as I am concerned I would recommend tomorrow that the housing side be abandoned by the Veterans Land Act administration and give all their attention to real settlement, real farming, as it was intended to be.

Mr. CHARLTON: Surely the minister does not suggest that three acres is a farm.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON: Three acres is not enough on which to make a decent living, and it is too much for a man to look after if he has some other job.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Intensive farming.

Mr. CHARLTON: If a veteran cannot build a house on a half-acre anywhere else it is still possible for him to build on these divisions?

And if so, is it that you want to get rid of the land you have on hand? He cannot build on a half-acre anywhere else, but if he builds on one of these divisions he may—

Mr. TUCKER: The reason is this. The whole thing was laid out on the basis of half-acre lots. Naturally the whole plans in particular subdivisions cannot be upset.

Mr. CHARLTON: That is the point. If a man wants to build on a half-acre lot why tell him he has to build in that particular locality? Why not build on a half-acre lot any place? It started out to be an acre lot; then the acres were divided in two. I understand that if a chap wants to build on a half-acre lot for instance in the Brantford subdivision it is going to cost him at the rate of $700 for a half-acre which, I will agree, includes water, roadways, and that sort of thing. I have an idea of how much the government paid for the land. I think the government was making very good money by charging that rate per acre.

Mr. TUCKER: The government is not making any money at all. It charges what was paid for the land plus the cost of development.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The government is not making a cent; it is losing money.

Mr. CHARLTON: The cost is rather high. I have a return showing the cost. I do not yet believe that at the price that was paid for that land the cost would be anywhere near $1,400 an acre when all the services that are given are included.

You can hardly get a private contractor around the country to take a contract to build veterans houses because you have made it so difficult for him.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I interrupt? If my friend reads the act, which I have no doubt he has done very carefully, he will see it states specifically that the government is not permitted to make any profit out of these transactions.

Mr. CHARLTON: No, but the contractor does.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The statement I have given is the truth.

Mr. CHARLTON: It is not the government that makes the profit, but the contractors have made plenty. The Veterans Land Act has made it so difficult, there is so much red tape in connection with building houses for veterans, that the private contractor will not even look at one of them. He has to put up a bond; he has to deposit ten per cent to get the contract and so forth.

How long does he wait to get his money? I know of one who has waited for over a year and he has not received his money yet, and I do not know whether there is any chance of his getting it within the next six months.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Which proves that there is no profit in it for the contractor.

Mr. CHARLTON: It does not prove anything, Mr. Chairman. The private contractors are all so fed up with the red tape that they have to go through that they will not touch them. The contractor who built the houses at Brantford, Hill, Clarke and Francis—I do not know where they came from—built a lot of these houses around the country. They must be a pretty big outfit; certainly they are not losing any money.

Mr. HARKNESS: I should like to touch on the various difficulties that have been brought up in connection with the Veterans Land Act and the charges of inefficiency and mistakes in construction and so forth. The government now claims that it has put its house in order; it has got rid of some twenty odd officials, and the presumption is that in future we will not have these difficulties. I certainly hope we will not have them. If the government has put its house in order we should be told who are these officials who have been either discharged or retired because they were not carrying on their duties efficiently. If the government does not want to give us names I at least should like to know in what areas they built houses. Were there three in the Calgary area or none there? What were the numbers in the other areas where veterans housing projects were constructed and complaints of difficulties were voiced? The committee is entitled to know the names of any places where the difficulties arose. Officials who were in charge have now been got rid of. We want to know the numbers, and so on.

Mr. TUCKER: It would not be fair really to place these on record. If the hon. member wants the names he can have them privately; but some of these people might quite properly say that they did the best they could under the circumstances. It would not be fair to say simply because they had not been doing a good job under these difficult circumstances that they should be condemned for all time. They have been let out. Naturally it is not our desire to judge them on the basis of what has happened.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Over twenty.

Mr. TUCKER: They are not with the department any more, but they might have a just claim that we had been unjust to them under the circumstances if we were to put it on *Hansard* that we had dismissed them and so forth. If the hon. gentleman wants their names privately he can have them.

Mr. HARKNESS: Perhaps there might be objection to putting their names on *Hansard*. If so, I should like to know the areas in which they worked.

Mr. TUCKER: That is the same thing, as the hon. member well knows. If he wants the names privately he can have them. It would be very easy to identify every one of them if the areas are given.

Mr. HARKNESS: I do not think it should be easy to identify them. We should have an indication of the places in which the trouble occurred. If the department has done a house-cleaning job we should be told what these areas are.

Mr. TUCKER: I understand that most of these people are veterans themselves. They were up against a very difficult proposition, in some cases they did not actually come up to what was expected. Their connection with the department has been terminated. If the hon. gentleman wants the list, he can have it, but surely he should be satisfied. These veterans did the best they could, I presume, and perhaps on a full trial it would be held that they had done as well as anyone could. Therefore it would not be fair to have them pilloried all over Canada as failures and perhaps worse.

Mr. HARKNESS: The parliamentary assistant has missed the point I have been trying to make. It is not a question of satisfying me, and I am not interested in their names. It is a question of satisfying this assembly and the country that this house-cleaning has been done. I did not ask for their names, but perhaps the areas could be given.

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member must know that if we said that, for example, in the Sarnia area the engineer in charge had been dismissed, everyone in the area would know who it was. It would be the same as giving his name. Why does the hon. member want us to do that? We have terminated the man's services, wherever it happens to be, and if the hon. member wishes to have the information he can have it. Obviously if he insists upon it, he can have it given publicly.

Mr. HARKNESS: I am not insisting at all on the names, but let us say that in the area in which Kamloops is situated three men were got rid of. Perhaps the parliamentary assistant could indicate that, or something of the kind.

There is one other point I would like to take up. It concerns men who purchased farms under the Soldier Settlement Act. I do not want to go into the general operations of that act or the various injustices which many of these men claim have been perpetrated upon them. I discussed this question at considerable length last year. I have received several complaints from men who bought farms in Alberta under the Soldier Settlement Act. These farms carried the mineral rights with them. When the men bought the farms they considered that they were getting the mineral as well as the surface rights, but when they came to complete their payments and title was turned over to them by the soldier settlement board they found that the mineral rights had been reserved. In some cases these mineral rights are valuable and in others they are not. It is possible that throughout Alberta any of them might be of value because of oil discoveries. I cannot see why the board should have held these mineral rights instead of turning them over to the settlers who purchased the land, especially when, as far as I understand, these men had no indication that the rights were being reserved until they made their final payments. This question was brought up in the house four or five years ago by my predecessor, Mr. George Ross, of Calgary, and at that time there was an indication that it would be looked into and something done, but nothing has ever been done. In the meantime several men have finished paying for their farms and now they are aggrieved that they have not the mineral rights. They feel that they rather than the board should have these rights and I wish the minister would make a change in the regulations. I understand it has nothing to do with the act, being merely a matter of administration. Can something be done so that these men may be given the mineral rights which they purchased, as they thought, in good faith?

Mr. TUCKER: Section 57 of the Soldier Settlement Act prohibits it, and a bill was brought into the house to change that so that they could get the mineral rights. That bill was turned down in the other place. I will not say at whose behest, because that might start an argument, but it was turned down there.

Mr. HARKNESS: Will the minister introduce a similar bill at the coming session? Probably it would not be turned down then.

Mr. TUCKER: It can be considered by the committee and recommended if they think it wise.

Mr. MENARY: On the order paper of July 2 several questions of mine appeared with regard to the Matador ranch, Saskatchewan. On July 7 I received the answer "no" to all the questions from the Acting Minister of Agriculture. I understand this ranch is now being operated as a cooperative farm by a group of veterans who secured it under the Veterans Land Act. Will the minister tell the house whether or not these are the facts? If they are, the government must have bought the land through the Veterans Land Act, and for this reason I would like to have these questions answered.

Mr. TUCKER: The Matador ranch is crown land of the province of Saskatchewan and was never acquired by the dominion government under the Veterans Land Act.

Mr. LENNARD: I wish to refer for a moment to the Spring Valley survey at Ancaster, Ontario. While I know that the deputy minister visited that survey, I feel the majority of the complaints are not being rectified as quickly as possible. I will not bring up the many matters that are being adjusted, but there is one thing that should be brought up because nothing has been done about it. I refer to the $25 being levied against landscaping, $10 for clearing and $15 for tilling. Only three properties on that survey were actually cleared and yet every one of the 96 residents is being charged $10. These matters have been taken up with the Veterans Land Act administration in Toronto, but they are not rectified. If the matter had been attended to properly in Toronto this would not have been necessary. In the matter of clearing, for which they were charged $10 each, 28 of these properties have low bushes and these were not removed. Three have old trees which were not removed and eleven have fences running all across the property, which should have been removed, while five have old fine stumps which were not removed. That is the situation. These residents were charged for something that has not been done. In the matter of tilling, there was a charge of $15 in connection with those properties that were tilled and I am told on good authority that the actual charge for tilling is from $2.50 to $3.50 or $4. This is an overcharge that should be attended to.

Mr. TUCKER: If the hon. member will give me the details I will look into it. I can only say that sometimes money is set aside for work but the amount charged the veteran is only what is actually spent.

Mr. POULIOT: If the very able parliamentary assistant would be kind enough to answer one question, I think it will be the last that I shall ask about this department. Referring to Bill 396, an act to amend the act with respect to commercial and professional loans to returned men, if a returned man buys a piece of land and constructs a building for professional or commercial purposes before having the definite answer of the department about a grant, would he be entitled to the grant in virtue of the law?

Mr. TUCKER: It just depends on whether this man would be considered as being engaged in a business or profession as defined in the act.

Mr. POULIOT: He is a druggist. He owns a drug store.

Mr. TUCKER: Is he going to run a drug store at that place?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

Mr. TUCKER: There would be nothing to prevent him from making application to the bank. If he was a veteran, and if it was to advance his business or profession, of course he would be entitled to make application to the bank.

Item agreed to.

Soldier Settlement and Veterans Land Act—

476. To provide for the payment of grants to veterans settled on provincial lands in accordance with agreements with provincial governments under section 35 of The Veterans' Land Act, 1942 (as amended by order in council P.C. 2122, dated 13th April, 1945), and payment of grants to veterans settled on dominion lands, in accordance with an agreement with the Minister of Mines and Resources, under section 35 of The Veterans' Land Act, 1942, as amended (P.C. 1550 of 18th April, 1946), $5,000,000.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I wish to refer to a matter which has been drawn to the attention of the minister on a previous occasion. It has to do with the Veterans' Taxi Owners Association of Montreal. When this matter was brought up in the house about a month ago the minister was inquiring whether or not officials of the department had been employees of the department at the time at which they were doing this, and whether or not they were using the regular time of their office hours for carrying on this business. Apparently there is plenty of evidence to prove that these gentlemen were officials of the department, that they used departmental literature in signing sheets and giving veterans

receipts for the money they paid in, and that Mr. Levesque was president of the company.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I do not know how the hon. gentleman relates his question to item 476 under soldier settlement and Veterans Land Act.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I do not think there is any particular item which would cover this. It is a matter of general administration. I think I can be through in two minutes. There is only one word I want from the minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I shall be very glad to give it.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: As the situation has developed, the veterans who put their money into this business in good faith may now, on account of the administration of the company, lose their equity in their cars. I wanted to get an assurance from the minister. I just want to see that their interests are protected.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I say that I have heard the two sides of the case. I heard a delegation of veterans who came up to see me, and probably others, who were approving strongly the support they received from Major Ferland. They were quite satisfied that the greatest loss anyone could sustain was $50, and that the organized cooperation which resulted from his efforts would lead to security and employment for them. That is the story as I received it on the one side. We had the other side of it here in the house. I think we had better let the matter rest there. We shall carefully watch the proceedings in order to see that the interests of the veterans are not injured in the slightest degree.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I understand that the matter is before the courts. That is the assurance I wanted from the minister.

Item agreed to.

Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Chairman, when you change from one branch to another in going through these estimates, I wish you would please give the committee time to see where we are going.

Demobilization and reconversion—

605. War veterans allowance board—allowances to dual service veterans (world war 1 and world war 2); to veterans, world war 2 only, and north west rebellion, 1885, $350,000.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: The minister promised me some statement with regard to veterans of the Riel rebellion.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: As to the numbers, and whether or not any consideration could be given to increasing the amount of their pension in view of the increased cost of living.

Mr. MACKENZIE: As my hon. friend knows very well, I think the only real consideration ever given to the veterans of the Riel rebellion was given by myself, with the help of my colleagues and of the house.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I appreciate that.

Mr. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend may rest assured that anything which is regarded as necessary in equity will be done in regard to the veterans of the Riel rebellion.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I wish to give the minister credit. Personally, when I have taken any matter up with him, I have always had the utmost satisfaction. It has been a matter of regret to me that I have had to draw his attention to some cases. We have had very good service. I think the minister has the interests of the veterans at heart, and I hope that continues to be so. As I pointed out the other day, any veteran of the Riel rebellion is by now in receipt of an old age pension, because he would be over seventy years of age. When he received pension because of his services in the Riel rebellion it cancelled his rights to old age pension. One pension came in and the other went out. In Saskatchewan to be deprived of old age pension also deprives a person of rights of hospitalization and medical and other attention. In view of the increased cost of living, I hope the minister will take into personal consideration the few of these veterans who are left. They are worthy of his attention.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I shall be glad to do that.

Item agreed to.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the leader of the opposition is justified in making the comment he made a moment or so ago. I will try to carry out what he suggests. The two items that were left, 899 and 900, are in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BRACKEN: May I say just one other word? There are branches of many departments to be dealt with this afternoon. I think everyone desires, as far as is practicable, to expedite the consideration of these estimates. I would suggest that when you leave one branch of one department, Mr. Chairman, you give us a moment or two to find where you are next taking us in the estimates.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, certainly. The intention was, Mr. Chairman, with the consent of my hon. friend, that when any department was called which has not yet been disposed of, the supplementaries and also the votes in regard to reconversion would be called immediately afterwards, so that all the votes concerning and relating to that department would be disposed of at the same time by the committee of supply.

Canadian pension commission—

900. Administration expenses, including the deputy chairman of the Canadian pension commission at $500 additional to chapter 62, statutes of 1946—further amount required, $500.

Mr. GRAYDON: I should like to bring to the attention of the minister a matter which was originally brought to my attention by one of the leading men in welfare services in one of the veterans' organizations in my own riding. I myself had personal knowledge of one of the cases which he brought to my attention. The matter has to do with an important principle which may have been dealt with by the committee on veterans affairs and may have been dealt with before in the house, but if it has, it has escaped my notice. An ex-serviceman who had served in the first war and who again served in another capacity in this war, died. A considerable length of time elapsed—the number of months has escaped my recollection for a moment; it was several months or perhaps nearly a year, but that is not germane to the point I desire to raise—before his widow was able to establish entitlement to a pension for herself because of her husband's demise. I fancy this matter must have been raised by other hon. members as well; but this veterans' organization feels that during the interim waiting period a very grave difficulty confronted the widow, and I imagine that is frequently the case also when a soldier is awaiting establishment of his entitlement. I was wondering if the minister had given consideration—and if not, would he give consideration—to making some kind of allowance which would at least permit these people to subsist and carry on until such time as the entitlement comes through. I believe it would be a matter of great satisfaction to the people so involved if this could be done. The minister knows this situation much better than I do, and perhaps he would clarify it to the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Could I ask my hon. friend a question just to clarify the position? Did this delay occur during the peak of demobilization, or was it before that?

[Mr. Bracken.]

Mr. GRAYDON: I am afraid I am unable to say definitely.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Because quite frankly we did get behind in our pension decisions during the peak of demobilization, when men were coming back in great numbers. That may have been the reason for delay in this case. In any event I can assure my hon. friend that if he would be kind enough to send me the details of that particular case I shall see that the Canadian pension commission immediately go into it thoroughly.

Mr. GRAYDON: In this case, of course, the widow has her pension; it has been granted.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is a matter of retroactivity, is it?

Mr. GRAYDON: I am not sure of that, either, because I have not the file before me, and I do not want to be too definite in my statements.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

57. Departmental administration, $830,703.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I do not propose to make any general or extended remarks on this administration item. I just wondered if the minister wished to make any general observations on the growth and development of the department, or if he wished to just take up the separate items as they are called.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): I had not contemplated making any general statement. As the committee realizes, the Department of Finance gets a pretty thorough overhauling in the course of the budget debate and other debates in this house, so I thought perhaps any particular questions might be taken up under the individual items.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Then I have just one question to ask. If the minister will look at page 109 of the details he will see a new item for several finance officers, for which some $20,000 is provided. I can quite understand that because of the mechanics involved in the increase in debt and what not there would be more need for clerical assistance, but I would have supposed that the general responsibilities of the department would be lessening through the decrease of activities of the wartime prices and trade board, and all that sort of thing. So it is not immediately apparent to me why these additional more or less senior officers, at any rate officers above the status of clerical assistants, are required. Would the minister say a word on that?

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall be glad to do so. The reason is that during the war the Department of Finance took on practically no one in this junior executive capacity. We did that purposely, as far as possible trying to hold these places for young men who had served overseas. From my own experience I can say that in this category the department is rather understaffed. I am not speaking of clerical assistants; these are young university graduates coming into the department as junior finance officers, the men upon whom we must rely for promotion to higher grades in future. As I say, they are all to be young university men and all will be returned men.

Mr. HACKETT: Can the minister say how many positions there are with a salary of $4,000 or more in his department today as compared with 1939?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I could not give that figure at the moment, though I can get it quite easily. If one excludes the purely wartime aspects, such as the wartime prices and trade board, I believe there has been comparatively little change; I can make that general statement.

Mr. HACKETT: Can the minister say how many such employees there are today?

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall try to get that information a little later on in the course of the discussion of these estimates.

Mr. ADAMSON: I should like to make a few remarks in regard to the exchange situation and to ask the minister some questions. At the beginning, having seen the minister's experts sitting in the gallery for three days now, I am impelled to remark that they also serve who only sit and wait.

The day before yesterday was the day on which sterling officially became freely convertible; and I assume it is hoped this will greatly help our adverse trade position with the United States. I want briefly to look at the situation as it is represented in the public press, which is the only source of information available to me. According to that source, in the month of April we had an adverse trading balance with the United States of some $92,000,000, and it was estimated that our adverse balance of trade in May would approach or exceed $100,000,000. In addition we have a loss in investment capital of some $26,000,000 for the first four months of this year, In other words our adverse trading balance is running at the rate of approximately $1,000 million a year, and the direct capital loss is approximately $100 million a year. I think for the first time in our history at least since the first great war we had a net adverse balance of trade on all counts, even assuming the free convertibility of sterling. In the first four months Canada had a favourable balance with the United Kingdom of $135 million; but with the adverse balance of trade with the United States of $296 million, assuming we could get payment for the United Kingdom balance in American funds it left us with a net deficit of $161 million in American funds. That is an extremely serious situation; for not only are we losing hard currency to the United States at a tremendous rate, but, on balance, we are not; even assuming the convertibility of soft currencies; meeting the adverse balance of trade.

Besides that our position is in debit with respect to capital, in that we are having our Canadian people invest larger sums in the United States than American citizens are investing in Canada—and that despite the apparent efforts of the foreign exchange control board.

Every modern war has been followed by increased prices. It was inevitable that there would be an inflationary trend after world war II, despite the fact that many programmes of control were put into effect to hold down prices. Since these stifled production in many instances, they encouraged rather than discouraged the inflationary trend, although they may have held it in check for a brief period.

This brings me to the point of considering the cost of government. I would compare this with the net cost of government in the United States, because I believe the economies of our two nations are so closely entwined that some comparison must be made. In 1939 the United States had a net government cost of some $10 billion and a national income of between $60 billion and $80 billion. The present estimated cost of United States government is around $50 billion per year, and the gross production of the country is, I understand, between $250 billion and $300 billion Therefore the ratio between cost of government and total net production of the country remains about the same, or approximately six to one. On the other hand, in Canada before the war, government cost us about half a billion per year while the national income was about $3 billion, or approximately the same ratio of six to one. Now the government cost in Canada is around $3 billion and, according to the last issue of the Canada Year Book, the national income is around $12 billion, making a shortage of production to the extent of about one-third. That is, the ratio of cost of our government to production is considerably greater than the ratio of cost of government to production in the United States.

I suggest it should be the primary duty of the government to endeavour to increase the net production of Canada, in order to bring our economy into line. I shall speak about the tariff in a moment or so, but before doing so I should like to quote from an article which came to my hand only a few moments ago. This article which appears in the *Quarterly Review* is written by Dr. R. F. Rattray, Ph.D. It deals with the economic position of Great Britain, and with British monetary losses. It states:

> British monetary losses during the last war amounted to £7,500,000,000 out of a total national wealth of £30,000,000,000 i.e., 25 per cent. The national debt is now £24,000,000,000. In 1945, £2,800,000,000 was added to it, £60 per head of population. The total is over £460 per person.
>
> The sterling balances, a euphemism for the money we owe to India, Egypt and Palestine for defending them, amount to £3,750,000,000. The American and Canadian loans amount to £1,400,000,000. Great Britain who entered the war as a great creditor nation, emerged from it owing the external world a debt three times as great as the reparations that it was declared impossible for Germany to pay after the war of 1914-18.

I put those figures on record because I believe they show that we must be realists in respect of our sterling balances. With a situation like that I do not see how we can possibly expect to receive great sums of convertible sterling in anything like the near future for the goods we sell to the United Kingdom. If these figures are correct they show that not only would we be impoverishing United Kingdom small balances, but, by forcing convertibility, we would be drawing so heavily upon the United States loan to the United Kingdom that we would be merely receiving payments from England of moneys she had borrowed from the United States. In other words we would be receiving second-hand, as it were, capital from the United States she has lent to Great Britain. I do not know how long that situation can carry on. It seems somewhat in the realm of fantasy that we may be forced to act in this way.

This brings me to the terms of the United States loan to Great Britain, and to what I shall call the strait-jacket clause in that loan, by which the United Kingdom is unable to transfer her purchases from the United States to other countries, under the terms of that loan. That is, if the United Kingdom is buying citrus fruits from the United States she cannot switch and buy the same citrus fruits from Palestine of North Africa, which are in the sterling bloc. That has forced the United Kingdom definitely to curtail her purchases in Canada, and will force her to do so even more in the future. The recent statement with regard to lumber is the case in point.

That brings me to the point which I wish to draw to the attention of the committee, the wisdom of placing the dollar on a par with the United States dollar last year. I feel that this has acted as a brake on our trade and has had the effect of forcing the United Kingdom to endeavour to purchase elsewhere than in Canada. Instead of assisting our external balances of trade it has had the very opposite effect. We see on the free market a discrepancy at the present time running as high as eight and a half per cent as between the value of the Canadian dollar and the value of the United States dollar. We see also a growing adverse balance of trade in Canada's international trading position.

The government may have some wizards who can overcome that situation. If so, I should like very much to know how it can be done. As far as I can see there are only three courses open to the government at the present time. The first is one which I think the government would be loath to embark on, that is, the imposition of extremely heavy and almost impossible tariffs on American goods coming into Canada. It would be difficult for them to do that because most United States goods coming here are essential for our very life. Commodities like coal and oil are needed to supply our motive power and our heat and it is necessary to have such imports. Another thing they could do is to devalue the Canadian dollar. It would be a brave man who would say to what extent devaluation would have to take place now in order to check the trend. That is the second possibility. The third possibility is that they may have to reimpose any of the controls on trading and exchange which were in existence during the war. Any one of those three would be a difficult and probably an unfortunate step to have to take in what we hope is the beginning of a more free economy.

Great stress has been placed upon the workings of the international monetary fund. As far as one can see this international monetary fund is a fund into which very largely the United States has placed credits, either in gold or in her own hard currency, and in which the United Kingdom has placed credits up to the statutory amounts required, and into which other countries have made proportional payments. However, what apparently has taken place is that most of the payments into the international monetary

fund have been made and lent by the United States government. The monetary fund has been used and apparently will be used as a form of relief agency. Money is being borrowed from it for the rehabilitation of devastated countries. Whether that was the intention of the framers of the fund, I do not know, but it seems to me that in view of the growing and increasing problems of Europe the existing credit of the fund will shortly be exhausted. As the United States puts up most of the money it is likely that they will find it politically impossible or at least difficult to have any congress of the United States continue to put up the money for this fund.

That was the objection raised by the director, Doctor Gutt and Professor Viner in a symposium on the fund written some months ago. This leaves the Canadian economy in an extremely vulnerable position. We have a situation in Canada which cannot be considered as anything but extremely serious. We have a relation of the cost of government and the income of Canada out of balance with that of the United States and very much out of balance with that which existed before the war. In other words, we have not fostered our production as much as we should and we are running behind in the ratio of production to gross cost of government, probably to the extent of five billion dollars a year.

In this drive for production the government in my opinion has dealt a serious blow to one of the great instruments of production, namely, the mining industry and particularly the gold mining industry, in their parity action. I want to say here, however, very definitely to the minister that any suggestion of bonusing the mining industry world be met with strenuous objection by that industry. The people in the mining industry feel that gold must be allowed to sell for what it is worth. They do not want and they would resent the suggestion of any form of bonus. The news got around that the government had some intention of bonusing gold to the extent of $42 per ounce. I am pleased to know that there is absolutely no foundation for that statement. It would be a retrogressive step of the worst type. The mining industry does not want to be bonused for its product. What it does want, and I say this to the minister with the utmost sincerity and candour, is this; it wants to be able to get the world price for what it produces. The argument put up by the government is that it is already getting the world price of $35 United States currency. The second argument is that what is now called the grey market or the free market is so small that it would not be able to absorb the production of the Canadian industry. The government states that, but when the industry suggests that it be allowed to find out what it can get for this gold—and we have a market outside of the United States, a big market of $35 an ounce, which is big enough to absorb the entire output of the Canadian gold industry; this market would result in the Canadian gold industry receiving considerably more than $35 an ounce for its product, gold—the government says that that would be an export of capital.

Mr. ABBOTT: It has never said that.

Mr. ADAMSON: I understood that was the argument. If it has not said that, so much the better. The mining industry suggested that it would accept payment in any currency the government wished to have; in other words it would accept payment in United States dollars. A very recent case is that of the American Smelting and Refining Company. The American Smelting and Refining Company now purchases concentrates from several of the British Columbia mines, refines the concentrates, produces gold bullion and sells that gold bullion in the open market at a price considerably higher than the $35 statutory price in the United States. The last sales reported to me this morning were considerably more than the prices received before the parity action was taken; that is the price of $38.50. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the government has been shortsighted in not allowing this industry to endeavour to receive the world price for its product. If the government does not consider that it is an export of capital to export gold for United States dollars I suggest that in Canada we should be allowed to establish a free bullion market so that the product of the mines could be sold in the same way as any other commodity. We are a gold producing nation. We need gold in the worst way; we need United States dollars in the worst way. It is my opinion that to establish a free market for gold would increase tremendously the output of gold bullion. At the present time it is shrinking considerably. Wages and costs are going up and probably will continue to go up in the present inflationary movement.

This of course, adds to the mines difficulties. I have already mentioned the increase in wages in the International Nickel Company. That increase amounted to 13½ cents an hour, making in all 23½ cents an hour in a little more than twelve months. That 23½ cents an hour is

bound to have a repercussion on the gold industry. Men are only human. If they can get 13½ cents an hour more working for a nickel company, unless they are tied down to the gold camps with families and houses, they will probably be moving to the Sudbury district. This will also probably have an effect on the other base metal producers, but the serious effect will be on the gold producers because the gold producers cannot get the world market for their product. Copper, lead, zinc, the three major base metals, aluminum and even nickel, although nickel has been wisely kept at a constant price for many years, are subject to world prices; whereas under the present situation gold, and gold alone, is arbitrarily kept at a price which at least the industry and much informed opinion believe to be considerably below the world market price.

In summing up, there are three things about the situation which appear to be extremely serious at the present time. The first is our adverse over-all balance of trade. The second is the necessity for increasing Canadian production so that we bring our production in line with our increased cost of government. The third is that at the present time an injury is being done to the whole gold mining industry, an industry which helped this country out during the days of the depression and during the critical days of the war when the empire was alone against the hordes of nazi Germany. Gold was a sheet anchor which helped us at that time. If this industry is allowed to languish it is not easy to recover.

I want to point out just one thing. I have stated the fact many times that 80 per cent of our gold production comes from mines discovered over a quarter of a century ago. But there is one thing I want to point out to the committee, and that is the Australian experience, where through an overzealous period of socialization they put such a crimp in the gold mining industry that for a period of over thirty years not one single new mine has been brought into production in that country. I mention that, Mr. Chairman, to show you that the gold mining industry is one that it is easy to kill.

I would not have spoken about speculation, but as I shall be met with the charge that speculation — mining speculation — on the markets of Montreal and Toronto is in some way considered an evil, I wish to point out again to the committee that speculation, mining speculation and even speculation by people who do not know the difference between a stope and a winze, is a necessary part of mining, and much necessary money is

[Mr. Adamson.]

speculative money. It must be speculative money, the only thing that any government should do is to make sure that the man who speculates gets the facts. Mining is an extremely hazardous and extremely speculative business, as its history in Canada shows. At the present rate, if we carry on as we are doing, the industry is likely to be destroyed in the comparatively near future. It will certainly stop the industry from doing any expansion, and I speak particularly of the gold industry, which is the major metal industry in Canada today, but it applies to the industry as a whole. It will certainly do that. Unless steps are taken to overcome our very serious exchange problem we shall be faced with the inability to meet our current payments abroad.

I would ask the government to reconsider their policy with regard to the mining industry and to reconsider their fiscal policy with regard to exchange. They may not be able to do anything about the latter because there may be an agreement with the international monetary fund or an agreement with the United States government. I submit, however, that to continue to have these monthly adverse balances of trade, to continue to have the mining industry going from one period of recession to another, means that it will not be long before it is impossible to meet our international balances of trade.

Mr. ABBOTT: The hon. member has referred to the so-called free market in gold. I have given before the reasons why we do not consider that Canadians should be permitted to export gold and sell it in these so-called free markets, and the reason of course is that we want to live up to our international obligations in that respect.

I would recall, first, that exports of gold from Canada have been controlled and licensed by the Minister of Finance under the gold export act of 1932, and this is not therefore a part of our wartime controls or a recent development. Under that legislation of 1932 it has been our policy in general to permit exports for sale in the normal monetary markets. In recent years, when premiums above that price existed in certain overseas markets, we have not granted licences for exports to those markets, for reasons I explained to the house before, and with which I believe those concerned are familiar.

It has also been our policy to grant licences for the export of certain gold-bearing concentrates or ores to the United States for smelting or refining, in those cases where proper facilities for economic smelting or refinement were not available in Canada, and that

applies to British Columbia. My hon. friend referred to concentrates or ores shipped to the American Smelting and Refining Company.

There are a few cases in which ores or concentrates of that kind contain arsenic. In the past the gold in these materials was paid for by the smelters or refiners in the United States on the basis of the standard price. According to press reports to which my hon. friend has referred, the American Smelting and Refining Company, which is engaged in this business, has recently announced its intention to market at premium prices the gold it produces from imported concentrates and ores, and has offered to pay ninety per cent of the premium to Canadian firms shipping gold-bearing material to them. In the past we have had no reason to concern ourselves with Canadian gold refined in the United States or being reexported from there at premium prices and therefore did not concern ourselves with its ultimate destination. I understand that the practice followed by the United States government is to require their own domestic producers to sell gold at the standard price but to place no restrictions on the reexport of foreign gold brought to the United States for refining. The United States government apparently feels as we do, that it is not wise to encourage international sales of gold at premium prices at this difficult and critical time. That was made quite evident in their official statement on June 24 endorsing the statement issued by the international monetary fund, in which the fund recommended to its members that they take effective action to prevent such transactions.

I presume the members of the committee have seen the statement on international gold transactions issued by the fund which was published by the United States government, but for those who may not have seen it I should like to read it:

> The international monetary fund has given consideration to the international gold transactions at prices substantially above monetary parity which have been taking place in various areas of the world. Because of the importance of this matter the fund has prepared this statement of its views.
>
> A primary purpose of the fund is world exchange stability and it is the considered opinion of the fund that exchange stability may be undermined by continued and increasing external purchases and sales of gold at prices which directly or indirectly produce exchange transactions at depreciated rates. From information at its disposal, the fund believes that unless discouraged this practice is likely to become extensive, which would fundamentally disturb the exchange relationships among the members of the fund. Moreover, these transactions involve a loss to monetary reserves, since much of the gold goes into private hoards rather than into central holdings. For these reasons, the fund strongly deprecates international transactions in gold at premium prices and recommends that all of its members take effective action to prevent such transactions in gold with other countries or with the nationals of other countries.
>
> It is realized that some of these transactions are being recognized by or through non-member countries or their nationals. The fund recommends that members make any representations which, in their judgment, are warranted by the circumstances to the governments of non-member countries to join with them in eliminating this source of exchange instability.
>
> The fund has not overlooked the problems arising in connection with domestic transactions in gold at prices above parity. The conclusion was reached that the fund would not object at this time to such transactions unless they have the effect of establishing new rates of exchange or undermining existing rates of other members, or unless they result in a significant weakening of the international financial position of a member which might affect its utilization of the fund's resources.
>
> The fund has requested its members to take action as promptly as possible to put into effect the recommendations contained in this statement.

That is the end of the statement. It was endorsed by the United States government on June 24. That is the reason why we believe it is in conformity with international obligations and in the public interest to prohibit exports of gold to this so-called free market.

The only other point which I should touch upon now is my hon. friend's reference to the devaluation of the Canadian dollar. I have dealt with this at some length on other occasions and I do not propose to repeat what I said then, but I would give the committee an objective outside opinion as to the effect of that action. It appears in a letter issued by the economics department of the Bankers Trust Company, New York, on June 13, 1947. It is entitled "The Canadian Exchange Situation." I will read only this one paragraph from the report:

> On balance, the rise in the official Canadian exchange rate does not appear to have been responsible to any significant extent for the country's present exchange difficulties. Thus devaluation of the Canadian dollar, reversing the upward move of last year, would probably do more harm than good. It would bring little relief to Canada's present United States dollar scarcity and would not remedy the basic cause of the deficiency. On the other hand, the repeated manipulation of the official Canadian exchange parity would most likely have repercussions upon the long-term attractiveness of Canada for the investment of capital and would certainly harm the revival of orderly international monetary relations in which Canada herself is critically interested.

I have only one other comment to make. I have listened with interest to my hon. friend's obesrvations on our adverse balance

of payments. I would point out what he, of course, already knows, namely, that the figures which he has given relate solely to our trading balance. They do not take into account invisible items; they do not take into account convertible exchange received from other countries; and they do not take into account gold received from other countries.

Mr. ADAMSON: I have just one observation to make in view of what the minister has said. In view of the present situation it appears that the parity rates or the official rates stated by the international monetary fund are proving, in terms of gold, to be a great deal too high.

Mr. QUELCH: Whilst I realize that it is not popular to speak at any length at a time like this, I feel obliged to refer briefly to the serious international monetary situation, because I believe that it is being and has been aggravated by the financial policies of the western democracies. In this house attempts have been made by many people to show that we in this group are opposed to international trade and international cooperation. I doubt very much if there is any group in this house who believe to a greater extent in international cooperation than do the members of this group, but we believe that international cooperation must be on a basis of mutual advantage to all concerned and not on the basis of exploitation of the weaker nations by the larger creditor ones.

There has been a good deal of discussion about the united nations organization building for peace. I think we should realize that it is hopeless to try to build a temple of peace upon a foundation of economic war. When the minister spoke in the budget debate, he stated that our large adverse balance of trade with the United States was to a considerable extent the product of Canadian prosperity. Personally I would say it would be more realistic to say that it is the inevitable consequence of the international policies we have been pursuing and adopting since the war. For example, the scarcity of United States dollars existed prior to the war. During the war it was quite evident that this situation would exist after the war, even in an exaggerated state. But we took no steps to remove the cause of this deficiency. On the contrary we aggravated it and today we are reaping the consequences in a state of world financial chaos. I would say that the situation is very largely due to the failure of the western democracies to assume their full responsibility for the financial obligations arising out of the war, then to set their own house in order and be in a position to balance their own international payments.

In the past the great industrial nations have failed to provide their people with a purchasing power sufficient to maintain effective demand against their own production. Consequently these nations have invariably depended upon the export market to provide greater employment within their own borders. In other words, they have attemped to dump their unemployment problem on the doorstep of other nations. There is no doubt that the United States of America, when they put forward the Bretton Woods agreement, had that purpose in mind. I would say that was very largely the policy of the United States between the two wars. When I refer to the United States I want to make it clear that I am not in any way attacking the people of the United States. I have a high appreciation of those people. When I attack the international policy of the United States government I am no more attacking the people of the United States than I am attacking the Canadian people when I attack the foreign policy of the Canadian government. I do not think the people of the United States are responsible for their foreign policy, and certainly the Canadian people are not responsible for the foreign policy of this government. In many ways that policy is in spite of the people.

The international financial policy of the United States caused the great depression by drawing away the gold basis of other nations' currencies, resulting in a general restriction of credit; and the drastic trade restrictions and barter agreements were the result of that depression rather than the cause of it. I mention that fact because time and again we have had it pointed out by the Minister of Finance that we did not want the same kind of restrictions of trade that caused the depression. Those restrictions came into being after the depression and were the result of the depression, not the cause of it. They were as a result, as I say, of the gold basis being withdrawn from the nations' currencies, thereby forcing them to adopt a policy of currency and credit restriction. Today, unfortunately, instead of appreciating that situation and trying to take steps to force the creditor nations to carry out their responsibilities, we are continually and progressively stripping the weaker nations of their defences.

On March 8, 1944, the committee on reconstruction and reestablishment discussed the question of international currency plans and, generally speaking, what the post-war financial

position would be. At that time we had as a witness Doctor W. C. Clark. I wish to quote briefly from the record of that time. I will quote first from a statement I made and then the reply of Doctor Clark; this is at page 36:

—if we are tying ourselves up to a proposal in order to satisfy to a large extent the demands of the United States and such a proposal in the future brings about international friction, we are not going to help the situation very much. Today we recognize our responsibility in regard to providing goods to other nations in war time, and look upon it as a moral obligation. Doctor Clark points out that after the war there will be certain nations that will be unable to purchase imports; they will have neither foreign exchange nor exports with which to secure foreign exchange. That is true, and it seems to me that after the war for a number of years the same moral obligation that exists today to provide goods under the mutual aid or lease-lend schemes, goods which probably should be in the form of a gift, should exist for a number of years after the war in order to rehabilitate those countries that have been devastated as the result of the war. Fortunately we are in a geographical position where we are not suffering from that condition, but it is our moral obligation to help to restore the damage in these devastated countries just as much as it is to help win the war. I think that provision should be recognized and that instead of making loans we should make gifts of the necessary goods, and when those nations have become rehabilitated and have their industries restored and are able to produce, in a majority of cases those nations will be anxious to export goods in payment for their imports. So I think there is a clear-cut line there. First of all it is a question of rehabilitating nations and putting them on their feet so that they will be in a position to pay for imports with exports, and once that is accomplished I think our whole endeavour must be to devise a scheme whereby nations will be able to pay for their imports with exports.

Then I would like to quote from Doctor Clark's reply to that statement:

In the first part of his remarks, Mr. Quelch proposed a very idealistic solution of some of the early postwar-year problems. In other words, he suggested the continuation of mutual aid or of gifts to other countries which could not pay for their necessary imports.

Mr. Quelch: Due to war devastation.

The Witness: I take it he means very much more in that connection than is implied by the UNRRA recommendations. That, as I say, is a fairly idealistic solution. If he could get that solution accepted by most of the countries of the world I would wish him a lot of success. I think, however, that you will find that even in wartime there is a considerable criticism of mutual aid to allied nations for assistance in the conduct of the war, and I would be rather fearful that it would be much more difficult to get acceptance of that solution by a great many countries of the world in the postwar period when the fervour of patriotism is not running so high amongst the peoples of the united nations.

You will notice, Mr. Chairman, that Doctor Clark referred to my proposals as being idealistic. In view of the events which have occurred since that time I think today people will agree that the proposals I put forward then were essentially realistic, because those are the very things that are being talked about as being necessary in order to restore confidence throughout the world. At that time Doctor Clark referred to UNRRA; but we must remember that initially UNRRA was regarded as a programme not merely of relief but of rehabilitation. Then it was amended under resolution 12 to become a straight relief project. I emphasized then that just giving people relief and continuing to keep them on relief would not permit them to get into the position where they could reconstruct their factories, rebuild their plant and rapidly get on their feet so they would be able to produce the goods needed to pay for the imports they would bring into the country. As I say, that was the discussion we had in 1944, and I repeat that I believe the stand took then, instead of being looked upon now as idealistic, must be regarded as the only realistic one. A statement in the *Financial Post* of May 24, 1947, fully substantiates that claim. On the front page we find an article written by Kenneth R. Wilson, which reads:

Great Britain has served notice that she foresees imminent economic catastrophe and a collapse of world trade. Basis of such a forecast is her belief that the world is running out of dollars.

As reported to me recently in Britain and indicated directly to high government authorities in Ottawa within recent weeks, British experts see Europe, Canada and herself directly involved in this expected breakdown.

If not averted, the pattern suggests world economic gloom and/or doom. It spells as well a breakdown of the multilateral system of trade and exchange on which Canada so largely depends. Such prognostications point essentially to the great economic question mark of our age: Will United States accept the responsibility of its post-war creditor position and match its vast productive surpluses with corresponding imports, loans or free gifts? All the world presently needs these surpluses but is going broke trying to buy them. Even Dean Acheson, retiring U.S. under secretary of state, said a few days ago that hope for world recovery lay in some new form of peace-time lend-lease by which United States could give away about $5 billions of goods annually.

Then he goes on to say:

Looking back on what has happened since war's end, and especially in the last six months, many well-informed people in Britain now believe the attempt towards multilateral trading and exchange has already broken down. They talk pessimistically about the world bank and the world fund as being "too little and too

late." They make the same comment about deliberations at Geneva. They see the hair-trigger recovery time table, required by terms of the U.S. dollar loan, as already hopeless upset by rising prices, slowness of recovery in Europe and the plague of poor crops and other "acts of God."

During the Bretton Woods debate we pointed out the futility of relying upon the Bretton Woods agreement to bring about the reconstruction of the devastated areas of the world. Unfortunately the supporters of the Bretton Woods agreement refused to face that situation realistically. I emphasize the fact that if attempts were made to enforce Bretton Woods and the ancillary agreements it was bound to stir up international friction. Well, since that time the situation has become greatly aggravated; and it is going to be far harder to deal with the situation now than if we had dealt with it in a realistic way immediately after the end of hostilities. Now, for instance, we have before us the Marshall plan. No one knows exactly what the Marshall plan stands for. When the estimates of the Department of External Affairs were before the house we tried to get the minister to tell us just what that plan was, and he implied that there really was no plan, though he also suggested that he had more information available than he was able to disclose. One thing is certain, however; the Marshall plan does mean some form of mutual aid or lease-lend or gifts to the stricken areas of Europe. Apparently today it is realized that the only way to bring about the recovery of the European countries is by some means of that kind.

I would say there is a real, sound justification for that stand. It may be remembered that during the war the allies pooled their resources for common use against the enemy. If every nation had cut down its standard of living to the bare necessities of life and made the rest of its resources available for war, then there should have been no question of debt as between the allies. But it may be remembered that before the United States came into the war Britain paid that country six billion dollars in cash for ships, munitions and aircraft. Yet those ships, aircraft and so on were being used to defeat the enemy just as much as the ships and aeroplanes that were produced later on. One may well ask what would have been the consequence to the allies if Britain had waited for a Pearl Harbor before coming into the war. Yet those early expenditures by Britain had to be paid by herself, and were not put into the common pool.

Another thing that greatly aggravated the situation was that immediately after the day of victory the United States cancelled lend-lease; but unfortunately the costs of war do not end with the day of victory. The costs of war continue for many months and, in some cases years, after victory has been accomplished. So it was undoubtedly the obligation of the western democracies to absorb their full share of that cost, namely the cost of rehabilitating the devastated areas of the world.

That should have been clear in 1944. But when a person made that suggestion in 1944 he was branded as idealistic. I believe however it is recognized today that the suggestions we made in 1944 were most realistic. What happened instead of that? The United States made the price of further help first of all the acceptance of the Bretton Woods agreement, the reduction of the British preference and the policy of non-discrimination in trade. We in Canada supported the United States in that policy. Actually all we have done by that policy is to help develop the sphere of Soviet influence in Europe, because the people of Europe have no love for a reactionary laissez faire policy of capitalism. And as they could not get the help they believed they should get, naturally they turned more and more to the Soviet union. Now we find Great Britain indulging in discussions with the U.S.S.R. in the matter of a trade agreement.

I should like to say a few words about the Bretton Woods agreement and the United States charter for the expansion of world trade and employment. Both of these, it will be remembered, were sponsored by the United States, which country apparently was aspiring to a place of world leadership. When any nation aspires to the position of world leadership it is necessary to investigate its record in matters of that kind.

I should like first to refer to discussions which took place in the committee on banking and commerce with respect to Bill 238, when we had before us as a witness Mr. Rasminsky. I quote this from the proceedings at page 29 where Mr. Rasminsky states:

I take it Mr. Quelch will say that the United Kingdom behaved as a good creditor should, that she had no tariffs and she was willing to accept imports in exchange. The whole point that is being made in this connection is not that a surplus of exports is wrong, it is not the foreign lending that is wrong; the point being made is that the United States can be counted upon to act as a bad creditor.

Mr. Quelch: As in the past.

The Witness: That is the point really that we have come to.

Mr. Quelch: I say, on her past record.

The Witness: You say that the United States on her past record can be counted upon to act as a bad creditor. I would reply to that that

on the basis of the experience before the war there is reason for misgiving regarding the willingness or the ability of the United States to carry out the type of economic policy appropriate to her creditor position.

And then, half way down the next page:

Now, I agree that on the past record there is reason for anxiety, there is reason for some pre-occupation. This fund, these arrangements through the breathing space they provide tend to relieve that anxiety a bit, because as I said this afternoon they provide some slack in the ties between the Canadian economy and outside economies. Now, on the second point, the low tariff point, I have here a paper that was tabled in the house today, proposals for the expansion of world trade and employment, communicated by the United States government, which I think all of the members have had an opportunity of reading. The paper will indicate a remarkable initiative in the direction of tariff reduction. I am not prepared to defend or even discuss the details of this proposal. I do not know whether they are adequate or not. All that I am arguing, and I think it is self-evident, is that they do indicate an awareness on the part of the United States of her responsibility as a great creditor nation for taking the lead towards tariff reductions.

Those who defended the Bretton Woods agreement pointed out we should remember that an international trade agreement would be drawn up shortly. Today that conference is taking place at Geneva. Yet strangely enough, when these nations got together to try to reach an agreement on some very important issues, at the very time it is necessary to do everything in the power of those nations to prove their sincerity, what do we find the United States doing? At the very time they are talking about reducing tariffs the United States announce their intention to increase their tariff on wool. I say that is not the way to create confidence. If in order to get a reduction in the British preference, and if in order to get other nations to agree to a policy of non-discrimination the United States came to that conference with a promise of reducing tariffs, then I say they have taken a poor way of proving their sincerity by, at that very time, raising tariffs on wool.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Or proving their ability.

Mr. QUELCH: And now, two years after the war, what has the fund done? We were told the fund would create a breathing spell. Is the fund waiting until the patient ceases to breathe? Surely if it is to provide a breathing spell it should be in operation and should be taking care of that great scarcity of dollars which exists today. But I would suggest to the minister that if the total fund of United States dollars were made available today it would be insufficient to deal with the situation.

I quote from the *Financial Post* to show what that situation is:

Currently, the problem is even more alarming than Dean Acheson pointed out. For in the first quarter of 1947, United States exports totalled close to $3·6 billions against only $2·6 billions in the same quarter a year ago. At the same time her imports remained stationary at $1·4 billions. This means a "gap" for these three months alone of $2·2 billions. It suggests a United States trade "deficit" for 1947 of close to $10 billions if this trend continues.

I believe the minister would agree that that situation would overtax the resources of the international monetary fund. When I have finished I would ask the minister to show just what that fund has done in an attempt to take care of this situation. Our main criticism is that the Bretton Woods agreement placed the responsibility for balancing trade upon the debtor nations, and placed little or no obligation upon the creditor nations. Thereby it has forced the smaller nations further into debt.

The weaker nations previously had power to protect their balance of payments by trade restrictions. These of course under the Bretton Woods agreement have been greatly modified, and will be still further modified if the United States charter for the expansion of world trade becomes a reality.

At that time we were told that the international trade conference would take care of the situation. I should like to deal with that matter for a few moments to show that actually it will only aggravate it. I understand the hard core of this agreement is what is known as non-discrimination between Great Britain, the United States and all other member nations. Under the financial agreement between Great Britain and the United States there was a policy of non-discrimination, but this international trade agreement will be one of non-discrimination between all nations participating in the agreement.

I have dealt with that policy in the house repeatedly, and at this point I should like to quote the explanation given by the *Financial Post* of what that policy really means, just to show what I would describe as the ridiculous situation into which any nation is placed if it tries to live up to that policy.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The Bretton Woods agreement?

Mr. QUELCH: No, the international trade organization.

Mr. BLACKMORE: With the Bretton Woods agreement.

Mr. QUELCH: Yes, but I am going to refer to the United States charter for the international trade organization. The *Financial Post* of May 24 states this:

Non-discrimination is really the "trade" side of the sterling convertibility coin. By terms of the U.S. loan, it was imposed as at December 31, 1946. It means that any alteration in terms of trade as between Britain and United States must be applied indiscriminately to other countries.

Thus Britain may not impose any barrier against the import say of American tobacco, without a corresponding bar being imposed against Rhodesia or a "soft" currency source.

As well, there must be no "discrimination" in respect of trade with Canada. This condition was imposed because under terms of the United States loan no creditor was to be given more favourable terms than those of the United States-United Kingdom agreement. It means that if Britain were to impose a quota against purchases of Canadian bacon, because of inability to pay for it in Canadian dollars, she would have to put a like barrier against Danish bacon, even though she might well be able to afford this "soft" currency product.

I should like to give an example of how that is working out in Great Britain today, and I quote from the British *Hansard* as follows:

Mr. Law (Kensington, S., Un) asked the minister of food if he is aware that United States asparagus has been on sale in the shops during the past fortnight when abundant supplies will shortly be available from France and this country; and if he will take the necessary steps to prevent the import of such unnecessary luxuries which are using up our rapidly diminishing United States loan.

Mr. Strachey: I am aware of this, but the quantity imported from the United States is extremely small—it amounts to under £200 worth up to 19th April which is the latest date I have. As the home supplies and those from the continent increase I doubt whether it will pay to bring any asparagus across the Atlantic. Where import restrictions are concerned, as my right hon. friend the chancellor of the exchequer told the hon. member for Canterbury (Mr. Baker White) on 6th May, we must respect article 9 of the Anglo-American loan agreement.

There you have a situation where Britain can obtain asparagus from France and apparently has plenty of French exchange, but in fact it is being imported from the United States and valuable United States dollars are being used. They are not in position to restrict the import of those luxuries because under the agreement if they restrict the import of luxuries from the United States they must impose similar limitations upon imports from France.

I think we in Canada are in a similar position. We are running behind with our trade with the United States. I think the minister will admit that we could do without many of the things we are importing from the United States. What is strange to me is that Progressive Conservative after Progressive Conservative gets up in this house and suggests to the minister that we should impose restrictions on certain imports from the United States. I think the question of canned vegetables came up. They should have known very well that when they agreed to the Bretton Woods agreement they were supporting action against trade restrictions because you can only place restrictions against the imports of a country provided the currency of that country is declared scarce within the fund. Today United States dollars have not been declared scarce within the fund although they are scarce in Canada and in Europe. Therefore, under the terms of the agreement we have no right to place restrictions against those imports.

Furthermore, if the organization which is being formed at Geneva comes into effect and if the section of the charter dealing with non-discrimination comes into effect we will be under a further obligation to place no restriction upon the imports of any country unless we place similar restrictions against those of another country. Is it logical or is it reasonable that we in Canada should be placed in the position where we cannot reduce imports from the United States unless we reduce them to a similar degree from other countries as well? Surely we should have that right. We should be able to buy more imports of a particular country if we want to, and less from other countries. However, under this agreement, if we restrict the imports from one country we have to place a similar restriction upon imports from all other countries.

When we have an adverse balance of trade with any country we should have and we must have the right to curtail imports from that country in order to bring about a proper balance of trade. I think the minister will agree that we could do with less canned vegetables from the United States. We do not need them. I think the time has come when restrictions should be placed upon the importation of some of these Buick cars that are coming into the country. However, the minister knows very well that if we did that that it would be a violation of the Bretton Woods agreement on the one hand, and it certainly would be a violation of the charter of the international trade organization, although I admit that we have not agreed to that as yet.

I should like the minister to explain just what is the policy of Canada with regard to that non-discrimination clause. I hope that

some day we are not going to have an agreement brought up in this house which would tie us to that non-discrimination clause. I should like to point out the serious situation which has been created in Great Britain by these financial agreements. First, I should like to quote from the *Financial Post* of May 24, 1947, which has the following to say about Great Britain:

Thus it is now clear that the government permitted heavy drawings on coal reserves rather than face the unknown fact that output was declining. In part, this led up to the coal crisis of last February—a crisis estimated officially to have already cost the country $800 millions in export trade in 1947.

Another reason given for the especially favourable showing in 1946 is the abnormally high exports of machinery and equipment in that year. It is now recognized that some, at least, of this equipment, should have been kept at home for rehabilitation of the domestic economy.

There you see the situation where Great Britain, trying to live up to the financial agreements she has signed with the United States, draws on reserves as she never should have done, ships large quantities of machinery out of the country that were needed for internal use, as well as large quantities of fuel which were needed as reserves. When the severe winter came last year she was out of coal and had to shut down many factories, thereby actually reducing her exports by $800,000,000. All this was the direct result of the financial agreements that she had signed with the United States under which she agreed to make her currency convertible by July 1947. I should like to quote again from the British *Hansard* to show how these agreements have actually aggravated the situation instead of helping it. I quote from the British *Hansard* of April 15, 1947, Viscount Hinchinbrooke speaking as follows:

We despatch overseas agricultural machinery and wreck our farming programme. We send overseas machine tools and interfere with industrial recovery. We send overseas locomotives and delay the travelling public. We send overseas cars and vans, and harass the professional man and the distributive trades. We send overseas household goods and clothes, and keep the housewives in a permanently exhausted state.

We despatch those things overseas in the interests of a strict overseas trade balance and against all the natural laws of war and victory.

If the stand we took in 1944 had been adopted, instead of talking now about the Marshall plan we would have urged upon the United States in 1945 a programme of mutual aid and lend-lease instead of the Bretton Woods agreement in order to try to bring about the rehabilitation of Europe. Then the tragic situation would not have developed as it has developed in England and elsewhere throughout Europe, a situation which has been driving many of the states in Europe into the arms of the Soviet union. We now find the British trying to make trade agreements with the U.S.S.R.

I have one other point I should like to bring up which arises out of a statement made by the hon. member for York West. I am not speaking in an offensive way when I say that I have always taken the stand that the people who supported the Bretton Woods agreement were either rogues or dupes. Some people say that "dupes" should be spelled with an "o" instead of a "u". As I say, I am not trying to be offensive. I can understand the attitude of the reactionary elements who looked upon the Bretton Woods agreement as a device to bring into full operation the gold standard. I can understand that attitude. They believe in the gold standard. Then unquestionably they would look upon the Bretton Woods agreement as the first step in that direction. I can also understand the attitude of the communists. There was nobody more enthusiastic in this country about the Bretton Woods agreement than the communists, and that applies to every other country outside of Russia. In every country outside of Russia the communists were emphasizing the benefits of Bretton Woods agreement. I can understand that because they were taking the stand that if the capitalist nations were fools enough to cut their own throats they were ready to help them. They looked upon the Bretton Woods agreement as a menace to the capitalistic system. It is to be noted that Russia refused to come in under the Bretton Woods agreement in spite of the fact that the communists in all other countries were urging their governments to become a party to it.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Good strategy.

Mr. QUELCH: We heard a good deal about gold from the hon. member for York West. I hold in my hand a release from the British United Press of June 6 which states:

Rumours that the United States will boost the price of gold to $40 or $50 per ounce can be discounted thoroughly, the *American Banker*, daily banking newspaper, says in an editorial.

"Gold," the editorial insisted, "is going to stay at $35 an ounce for a long, long time. Prices equivalent to $60-$85 an ounce paid in Indian and Cairo bazaars are as far out of line as cigarettes selling in black markets at as much as $1 each."

I hope that article is right. I do not doubt it, as I do not think there is any more justification for raising the price of gold beyond the economic price than there would be in say raising the price of wheat to $5 a bushel in

order to expand its production. Gold is not worth any more than $35 an ounce, therefore why should the price be raised? I remember that during the Bretton Woods agreement debate many members on the government side emphasized that is had nothing to do with the gold standard.

Mr. BLACKMORE: And the Conservatives too.

Mr. QUELCH: It must be remembered that in the committee Mr. Rasminsky remarked that it was a form of gold standard. He was far more honest than some hon. members in the house were prepared to be. He admitted at the time that it was a form of the gold standard. I do not doubt for one moment that the reason some of the Progressive Conservatives supported it was that it was very definitely looked upon as a form of gold standard. I have heard the statement—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must remind the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. QUELCH: May I just quote—

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall rise and therefore give the hon. member the right to continue.

Mr. QUELCH: May I quote this press report:

Gold to be Restored as Monetary Unit N.Y. Banker Predicts

Montreux, Switzerland, June 6—(BUP)—W. Randolph Burgess, prominent New York City commercial banker and former president of the American Bankers' Association, predicted indirectly here today that gold will be restored to its former status as a monetary unit. He set no date, however.

In a speech before the 11th congress of the international chamber of commerce, the vice-chairman of the National City Bank of New York said that "the managed gold standard was for many years an effective instrument of central bank policy. Gold has a human appeal and power which some of our modern economists have completely failed to understand. This extraordinary value of gold has been recognized in the statutes of the international monetary fund.

"The exile of gold in the 30's did not and will not endure," he said.

I understand that when he makes that statement he has in mind gold coming back into operation, perhaps through the back door, through the international monetary fund. I should like to ask the minister a couple of questions. Since the Bretton Woods agreement was supposed to provide a breathing space after the war for nations to readjust their payments, will the minister outline the activities of the international monetary fund to provide that breathing space? I have the reports which I have read through carefully, but I cannot find any activities at all. Surely they are not going to wait until the patient is dead. I know the bank of reconstruction and development has made a loan to France. I am referring to the fund. What are they doing to help?

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend has read the report. I understand that two countries in particular, France and Holland, have already made use of the facilities of the fund.

Mr. QUELCH: They have made use of the international bank.

Mr. ABBOTT: No, of the fund.

Mr. QUELCH: There is no sign of it in the report.

Mr. ABBOTT: They have made use of the fund.

Mr. QUELCH: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. ABBOTT: France has used the bank as well. France has used both institutions; Holland has used the fund.

Mr. QUELCH: Has the minister a copy of the report? Can he show in the report that they have used the fund? I have read the report through and I could not find any sign of it.

Mr. ABBOTT: They have used it since the report was brought out. My hon. friend will recall that the fund actually came into operation about March 1, was it not? These transactions to which I have referred have taken place since the issue of the first report.

Mr. QUELCH: Does the minister consider that the fund will be able to cope with the deficiency of United States dollars?

Mr. ABBOTT: No, not alone. It was never contemplated that it would. I and my predecessor have discussed the operations of the fund in some detail in the house on previous occasions. No one has pretended that the fund could cover the whole field, but it is one instrument which it is believed will prove useful in establishing exchange stability and in trying to reestablish the orderly trade of the world; that is all.

Mr. QUELCH: Time and again I attacked the Bretton Woods agreement on the basis that the currency of a nation may become scarce within another nation without becoming scarce within the fund, yet under the Bretton Woods agreement a nation cannot restrict the imports of another nation unless the currency of that nation has been declared scarce in the fund. The former minister tried to ridicule my criticism but that apparently is what has

happened today. You have today a scarcity of United States dollars in Europe. United States dollars have not been declared scarce within the fund; therefore under the agreement these nations have no right to place a restriction on imports. Can the minister deal with that point?

Mr. ABBOTT: Well, I had hoped, Mr. Chairman, that it would not be necessary to discuss at this late date in the session under existing climatic conditions the merits or demerits of the various Bretton Woods agreements, and I still entertain that hope. The international monetary fund, as I said a moment ago, was never intended to cover the whole field, and my hon. friend would be the first one to agree that the currency requirements of the European continent today are abnormal; they are not the normal ordinary balances which one would expect to meet under the old system, I suppose, of establishing gold. They are in large measure due to reconstruction requirements. The bank of reconstruction and development, as he knows as well as I do, was intended to provide some of that longer term capital. It is obvious that the requirements of these countries for reconstruction purposes are in excess of what these institutions can possibly provide; other and more direct means will no doubt have to be found, and that is what is involved in the discussions which are going on in Paris now, as my hon. friend knows, of what is called the Marshall plan. But I am not prepared nor can I today engage in a long and detailed exposition of what the fund or the bank is intended to accomplish. My hon. friend knows that that has been done on previous occasions. It may not accomplish its purpose, but this house has approved the participation of Canada in these two institutions, and we are going to see how they work out. That is the position. I have never been one who feels that there is a great deal of advantage in post mortems, particularly until we have given things a chance to work out.

Mr. QUELCH: I am not making a post mortem. I have suggested that if a certain situation arises we should have the right to make a recommendation to the fund. The minister says it cannot deal with everything. I agree. Surely it should not be allowed to act as an impediment.

Mr. ABBOTT: We have a right to make recommendations.

Mr. QUELCH: As I say, it should not be allowed to act as an impediment. Article VII states that when the currency of a nation becomes scarce within the fund, restrictions on trade may be imposed. To all intents, United States dollars have become scarce. Why cannot the fund now declare United States dollars scarce so that any nation can feel absolutely free to impose restrictions on imports? Surely that is the logical thing. You could not have currency more scarce than United States dollars are today. Why cannot the fund declare United States dollars scarce? That is a logical question, as I think the minister will agree.

Mr. ABBOTT: We could go on with this discussion literally for hours. As no one knows better than my hon. friend, the situation is complicated by the fact that the British loan intervenes. We talk about scarcity of American dollars. Of course there is a so-called scarcity. It is a world scarcity.

Mr. QUELCH: The fund does not recognize it.

Mr. ABBOTT: An attempt is being made to meet it in a variety of ways. The fund is one way, the bank is another, and if the Marshall plan goes into operation that is another. Others may be devised. I am not suggesting for a moment that ultimately it may not be necessary to suggest that the non-discrimination conditions of the fund and other institutions may not have to be done away with.

Mr. QUELCH: Hear, hear.

Mr. ABBOTT: But I am not going to make a statement as to whether we should or should not make representations on that now. It is a very important question of public policy.

Mr. QUELCH: It has a direct bearing on the situation.

Mr. ABBOTT: I have listened with interest to the views of my hon. friend, as I listen to the views of any other hon. member who wishes to express views on this important question, but I do not think it is fair to ask me to state positively what the government's views are on this important question.

Mr. QUELCH: Can the minister explain briefly what Canada's attitude towards chapter 5 of the United States charter on the international trade organization will be at Geneva in relation to that question regarding non-discrimination? Can he tell us what Canada's attitude will be? Will we oppose it?

Mr. ABBOTT: I would rather not make a statement on that now. It is under discussion at Geneva. We have our representatives there,

as the committee knows, and I think it would be inappropriate for me to make a statement on that question.

Mr. ROWE: Is it not true that Canada now has the highest protective tariff?

Mr. ABBOTT: I could not say.

Mr. ROWE: You should know.

Mr. ABBOTT: I would have to check up on the facts.

Mr. KNOWLES: I should like to take up with the minister a question concerning which I gave him notice on the third reading of the Civil Service Superannuation Act amendments a few days ago. It is also a matter concerning which I have questioned the minister on the orders of the day several times during the session, and I hope these warnings will have enabled him to get into a position to deal favourably with the subject.

The point I have in mind is the plight of superannuated civil servants, particularly those whose pensions are in the lower brackets, owing to the increases in the cost of living since these persons went on superannuation. It is a very unusual experience to have the Ottawa *Journal* speak favourably on any remarks of mine in this house.

Mr. ROWE: A very good paper too.

Mr. KNOWLES: Since the Ottawa *Journal* supports neither this party nor the party of the government, one may assume that if there is any question between the two of us the view of this paper must be quite objective. In its edition of July 10 there was an editorial headed: "Superannuated need help". I quote:

When Mr. Stanley Knowles, C.C.F. member for Winnipeg North Centre, suggested a cost of living bonus for pensioned civil servants, Finance Minister Abbott promised "to do my best."

Mr. ABBOTT: That was to discuss it. I notice that the Ottawa *Journal* has taken that out of its context. My hon. friend asked me to be prepared to discuss it and I said I would do my best, and I will.

Mr. KNOWLES: The editorial goes on:

The *Journal's* hope is that Mr. Abbott's best turns out to be just and much needed help. Superannuated civil servants have been the forgotten men and women of the past few years. While most of the rest of us have been given some relief in the way of increased wages and salaries, they have been left with their fixed superannuation scales, reduced in value drastically by a higher cost of living.

I am not going to read the whole of the article, but I will quote the concluding paragraph:

The superannuation fund was intended to give civil servants who had served the state for many years freedom from fear and want. It is not doing that today, or at least not doing it in the case of thousands. We think it ought to be made to do it.

Early in these remarks I think I should give figures concerning the number of people affected. According to information put on *Hansard* by the minister's parliamentary assistant on February 10 of this year, at page 242, there were at that time 7,643 people classed as retired federal civil servants receiving pensions. Of this number 969 are receiving pensions of $30 a month or less. In other words, they are worse off than the old age pensioner. In fact, if you go to the $40 a month figure, which is the old age pension in some provinces, we find there are 1,874 of these retired civil servants receiving $40 a month or less. I submit that the contention of the Ottawa *Journal* and others is well founded, that that is hardly freedom from fear or want.

The organization representing superannuated civil servants has been at work on this matter for some considerable time and in particular making as strong representations as it could to the government for a cost of living bonus or other supplement. The first letters to the government date back to the year 1943. I have in my hand sessional paper 24B tabled on July 7, 1947, containing correspondence between the government and the organizations representing these people. A notable quotation in one of these letters is that over the signature of the Prime Minister's private secretary dated January 17, 1945, addressed to Mr. Wilson, secretary of the association of superannuated civil servants at its head office in Ottawa. The Prime Minister's secretary said:

Mr. King wishes me to say that he will be very glad to bring the representations of this communication to the attention of his colleagues.

Later there was correspondence between this organization and the minister's predecessor, the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Ilsley), and in one of his replies the previous minister of finance dealt with the points raised in the communication from the organization although, I confess, not too favourably. But he concluded with this sentence.

The best I can do is to promise that your representations will continue to receive consideration.

During the course of this session, each time I have questioned the minister about this matter either by means of a question on the order paper or by asking him directly on the orders of the day, he has said that the matter is still under consideration. Some of us have had enough experience to know that one should not count too much on that kind of an answer, but the retired civil servants have

taken hope from the fact that their plight was still under consideration. They have dared to believe that before this session was over something might be done for them.

In the course of the correspondence the organization representing these people drew the attention of the government to the Pensions Increase Act, 1944, of the United Kingdom. I point out that that act was passed during the days of the previous government. The act to which I refer maks possible an increase in the pension of retired civil servants in the United Kingdom, and I think I should quote these three clauses:

(a) where the pension does not exceed four hundred pounds a year, by ten per cent;

(b) where the pension exceeds four hundred pounds a year but does not exceed six hundred pounds a year, by seven and one-half per cent; and

(c) where the pension exceeds six hundred pounds a year but is less than six hundred and forty-five pounds a year, to six hundred and forty-five pounds a year.

There are some provisions in the act to prevent duplication, but its purpose was to bring up the pensions of retired civil servants in the United Kingdom to enable them to meet the increased cost of living. I ask the minister to note the level of the pensions to which these increases were added. For example, note the figure of £400 a year. Those are pensions of $1,500 or $1,600 a year, and yet increases were added to these and even higher pensions. On the other hand, as I have already indicated, we have 1,874 retired federal civil servants in this country whose pension is $40 a month or less, or $480 a year or less.

I think that is the case, Mr. Chairman, and that I do not need to take any further time to press it upon the minister. There has been this lengthy period of correspondence back and forth. There have been delegations from the association of superannuated civil servants who waited on the minister's predecessor and, I believe, not many weeks ago waited on the minister himself. They feel that they are, in a sense, forgotten. They see people who are still in positions of employment and, while they recognize, and rightly, the claim of these people to increases in their take-home pay and so on, they feel that those who are employed get more consideration than do older people whose day of activity in the economic sphere is over and who are more or less thought of as on the shelf. Their bargaining power and their pressure seems to be much less and they feel pretty keenly the delay in connection with this matter. Their hope that continued consideration would mean something is one that I trust will be fulfilled through early action by the minister.

There is one other matter, although it is not related at all to the one about which I have spoken, on which I should like to say something to the minister. In order to save my getting up again I shall deal with it now and the minister can reply to both matters when I sit down. The other question has to do with the return of compulsory savings payments which were collected during three income taxation years during the war. We all know that the provision was that the first of those payments was to be returned not later than March 31, 1948, the second year's payments in the following year and the third year's payments in the year after that. A good many people who back in the war years, were in a position to make income tax payments, including compulsory savings payments, now find themselves in difficult circumstances due to ill health or unemployment. They see prices going up, which means that the value of the nest egg they have with the government is going down. For these and other reasons there are many who feel that it would be only fair for the government to give back to them, as soon as possible, the entire amount of those compulsory savings. The minister has made it clear to us with regard to the first year's payments that it is impossible to do anything now much in advance of the date of March 31, 1948. But I make an appeal to him to consider including, in that one cheque which is to go out, the entire amount of the three years' payments. If that cannot be done, I will suggest a compromise, and that is that there should not be more than two bites at the cherry in connection with this matter. After all, as far as the government is concerned, it is a debt. It is not in the nature of a payment such as old age pensions and these other things we are concerned about. I should imagine that the government would be glad to get rid of the work which will be involved in returning this money. I urge that the minister give consideration to the return of compulsory savings in as few payments as can possibly be made. Those are the two matters which I wished to mention. I hope the minister will comment on both and, I dare to hope, comment favourably.

Mr. RICHARD (Ottawa East): I have listened with some interest to the remarks made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. May I say that both my colleague from Ottawa West and myself for some time have been studying the matter of allowing

the cost of living bonus to the superannuated civil servants of Canada. We have had delegations and representations on many occasions, and both of us have interviewed both the present and the former minister of finance in this connection. I feel, no doubt as do all hon. members, that superannuated civil servants, especially those who receive a small pension, are under great hardship in these times when the cost of living has risen to such a large extent. I think it is only just that this government should give consideration to these people who are underprivileged in these circumstances and who, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, sometimes receive much less than old age pensioners. This government should consider immediately giving to them the relief for which they are asking.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: In connection with the matter just referred to by the hon. member for Ottawa East, may I say that I have heard of various railway employees, who at the end of their period of service are entitled to a basic pension of $25 a month, leaving before the end of their period of service in order thereby to place themselves in a position later on to be entitled to an old age pension of a larger amount, or, if they were old soldiers, in order to be entitled to war allowances which would otherwise be denied them. No individual or party has any monopoly on a desire to see fairness accorded to the civil servants. I join in supporting what has been said, and I know something about it because my own father was a civil servant in the dominion service for many years. In that connection I would point out that one of the great difficulties about superannuation is this. Where over the years a person pays in to the fund and then passes away shortly after becoming entitled to be pensioned, the reduction in many cases by 50 per cent of the amount which was to be paid so long as the civil servant and his wife continued to live often brings the amount so low as to make it almost impossible for the relict or the widow to live after the departure of the pensioner.

I want to bring two or three representations to the attention of the minister in connection with compulsory savings. This is a matter that affects hundreds of thousands of Canadians. During the period of the war it was almost impossible to keep clear and definite records as to who would be entitled to the return of the refundable portion or the compulsory saving after the war. Each year when income tax was paid the individual was given a slip indicating the amount of the refund to which he was entitled. Well, untold numbers of those slips have been lost. In that connection there is this further point, that employees moved from one job to another, from one type of employment to another, with the result that today many have nothing to show that they are entitled to the refund of any amount. As a matter of fact in certain cases it is going to be almost impossible to identify the individuals concerned, if indeed they have not already passed on. I suggest one of the reasons the governor in council has not seen fit to provide for an earlier return of the amounts to which these people will be entitled is the tremendous wall of difficulty that will have to be scaled before these payments can be made. An analogy comes to mind in connection with the wheat board, which issued certificates in 1941, 1942 and 1943. Many of those certificates ran into large sums of money, but thousands have been lost, even including some for quite large amounts.

First I should like to place before the minister this suggestion. The first of these payments is to be made not earlier than March 31, 1948. I come in contact with people in all parts of the country, and they ask, "When are we going to get back this money? We have nothing to show any longer. What is going to be done to protect us?" Would I be presuming if I were to suggest to the minister that now is the time to get ready for making the great bulk of the payments that will have to be made, and I suggest a series of advertisements or radio announcements now so that people will be able to establish their claims and the government will be in a position to meet the great volume that will come pouring in an avalanche within the next few months.

Then I ask, why the delay in making the repayments? In 1945 the then minister of finance, now Minister of Justice, stated that under changed conditions the government would give consideration to the payment of these refunds without necessarily waiting until the dates specified. Today in certain sections of the country there is a large body of opinion that these payments should be made, and I suggest that something be done to that end. The encouragement of at least offering part of the payment that will be made in 1949 would bring many of these people into line to establish their claim now, thereby obviating a situation which will be a terrific strain on the Department of Finance or the Department of National Revenue, whichever department looks after this matter, if something is not done now.

I want to make another suggestion. Today provision is made for repayment in certain cases. I understand, for instance, that when a person becomes sixty-five years of age he is entitled to the refundable excess. If it can be done in such a case could not some provision be made for repayment to persons permanently incapacitated, persons unable to work, either through physical incapacity or through unemployment? I have one case in mind, which is not at all a peculiar case. It is that of a man who worked during the period of the war, a veteran of the first war, and who is now incapacitated. He has a very substantial amount in refundable income tax, yet the return of that money, which belongs to him, is denied at a time when it would be particularly helpful. Could not something be done to enable persons in that position, physically incapacitated or unemployed, to make a statutory declaration setting forth their position and as a result be able to obtain these refunds? If that were done most of the complaints one hears in regard to this matter would be removed, and a great deal of help and benefit would be given those who need the money. Action taken now by the minister in advancing the date of repayment to those unemployed or incapacitated, and also to the estates of those who were entitled to repayment but who have passed on, would be very beneficial.

Mr. ABBOTT: Perhaps I had better deal with the two points raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, the hon. member for Ottawa East and the hon. member for Lake Centre. This question of the consideration of something additional being given to those in receipt of civil service superannuation payments is of course a very important and very difficult matter, and is not a new question. As my hon. friend has pointed out, it was taken up with my predecessor, and it has been taken up with me. Only a week or so ago I met a delegation on this matter, and I have been giving it almost continuous consideration. It is a difficult question, and one of the difficulties was touched upon by the hon. member for Lake Centre when he pointed out that there were railway pensioners who were in receipt of pensions of perhaps $25 a month. That is true throughout the country. A great many persons are in receipt of pensions from private pension funds which have been established by their employers, or pensions they may have created for themselves by purchasing annuities. All these factors have to be taken into consideration before any decision can be reached with respect to what if anything can or should be done for a special group of pensioners, in the case we are discussing those in receipt of annuities under the civil service superannuation fund.

I am not in a position to say what if anything we can do. I am still considering it, still getting data on it, and certainly it will not be possible to make any provision this session. All I can say is that the whole question is continuing to receive my earnest and sympathetic consideration. I do not want that adjective "sympathetic" to be understood in the sense that I am certain something will be done. That would not be fair. As I say, it is a very difficult question, and no one will appreciate that more than the hon. gentlemen who have spoken. Whatever decision is taken we have to make sure it is the right one. I cannot do more than give the committee the assurance that that will be done.

Mr. KNOWLES: Before the minister moves on to another subject, may I put in a plea that he consider the matter further on behalf of the pensioners in the lower brackets?

Mr. ABBOTT: Those are the ones with which I too am particularly concerned.

Mr. KNOWLES: There are 374 who get $20 a month or less.

Mr. ABBOTT: Probably under the amendments to the Old Age Pensions Act, if they had no other source of income they would be eligible for old age pension in addition to superannuation. I cannot see why they would not be, so long as they were within the area of permissible income. However I cannot do more than say that we will carry on with further consideration of this important matter, and whatever decision is taken will be announced as quickly as possible.

The matter of compulsory savings was mentioned. Here we have a difficult administrative problem. From what the hon. member for Lake Centre has said it would appear that he has anticipated a good deal of what we are doing in the department. The comptroller of the treasury and the department headed by my colleague the Minister of National Revenue have been working out a plan for sending out these cheques. The first set of cheques are to be out before March 31, 1948. It is really a tremendous job. I believe the system we have will be effective, but this year it will be something in the nature of a process of trial and error. There is no doubt that cheques will be sent out to many wrong addresses. It does not depend, of course, upon application being made by the person who is entitled to the refundable portion. If that person has made

an income tax return, and that return is there, the amount of the refundable portion to which he is entitled will be sent to him by cheque to the last known address in the possession of the department. I believe it will be found, as has been indicated by the hon. member for Lake Centre, that by reason of shifts in population there will be a number of wrong addresses. We will endeavour of course to get up-to-date addresses. The cheques will be prepared by the comptroller of the treasury from the list given him by the Department of National Revenue.

Following discussions we have had, I believe it is the intention of my colleague the Minister of National Revenue in his department to publicize arrangements by newspaper, and probably by radio as well. In any case, I believe that has now been pretty well worked out.

On the question of anticipation of payments for two subsequent years, I believe I must say it is not possible to do that this year. I indicated a moment ago that we look upon this first set of cheques to be sent out this first time as the initial period of trial and error. We will see how it works. I can see some advantage in combining two subsequent years. However I will not say now that it will be done, but I can say that we will certainly consider the advisability of doing it. As I say, I can see great advantage in not having to do it three times, and in doing it at the most only twice.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: How many are there altogether?

Mr. ABBOTT: My colleague will give that figure on his estimates, but I can say there is a large number. In connection with a problem which came up I was advised there were something like 15,000 cheques which have to go out for amounts under a dollar. However we will live up to our contractual undertaking, and send them out.

Mention has been made of compassionate cases. Perhaps I have received more correspondence on the point than has the hon. member. Naturally I receive many letters. We came to the conclusion that from the standpoint of administration it was too difficult to try to do this. I never like to use difficulty of administration as an excuse; nevertheless the staff of the Department of National Revenue is now so overworked that we felt that to set up a staff for the purpose of investigating and looking into so-called compassionate cases would prove administratively impossible. Therefore, rightly or wrongly we have decided to adhere to the rule that it is paid to people who attain the age of sixty-five or to the estates of those who have died.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is the position in connection with estates?

Mr. ABBOTT: It can be paid at once. We have to know, of course, that the man or woman has died; that must appear on our records.

While I am on my feet may I reply to the question asked by the hon. member for Stanstead as to the number on the staff of the Department of Finance who receive more than $4,000. The total is 58, and that figure is broken down among our branches as follows: Administrative branch, 19; bank inspection branch, 1; the mint, 3; superannuation branch, 1; comptroller of the treasury, 3. Our total staff, including that of the comptroller of the treasury, is now 6,460, which represents a reduction of 4,600 or 4,700 from the wartime peak which I believe was reached in 1946.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I would draw the attention of the minister and the committee to a matter which I believe is uppermost in the minds of the large majority of people in Canada. The subject is not new in the House of Commons, and this is not the first time I have spoken with respect to it. However this may be the last opportunity we will have to point out to the minister that in the matter of controlling prices and arresting the rising cost of living the government has not done a notable job.

Mr. ABBOTT: The items in connection with the wartime prices and trade board will be before the committee, I should hope before six o'clock. Would the hon. member speak at that time on this matter? Of course he has the opportunity to speak now if he wishes. At that time I shall have the officials before me.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: The observations I shall make will not require the services of the minister's officers. What I shall say will be mostly a matter of opinion.

Mr. ABBOTT: I had in mind the answering of specific questions.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I shall not ask any questions except those it will be impossible to answer.

Mr. ABBOTT: Rhetorical questions.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I shall use as my text today a quotation from the former minister of finance, now Minister of Justice. Almost exactly a year ago, on July 5, 1946, he used these words:

> When all is said and done, the objectives of our national stabilization programme are the preservation of real social values, the protection of the value of real wages, of the real incomes of primary producers, of the real value of the

income of pensioners, and teachers and office workers, and of the war-time savings of so many millions of Canadians.

With that statement I agreed one hundred per cent. The unfortunate part of it is that the intent was not carried out. I do not wish to refer to what was said by the former minister, because his work is now in another department of government; but I would say to the Minister of Finance that he has not carried out the objective laid before the house on July 5 last year by the former minister. Whether the policy of the government has changed radically, or whether the change in ministers has had something to do with it, I shall leave to the judgment of the committee.

Mr. ABBOTT: The change has been in economic conditions. To use a phrase from scripture, there is no use kicking against the pricks.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: The fact of the matter is—and I shall give figures to support my contention—that the people of Canada are convinced the government has followed its decontrol policy much too fast, and with too much recklessness and with complete disregard for those in the low income groups.

I shall begin by pointing out that as recently as July 15 of this year there appeared in the Winnipeg *Tribune* a report on a public poll on the question of price control. The question was asked whether in their opinion prices had been decontrolled too fast, not fast enough or more or less reasonably. I am not saying that everything done by a public opinion poll is 100 per cent waterproof; because we must make allowances, but such a poll does indicate the general trend of what the people think. Fifty-four per cent of those who expressed an opinion said that the government was moving too fast; nine per cent said they were not moving fast enough—there is quite a wide range between those two figures—about thirty per cent thought possibly it would do and seven per cent were undecided.

In case some one might say that those interviewed were most likely wild-eyed radicals who supported the C.C.F. and were opposed to the government, I would point out that there was a report in the same news item breaking the figures down into the supporters of the various political parties. Of those who supported the Progressive Conservative party, a party which has not been noticeably in support of price control, fifty-one per cent said the government was moving too fast in the direction of decontrol. Fifty-two per cent of those who supported the Liberal party thought the same. There was just a one per cent difference between the two parties. I did not know they were as close as that. Sixty-five per cent of those who supported the C.C.F. felt that way.

The next question that arises is as to the factors that have entered into the increased cost of living. There are those who will say that wages have gone up, that costs of materials and the cost of production has gone up. Another poll was taken recently, and the result is given in the Toronto *Daily Star* of July 12. This article reads:

55 P.C. Across Nation point to "Big Profits" as No. 1 Price Villain

While numerous complex factors contribute to the rising trend in prices, popular discussion of the causes has centred on the debate as to whether high wage rates or high profit-taking has been the chief cause.

The measure of over-all Canadian opinion on that question emerges in the results of the latest Gallup poll of an accurately balanced cross-section of voters of all classes throughout the country.

"Do you think the main cause of high prices in Canada is high wages, big profits or some other cause?"

	per cent
Big profits	55
High wages	26
Shortages, et cetera	9
Other causes	15
Undecided	8

Those are simply straws in the wind and I do not claim them to be anything more than that. As I said, we cannot accept these things as pure gospel because they are simply a testing across the country. However, it is my experience, and I think it is the experience of hon. members generally, that the people of this country are resentful of the way in which prices have been decontrolled and of the way in which the cost of living has gone up in the last few months. When the minister spoke last year on his budget he referred to a national stabilization programme. That sounded dramatic and high sounding, but I have yet to see any evidence of such a programme. He said that one of the objectives of that programme was the preservation of the real value of the dollar. The closest calculation I have been able to make is that the pre-war dollar of 1939 is worth no more than sixty cents today. In spite of the official figures of the increase in the cost of living index, when you take into consideration deterioration in quality and other factors you will find that a dollar today will buy only sixty cents worth of goods as compared with 1939. What about wages? Have wages in this country been preserved? We find that the Toronto welfare council estimate that in 1944 the minimum income required for a family of five to live in health and self respect

was $1,864. If we were to take into account an increase of only eleven per cent in the cost of living, which is the most conservative figure that has been given by any source, it would take at least $2,100 for a family of five to live in health and self respect, not in any extravagant way.

We find from the dominion bureau of statistics that in the first nine months of 1946 the weekly pay-roll was 3·2 per cent lower than for the same period in 1945. In other words, the trend of wages has been downward in spite of the fact that it should have been upward in order to maintain a proper standard.

Mr. MITCHELL: Why not take the latest index of prices and wages of the bureau of statistics?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I am quoting the figures of the bureau of statistics. If the minister wishes to dispute them it is his privilege. At the same time, corporation profits by some seventy-nine companies were 51·6 per cent higher on an average in 1946 than they were in 1945. The total profits of these seventy-nine companies showed an increase of $32,900,000. These companies may have been in a more fortunate position than others, but Abitibi Power showed an increase of 204·7 per cent; Canadian Breweries, 165·9 per cent; Canada Cement, 101·6 per cent, and Orange Crush, 448·3 per cent.

Mr. HACKETT: Where would we get money for our services if we did not have those taxes?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: The increases in profits I am referring to are after taxes were paid. The question of taxes does not enter into the matter.

An hon. MEMBER: Maybe they made only a dollar the year before.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: The profits in 1945 of these companies were $81,900,000, and they increased to $94,800,000. That is not a profit of one dollar. The percentages of increase I am giving are after taxes were paid. The hon. member for Stanstead says that it is the taxes paid by these corporations which make social services possible. That is possibly so when we follow the economic system we have now, but I suggest that if these corporations or similar ones were owned by the people of Canada, if they were corporations such as the Polymer corporation and others, every dollar earned would go to the payment of social services because every dollar would go into the public treasury instead of only a percentage of it.

[Mr. Zaplitny.]

Mr. MacNICOL: It would break all to pieces.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I am not going to argue that point with my hon. friend to my right at the moment. I am not talking about the ownership of industry, although I could get into that very easily if the Chairman would permit. When we go down the list of ordinary commodity prices we find that such items as salad and cooking oils and shortening have gone up ten cents a pound as compared with last year. Soap of all kinds has gone up in price. Biscuits and bakery products have increased. Shirts and underwear have increased by twenty-five per cent and leather gloves and mitts have gone up from eleven to sixteen and a half per cent. And so on *ad infinitum*.

First of all, the so-called national stabilization programme promised over a year ago by the then minister of finance has not been followed out by the government, in spite of the fact that public opinion polls show definitely that the people in favour of such a programme were willing to support it and are still in favour of it.

Second, I am pointing out the reasons why the cost of living has risen as sharply as it has. The reason quite definitely is not that wages have gone up because, according to the bureau of statistics, the average wages were lower in the first nine months of 1946 than they were in 1945. May I quote an authority which I think my hon. friends to the right will accept, the *Financial Post*. In one of its editorials, the *Financial Post* comments to the effect that there has been an "unexpected buoyance in corporation profits in Canada in 1946". I wonder why is was unexpected. Possibly the reason it was unexpected to the *Financial Post* itself was that the corporations themselves felt that the government was going to carry out its national stabilization programme which was promised to the Canadian people a year ago. They got more concessions than they had expected themselves, apparently.

Mr. HOWE: Perhaps it was because you fellows said that there would be a depression in 1946.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: May I come back to the question of the prices of commodities? First of all, let us take milk. I am not going to go into details of it because it has been debated in this house often. But these figures are significant. In 1944 we were told that the consumption of milk was still twenty-five per cent below the minimum level of consumption

required by Canada's food rules. The consumption of milk was fifty per cent higher than in pre-war years. In other words, according to these figures, in the pre-war years the people were not getting anything like the amount of milk they should have been getting. Hon. members know what the action of the government was. Subsidies were withdrawn. The price of milk has gone up, not the same across the country, but it has gone up sharply in most of the cities. The result is that the consumption of milk is again dropping. We have not yet reached the full point at which the consumption of milk could be considered adequate, but we are starting down hill again and it will not be long before we shall be starved for milk once more.

I want to point out also that when the then minister of finance spoke on the same day as I quoted earlier, he used these words:

> The policy of paying subsidies will remain in effect in order to prevent undue increases in prices of articles of major importance in the consumer's cost of living and in primary producers costs of production.

That is a general statement, but if it means anything at all it must mean that the prices of the things that go into the cost of production will be held down by this government. I claim that that has not been done; and the indication now is, as was forecast in the papers only a few days ago, that by October of this year practically all the price controls will have been removed, with perhaps the exception of rent and sugar. That is not what the people of Canada expected, or were led to believe from the statements that were made by the former minister of finance in this house only one year ago. I want to make a protest—I consider it my duty to do so—on behalf of the farmers of western Canada, to whom the stabilization of prices in this country means more than it does to any other single occupation or group.

Mr. ABBOTT: They have been getting steadily higher prices throughout the last three or four years.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I want to say this to the Minister of Finance. Perhaps he has not as much experience with the west as some other people have. When the government entered into the wheat agreement some time ago, the farm organizations of western Canada and of all Canada, the wheat pools and other interested bodies, made it very plain that they were willing to support the government on the plan of stabilization of prices of wheat and other grains so long as the government would give their pledge that they would stabilize prices throughout the whole economy. In other words, these organizations were prepared to take less than the world price for wheat if they were guaranteed a certain minimum price and at the same time were guaranteed that the prices of the things which entered into the cost of production would not be radically increased within the next few years. That understanding was given. These pledges were made in clear language, as I have already quoted. It is true it is not the same minister of finance who made that pledge, but it is still the same government. After all, it is the government that is responsible for—

Mr. ABBOTT: My predecessor never gave any pledge that the cost of living would not go up. No one knows that better than my hon. friend; my predecessor could not; no responsible minister could give such a pledge.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: He did say this:

> The objectives of our national stabilization programme are the preservation of real social values, the protection of the value of real wages, of the real incomes of primary producers, of the real value of the income of pensioners, and teachers and office workers, and of the war-time savings of so many millions of Canadians.

Mr. ABBOTT: Freeze wages, freeze salaries, freeze everything; that cannot be done in peace time.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: It appears that the government was quite prepared to freeze the price of wheat at $1.55 for a period of five years, and while doing so indicated clearly that the cost of production would be held down so that the farmer could produce wheat at that price, and the farm organizations of this country took a reasonable stand and were ready to accept that—

Mr. ABBOTT: Did my hon. friend say the price of wheat was fixed at $1.55 for five years?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: That is the ceiling price of wheat, is it not?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is the price at which it is now being sold.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: If that is not the ceiling price for a period of five years I shall be glad to hear from the minister what it is, what it is going to be. The point is this, the farmers agreed to the—

Mr. ABBOTT: I want to keep my hon. friend straight on this. My understanding of the wheat contract is this—it is not in my department, of course—the price of the British contract is $1.55 for the first two years; then it is to be negotiated for the subsequent two years. That is all I want to get straight. My hon. friend made the categorical statement that the price of wheat under the contract was fixed for a term of five years at $1.55, and it is not.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Well, I am willing to accept that statement. The present price ceiling is $1.55.

Mr. ABBOTT: For domestic sales.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Well, accepting that arrangement, the farm organizations were definitely given to understand that their interests would be protected in the matter of the cost of production. There is a great deal of resentment today and, I think, legitimate resentment, on the part of the farmers, who feel that they have been led down the garden path by the present government. That is true, not only of the farmers themselves, but of the different classes of people who were mentioned by the minister himself. He referred to the incomes of primary producers, pensioners, teachers, office workers, and so on. One of the reasons why this session has lasted as long as it has is that we have debated hour after hour about doing something for this class of people, that class of people and the other. Why? Because the cost of living has gone up so much that today they are not able to make a living. Hon. members around me have been making a plea for the superannuated civil servants because the cost of living has gone up. Yesterday we heard a discussion about wartime housing and it has gone on today. We have been told that the cost of building these houses has gone up terrifically. Why? Because the price of the things that go into them has gone up, and so on. Practically all the problems that have been faced by this parliament during this session had as their underlying cause the fact that the price stabilization programme promised by the government a year ago has broken down, has not been carried out. I want to say frankly to the Minister of Finance that, in my opinion, he has been one of those responsible for the hatchet job that has been done on the price stabilization of this country. His political views are such that, to put it in plain words, he is, in my view, more reactionary than the former minister of finance was. Apparently he believes that the sooner we get back to this high and mighty sounding free enterprise economy, the better off we shall be. If he can show me how he can operate a free enterprise economy in fairness to all I shall be willing to listen. But here is something that is happening right now. This is a publication of the Department of Labour, the *Labour Gazette* of February, 1947. It points out that the annual report of the proceedings under the Combines Investigation Act was tabled on January 31, 1947. The report read in part as follows. This is a direct outcome of the sweeping away of controls.

[Mr. Abbott.]

> The imminent or actual withdrawal of many governmental war-time restrictions led trade associations in a number of instances to consider the introduction of various forms of cooperative activity on a voluntary basis.

It sounds good up to that point, but what is this voluntary cooperation? The statement goes on:

> Organized groups in several distributive trades were found to have in active preparation programmes of joint activity which included objectives such as the adoption of uniform selling prices and other restrictions on competition.

How will the minister square that kind of thing, the direct outcome of the free enterprise system, with the objective of the free enterprise system? Free enterprise is being destroyed by the very people who shout "free enterprise". They are combining themselves into monopolies and cartels and are restricting competition, setting prices where they want them, without regard to the law of supply and demand. Further on, the statement is more damning:

> It became increasingly evident during the inquiry which was made into private business agreements that serious restraints on trade may develop out of arrangements which, in so far as they become apparent to the public, may bear an appearance of innocent protection of private interests but which when fully disclosed are found to be restrictive to an injurious degree.

There you have it quite plain in a government publication warning the government as early as February of this year, while there were still considerable controls on, that forces were at work organizing for the purpose of restricting trade, forming monopolies and entering into agreements in order to set an artificial price far above the necessary level, and extracting from the people all the profits they can get. That has been and is still going on, apparently with the blessing of the present Minister of Finance.

Mr. ABBOTT: Nonsense.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I did not want this opportunity to pass—

Mr. ABBOTT: A typical C.C.F. speech.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: —without making a protest on behalf of the people of western Canada particularly, who entered in good faith into the matter of prices of grain, on the understanding that the government would make a real effort to maintain its own promised stabilization programme. The government has failed to do that and has not the slightest intention of doing it, because the indications are that price controls will be completely swept away by the end of the summer. If they are, and if there are murmurs in western Canada, which will become louder in the next

few months than they are now, the government can understand clearly that they have been warned not once but a dozen times, and they are responsible. If they find themselves in the west faced by a general strike on the part of farmers, they will have only their own policies to thank for it.

Mr. BLACKMORE: We have had a very fine preparation for the serious consideration of the whole way of carrying on which we are following in our system, economic and financial. I believe everyone was greatly impressed when the matter of mutual aid legislation was being discussed by certain members. A good many members, I believe, wondered how in the world such a mutual aid contribution as $5 billion a year from the United States could be financed. The other day I was reading an article in a United States publication in which the author raised that question. He asked how long the United States economy could endure such a strain.

It is quite obvious that it would be good for the United States economy if she could get rid of those $5 billion worth of goods. She needs to do that, because, unless she sees how to get rid of her goods, she is unable to see how she can employ her people. Very much of the present questionable United States trade policy which is driving the nations almost into a frenzy of despair arises from the fact that the United States leaders feel instinctively that they must get rid of vast quantities of their goods abroad. They do not know how in the world to get rid of them, how they will be paid for.

This is a serious matter, because it goes to the heart of the whole economic situation confronting the world, and it could involve us in another ruinous war. One of the main difficulties with the United States is that she is unable to put her own people in a position to consume her goods. If she could do that she would not have to worry so much about ridding herself of goods outside. That is an important problem which must challenge the most earnest thought of every thinking person in the Anglo-Saxon world today, inside this parliament and out.

Another problem raised this afternoon rather incidentally is this one. Suppose the United States advances $5 billion worth of goods for a period of five years, $5 billion a year. She will have $25 billion worth of goods owed to her at the end of the five-year period. The nations that received those goods will be desirous of repaying, granted their economies have been rehabilitated at that time; but the United States will be afraid to accept goods from those nations in return, lest those goods should compete in her markets with her own goods. The result will be that the nations which received the $25 billion worth of goods will be eager to repay the United States; the United States will be eager to receive payment, but she will not be able to receive goods in return. The result will be another utterly confounding situation which will require some method of treatment different from anything we have applied in the world up to the present time.

I submit that this afternoon has been full of provocative expressions on the floor of the house and that the discussion has been very valuable. I doubt whether we have had a more profitable afternoon since I came to parliament this year. Lately the hon. member for Dauphin has been raising two problems that are not far from the minds of all hon. members; one of them has to do with prices. It is one thing to say that we want prices down and another to see how we shall get them down and keep them down.

The minister correctly said a few minutes ago that you cannot pass laws to keep prices down in peace time because people will not submit to them. At the same time you need to be able to keep prices down. If you are unable to do that, you lose the value of your money because the more prices rise, the more the value of the dollar declines.

Another serious problem which faces our generation throughout the world is the question of finding money to pay to the people who are needy, those in receipt of small pensions. That has been exercising us. There are members who have done their duty and have done it quite well by bringing to the attention of the government during the last few days the many liabilities that face the government, moral liabilities, the many things the government ought to do. But the most interesting fact is that none of these gentleman who have raised these questions concerning the things the government ought to do has made any suggestions as to where the government can get the money to do these things.

I trust that hon. members will indulge me if I endeavour to give some attention to the question as to how to get that money. Hon. members will, I am sure, at once say that I am going to talk about the printing press and the creation of money and they will say immediately, that is the old story; there is nothing to it. Well, I would ask hon. members is there anything to the ideas they have? Can they see in their orthodox way of thinking any conceivable way out of the

difficulty I have indicated? I think every hon. member will have to say frankly, "No, I cannot." Very well. When a person gets into that frame of mind, he ought to be receptive, anyway. So, Mr. Chairman, I think it might not be amiss to devote a certain amount of the valuable time of hon. members to a discussion of this most important problem. As you will remember, we spent thirteen hours in discussing the redistribution bill. I am not saying that any one of those hours or any one of those minutes was unwisely spent. But if we can find any inkling of a solution to these desperate problems which face us, and which are so bewildering, I think the house would not be spending its time unwisely if it devoted thirteen weeks to the discussion of such a solution. One of the unfortunate things about our discussions in the house, since I have come here, is that so little of our time is devoted to finding a way out of our difficulties. So now I make bold to ask the indulgence of the members of the house while I go into this matter with some care.

During the war many people spoke of a new order. I think our own Prime Minister was one of the leaders in Canada who did so. Most people believe that a new order could be possible when they look at the machines we have, the solar energy we have learned how to use, the plastics we have learned how to create, and the unemployment which normally is everywhere around us, showing that we have a surplus of man-power as well as great quantities of materials. Everybody says, "Surely, if we have all the materials which evidently are available and all the man-power which evidently is available, there must be something wrong with us if we cannot have a new order of abundance where everybody can have at least all he needs". Right into that situation when people had learned what I have already mentioned, there came a statement of Doctor Charles A. A. Stine, an eminent chemist in the United States, that between 1940 and 1942 they had discovered new continents of matter as a result of technological discoveries. He says that we have now between ten and one hundred times the raw materials at our disposal that we had in 1940. Then we had the breath-taking announcement of atomic energy, the possibilities of which no one today even dares to guess; for, if the atomic energy is of value in destruction, it must also be valuable in construction or building. There is no reason that I can see why we cannot learn to use atomic energy to accomplish many wonders which now would seem impossible. Those two discoveries, the discovery of plastics and the discovery of atomic power, open up to us matter and energy supplies which are literally limitless. I do not think any one of us has thought with much happiness about the possibilities of atomic energy applied to ordinary industry, because we think, "Well, if we learn how to use atomic energy instead of coal, look at what will happen to the coal miners. If we learn how to use atomic energy instead of gasoline, look at what will happen to all the gasoline purveyors," and so on, and so on, until most people would regard the matter, after a few moments' thought, with more than a little apprehension. That ought not to be. We are richer because we have discovered atomic energy. We are richer because we have discovered these new continents of matter.

It has got out into the minds of men, that somewhere between 1913 and 1928 the world had rounded a mighty corner and sped from an age of scarcity into an age of abundance. The better informed people have read such books as "Chart of Plenty", by Doctor Harold Loeb, published in 1936, which gave some information having an important bearing on the matter which the hon. member for Acadia was discussing a little while ago and to which I have referred. What in the world will the United States do with all the goods she can produce? For this man pointed out that in 1935 the United States was able to produce so many goods that if she knew how to distribute them she could give $4,400 worth of goods to every family in the United States. All hon. members will recall what a pathetic situation the United States was in during 1935. There were 15,000,000 people unemployed. Only about twenty-one people out of every 100 were able to get the bare necessities of life. There was something desperately wrong there. What was it? Once more the challenge comes before us, what to do.

There are some citations which I should like to refer to once again, and which I have already mentioned, to show that the kind of thing I intend to talk about this afternoon is not entirely the work of the imagination of cranks or fantasts. The better informed people have read such books as "Economic Tribulation" by Vincent C. Vickers of the Vickers-Armstrong Company in England, who was at the same time a director of the Bank of England. This man almost with his dying efforts, wrote a book which was published in 1941, called "Economic Tribulation", in which he gave in considerable detail what he thought would happen if we did not have some changes. He talked about the destruction of the British empire, and the destruction of practically everything we hold

dear. Then he went on in his last chapter to suggest what he conceived to be the changes we needed, and these changes are singularly similar to the suggestions which the social credit movement has been making now for twelve years in this house and in various parts of the country.

Mr. Vickers was certainly not a social crediter, He thought his way to the conclusions he arrived at with his own knowledge and his own intelligence. I should now like to read, if I may just at this point, a little quotation from a man whose opinions can hardly be too lightly disregarded. I refer to the Right Hon. Reginald McKenna, chairman of the Midlands Bank in England. This man has said, in a report to his shareholders, that money can be created by the authorities themselves if they choose to exercise their power. He goes on to say that the age which produced all this wonderful skill in creating goods and creating power has also given us the means whereby to use those goods and that power without destroying ourselves. These are his words, which appear in the January 30, 1936, issue of the London *Times* at page 23:

Additional currency, however, can now be furnished by the authorities, if they choose to exercise their powers, without reference to the central bank's holding of gold. Thus, the nineteenth century which brought into general use a means of payment hitherto scarcely known outside London, brought also the machinery whereby it could be subjected to intelligent control.

I believe in the truth of what the Right Hon. Reginald McKenna declared in those words. I believe they constitute a standing challenge to every public servant in the Anglo-Saxon world. The question we now want to have answered for ourselves is whether, if the authorities themselves create additional currency, that additional currency will be sound. Apparently we feel that additional currency will be sound enough if it is to be lent by banks out into circulation. What we all want to know is whether that currency would be sound if it were created by the government and spent into circulation without being borrowed from the bank and without being paid as wages to people working in industry. As soon as we can have those questions answered, we shall be in a position to appraise the whole concept which underlies social credit.

There will be those, I believe, who will read the words I am about to utter, in places that I cannot at present conceive. I should like to say what I am going to say in such a way that it will help them follow through the reasoning. I have selected a number of questions which, I believe, will help anyone who follows them through to form an opinion as to the soundness or unsoundness of the proposal to have money created by the state and spend that money into circulation, provided that the amount of money created is not too great. I am going to read the questions. I may say I have put a copy of these questions in the hands of the authorities, so that they have had a chance to give thought to the answers. I do not believe they will have had time to prepare complete answers. Therefore I have endeavoured to answer the questions myself in many cases, and all the minister will have to do is question the answers I leave, which, I believe, will save the time of the committee and give us something rather constructive to work upon. I am going to start with a statement by the Prime Minister which is familiar to everyone:

Once a nation parts with the control of its currency and credit, it matters not who makes the nation's laws. Usury, once in control, will wreck any nation. Until the control of the issue of currency and credit is restored to government and recognized as its most conspicuous and sacred responsibility, all talk of the sovereignty of parliament and of democracy is idle and futile.

I have the following questions I should like to ask the minister:

1. How would the minister define the expression "control of the issue of currency and credit" as used by the Prime Minister in this quotation?

I am going to leave that for the minister, because obviously it is his question to answer.

2. Does the minister believe that the government of Canada at the present time has adequate control of the issue of currency and credit?

I would say the answer there is, no. The minister may question what I say, but that is my answer for reasons which I set forth in the following questions.

2. (a) In the minister's opinion, what factors ought to determine the optimum desirable amount of money in circulation in a state?

The answer would be, I would say, in the words of Hon. C. A. Dunning, "the needs of business," and the needs of business, I would say, are the needs of production and consumption, or distribution. If the minister disagrees with that answer he may tell us why.

3. Is adequate control of the issue of currency and credit being exercised in Canada at present by the Department of Finance? In other words, is the optimum desirable amount of money being maintained in Canada today?

My answer is, no. Consequently I would say that the objective the Prime Minister set for himself in 1934 has not yet been attained. One of the reasons I am asking this question now is to find out how to attain it.

3. (a) If not, in what respect or degree is the Department of Finance falling short of the desirable objective?

I would say it is failing to get adequate production and failing to get adequate consumption. I think about all one has to do in order to impress upon hon. members the fact that we are not getting adequate consumption is to read this little quotation, which I think I will take time to read now. This is an excerpt from a letter from the bureau of statistics addressed to myself and dated September 25, 1946. I read the third paragraph:

> The percentage of wage-earners earning less than $450 for the twelve months' period prior to the date of the census, June 2, 1941, was 32·9 per cent; 28·7 per cent of the wage-earners reported earnings between $450 and $949; 29·9 per cent earned between $950 and $1,949, and 6·8 per cent earned $1,950 and over. 1·7 per cent of the wage earners did not state the amount of earnings for the year.

That letter is signed by Mr. J. L. Forsyth. I believe it was the hon. member for Dauphin who said it was stated that a man and wife and three children, if I remember correctly, required at least $1,800 a year in order to maintain a reasonable standard of health and decency in Canada at the present time. If that is correct, then this statement by Mr. Forsyth indicates that only 6·8 per cent of all the wage-earners in Canada in 1941 were receiving enough to provide for themselves a reasonable standard of health and decency. Surely no one will say that a system which could do no better than this in 1941, the second year of the war, is getting enough purchasing power or currency and credit into circulation.

3. (b) And if not, what reasons would the minister give for any deficiency at present obtaining in the control of the issue of currency and credit in the conduct of Canada's financial and economic system?

I would answer that in this way. Inability to provide for most of the wage-earners of Canada an income which will enable them to buy the needs of life, which will enable them to buy the things Canada is able to produce in abundance; which means that, even though Canada may be able to produce great quantities of goods, she is unable to consume those goods in Canada. In other words, Canada will be in the same position as the United States; she will be seeking external markets in order to provide employment for her own pepole, and therefore she will be supporting the policies of the United States, the most favoured nation clause and all the rest of it. I believe that constitutes sufficient justification for the answer I gave to question 3 (b).

[Mr. Blackmore.]

4. In the minister's opinion what ought to be the definition of the expression "money in circulation?" Ought it to be the amount of money in possession of citizens of the state or the amount in the possession of the probable producers and consumers of the state?

I would answer that it is the latter. In addition I would say that one sees altogether too great a tendency on the part of people in Canada who study matters of this sort to look at the bank deposits and say that is the amount of money in circulation. That is not the amount of money in effective circulation at all. The amount of money in effective circulation is the money going into the hands of would-be producers to enable them to produce, and that which is going into the hands of the would-be consumers to enable them to consume. All other money is more or less dead.

4. (a) Would the minister agree that effective control of the issue of currency and credit in Canada would comprise:

(1) Ability to get into and maintain in circulation in the right hands a sufficient amount of money to enable Canadian producers to produce enough of every kind of desirable goods and services to supply all the Canadian people with the optimum amount of such goods in so far as the physical resources of Canada render possible such optimum production?

My answer would be yes, and I do not think the minister will question that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I do not know whether I shall have to give the floor to one of these hon. gentlemen who seem to have so much to say.

Mr. FOURNIER (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Oh, no; go on. We have nothing else to do.

Mr. BLACKMORE: If you would only go out in the lobby and read a book it would help.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I might make this comment, in a general way. It is people just like these hon. gentlemen who blindly rushed us into Bretton Woods. They are still blind, still unwilling to listen and learn.

4. (a) (2) Ability to get into and maintain in circulation in the right hands a sufficient amount of money to enable Canadian consumers to consume enough of every kind of desirable Canadian goods and services to supply all the Canadian people with the optimum amount of such goods in so far as the physical resources of Canada render possible such optimum consumption?

I think the minister will agree that the answer there must be, yes.

4. (b) If not, why not in each case?

I do not think I need answer that.

5. Would the minister say upon his responsibility as minister that it ought to be possible for the Canadian finance department to get into circulation in the right hands a sufficient amount of money to enable Canadians to produce enough of every kind of desirable goods and services to supply all the Canadian people with the optimum amount of such goods in so far as the physical resources of Canada render possible such optimum production?

The answer would be, yes.

5. (a) If not, why not?

I do not think anyone will say such is not the case.

6. Would the minister say upon his responsibility as a minister that, under normal conditions, it ought to be possible for the Canadian finance department to get into circulation in the right hands a sufficient amount of money to enable Canadians to consume enough of every kind of desirable goods and services to supply all the Canadian people with the optimum amount of such goods in so far as the physical resources of Canada render possible such optimum consumption?

The answer would have to be, yes.

6. (a) If not, why not?

There would be no answer. I say that if the Department of Finance in Canada is, at the present time, unable to achieve the objectives we have indicated up to the present time, then that constitutes a condemnation of that financial system and constitutes a challenge to the people of Canada to make such changes as ought to be made to enable the Department of Finance to do the things it ought to do.

7. What measures are available to the minister for use as effective means of getting into the hands of Canadian producers enough money to produce as indicated in questions 4 and 5?

I will answer this, and the minister may accept it if he wishes: only loans of banks and other lending agencies, private investment from savings. If those agencies which are in the business of lending are unable to get into the hands of the producers enough money to produce, there is something wrong. Something needs to be done.

7. (a) Give detailed answer:
(1)
(2)
(3)
(4)

I shall not go into detail there.

8. What reasons has the minister for believing that these measures would be efficacious in case of:
(a) A depression.

It is a well known fact that in times of depression bankers do not lend; yet we still have to have production.

(b) An overproduction of goods in Canada, bearing in mind that in a depression banks hesitate to lend for production, while in times of over-production producers hesitate to borrow?

Here I believe we have put our finger on one of the greatest inadequacies of our present system of currency and credit in Canada. We have no means whatever of overcoming the difficulties which are produced in the event of overproduction or depression.

9. What measures are available for use to the minister as effective means of getting into the hands of Canadian consumers enough money to enable them to consume as indicated in 4 and 6? Give detailed answer.

I will answer that.

First, wages and income of earners;

Second, incomes from investments of various kinds;

Third, prices received for goods produced;

Fourth, profits made by various business transactions.

I think the minister will be unable to give a fifth one. This means that if a person, we will say, working in a coal mine receives $100 a month and to maintain a standard of health it is demanded that he receive $150, the minister has at his disposal no means whereby he can get the extra $50 into the hands of that labouring man, no matter how completely deserving he may be, or no matter how badly he needs it. There, again, is a flaw in our system.

10. Does the minister believe that the finance department has the responsibility of controlling the issue of currency and credit in Canada?

I think the minister will say, yes, and I will agree with him.

10. (a) If not, what department or departments or agencies of the Canadian government has or have that responsibility?

The minister does not need to say anything, except that the Department of Finance has that responsibility.

10. (b) Has the finance department the power to control the issue of currency and credit in Canada?

That is an interesting and important question. I say that theoretically the answer is, yes, but I am not just sure whether, from the practical point of view, the Department of Finance has that power. If the minister is satisfied that the Department of Finance has it, I shall be satisfied and happy to have him say so.

(1) If not, why not?

(2) And if not, what department or departments or agencies of the government has or have that power?

I will leave that open.

11. Does the minister believe that the control of the issue of currency and credit is the biggest and most important public utility in the economic activities of the dominion of Canada?

I suggest the answer is, yes.

12. Does the minister believe that the control of the issue of currency and credit in Canada means, in effect, control of the whole national life in Canada?

I think the answer would be, yes.

(a) If not, why not?
(b) And if not, then in what respects?

I do not believe there would be an answer there.

(c) Would the minister concur in the opinion expressed in the statement: "money is the bloodstream of the national economy?"

I think the minister would say, yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: He has been saying "yes" a lot of times, and "no" a lot of times.

Mr. BLACKMORE: We are working it through, and we are getting down to the place where we should be able to trace our way through our financial system.

13. What does the minister believe to be the fundamental principles upon which the present Canadian financial system is based? Would these be—

These questions I would like carefully attended to. If the minister does not agree with me in my answers, I should be glad if he would answer.

(1) That all money must be issued as a debt?

The answer would be, yes. That seems to be the fundamental principle of the present financial system.

(a) What are exceptions, if any?

I will leave it to the minister to fill that in.

(2) That all money must be distributed through industry as wages, salaries, dividends, etc.?

The minister would say, yes, I believe, because we hear so much about something for nothing not being a sound principle.

(3) That no one has a right to money unless he earns it, or it has been earned through producing goods and services?

The answer would be, yes.

(4) That competitive foreign trade is a fundamental essential mechanism for the distribution of purchasing power or money into people's hands?

The answer would be, yes. We hear consistent insistence upon need for foreign trade. Consequently we have to look upon foreign trade as part of our financial system.

[Mr. Blackmore.]

(5) That competitive foreign trade is the fundamental and essential mechanism for the distribution of goods as between nations of high productive potential (so-called "have-nations") and nations of low productive potential (so-called "have-not nations")?

The answer would be, yes. This particular matter we had before us this afternoon. The hon. member for Acadia was pointing out that in 1944 there had been a discussion as to whether a nation should give goods to another nation. Up to the present time that has not been accepted as a sound principle. Consequently the answer to that fifth question would be, yes.

14. What other fundamental principles, if any, underly the present Canadian financial system?

I will leave that for the minister to answer, if he desires.

15. Assuming that under the present financial system, all money issues as debt and is regarded as debt, would it be correct to say that Canada's system is essentially a debt-creating system?

The answer would be, yes.

16. What elements in the present Canadian financial system combine to make that system a debt-creating one?

17. Would several of such elements be:

(1) Use of only debt money?

The answer would be, yes.

(2) Interest?

The answer would be, yes.

(3) Profits?

The answer would be, yes.

(4) Savings—

The answer would be, yes.

—and investments including purchase of insurance?

The answer would be, yes.

(5) Taxation?

Yes.

(6) Alternating booms and depressions?

Yes.

(7) Alternating periods of bankers' willingness to lend money and unwillingness to lend money?

Yes.

(8) Fluctuations of prices?

Yes.

(9) Fluctuations of wages?

Yes.

(10) Fluctuations of markets?

Yes.

(11) Fluctuations in unemployment.

Yes. It is agreed that the Canadian banking system is a debt-creating system. One of

the important things we must consider in the course of our study is how it can be turned into a non-debt-creating system.

18. Does the minister believe that there are any valid and unavoidable reasons why Canada's financial system must continue to be a debt-creating system?

I think the minister would have to say, no.

19. Does the minister believe that there absolutely could not be a non-debt-creating financial system or at least a debt-liquidating financial system in Canada or any other similar individual enterprise country such as United States?

I am going to take the liberty of answering for the minister and say, no.

20. Can the minister suggest any valid reason why it should not be conceivable to modify the Canadian financial system in such a way as to change it into a non-debt creating or, at least, an automatically debt-liquidating system?

I am going to make bold and answer for the minister, no.

20. (a) If so, then what valid reasons?

I am going to say that the minister cannot find a valid reason.

21. Would the minister be willing to consider objectively and scientifically the possibility of discovering the means of bringing about such a change?

Knowing the minister as I know him, I think I would be safe in answering for him, yes.

21. (a) If not, why not?

22. Would the minister be willing to employ such means when discovered?

I do not know whether to say, yes, to that question for the minister. I will leave that for him to answer.

22. (a) If not, why not?

One reason why I have asked these questions is that I heard when the Liberals were in opposition they did a lot of talking about debt-free money, but just as soon as they got into power they never said a word about it. I understand that the present Minister of Veterans Affairs was enthusiastic over debt-free money, but he never says a word about it now. Naturally that causes one to ask that question and the minister can answer it.

23. If the Canadian government through the finance department were to discover the means of changing the Canadian financial system from a debt-creating system to a non-debt-creating system, and if the Canadian government were to become convinced that such a change were necessary in order to give Canadians the results to which Canada's resources entitle them:

(1) Would the Canadian government be free to make such a change?

I want to know whether there is any power in the United States, in Wall Street or London or anywhere else in the world which could exercise a restraining influence on the Canadian government and prevent them from introducing a change?

The CHAIRMAN: I must inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I had a number of other questions which I should have liked to ask before the item was carried.

Item agreed to.

Superannuation and retirement benefits—

60. Superannuation and retirement acts, administration, $198,924.

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not think this session should close without some reference being made to the public service. What I am about to say about one individual can no doubt be said about scores of civil servants across Canada. We are all proud of our civil servants. I wish to refer especially to the recent retirement of Miss Ida Boyce after long and faithful service in the debates office of the House of Commons. I feel sure that on many occasions hon. members of the house have been deeply indebted to Miss Boyce for her assistance. I was pleased to learn this morning that Miss Boyce's father, the late Mr. J. C. Boyce, had been appointed to the reporting staff of the House of Commons in 1880. Her brother became a member of the staff in 1899. This means that three members of one family have made a worthy contribution to the public service of this country.

Mr. KNOWLES: The brother is still on the House of Commons staff.

Mr. MacNICOL: And rendering excellent service. This record is only an indication of the kind of service that is being rendered in Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, Vancouver, Winnipeg, and in every other city in which the dominion government has a staff. It all goes to show how proud this country should be of its civil service. I am informed that Miss Boyce was a member of the debates staff for forty-seven years. That is a wonderful record. No other country has a better civil service than the Dominion of Canada. I just felt that before this session was closed something ought to be said about one who, now retiring from the service, had been associated with the House of Commons staff for so many years and was so well and favourably known to most of us.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am sure all members of the house will join with what my hon. friend has said. I thank him for what he has said about Miss Boyce.

Mr. POULIOT: The name of Miss Kearns should be added to that of Miss Boyce. They are both splendid public servants.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): There are a number of items under the heading of superannuation and retirement benefits, and I should like to know why this whole question is split up into so many areas. Is it because it has "growed" like Topsy? Is the arrangement to continue permanently? Is there a sound basis behind it? I wish the minister would say a word about this at seven o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would be obliged if the leaders of the several groups would kindly inform me after the house reassembles this evening whether they think it will be possible to arrange for prorogation before midnight tonight? The reason I ask that question is this: There are always certain arrangements which have to be made. The other house has to be kept in session to receive supply, and arrangements have to be made for the deputy governor general and other officials to be present. This always takes a little time. If it could be ascertained that we might prorogue, say at eleven o'clock tonight, I would arrange accordingly. if not, I should like to be able to tell those officials who otherwise would be expected to be here that we shall not prorogue until some time tomorrow. I am just asking if the chances for prorogation can be found out during the recess.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at seven o'clock.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock we were considering item 60.

Mr. ABBOTT: Just before we rose at six o'clock, the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario asked me to give an explanation as to why there were a number of items relating to various superannuation and retirement funds. There are a number of plans which were instituted before the present Civil Service Superannuation Act was passed, and the number of annuitants is as follows—I thought the committee might be interested—public printing and stationery, one; civil service retirement fund, 57; public service retirement fund. 141; widows' annuities, 141, and the Royal Canadian Mint, 8, a total of 348. There were various retirement plans that were instituted before the present Civil Service Superannuation Act was introduced in 1924. As I said the other day, when presenting the amendments to that act, it is our hope that eventually all the permanent civil servants will come under the Civil Service Superannuation Act. These various miscellaneous funds are passing out of the picture as the annuitants, who are entitled to received annuities under them, die.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): When the minister said that it was hoped. I was about to ask, would that not automatically come about when these other funds lapse?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): That will come about automatically.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is, unless some other plan is instituted, automatically the Civil Service Superannuation Act will be the only act under which a permanent civil servant will receive an annuity.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous grants and contributions—

64. Canadian General Council of Boy Scouts, $9,000.

65. Dominion Council of the Girl Guides, $4,860.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think someone ought to say a word on these two items, and it ought to be brief and to the point. Perhaps I might be entrusted with that duty at the moment. On the passing of these two items, this parliament ought to pay a word of appreciation and tribute for the fine type of work being done by the boy scouts and the girl guides and of those who have been responsible for the organizations continuing and advancing. We talk a lot about citizenship and the Citizenship Act, but really, Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any work done in the whole dominion that contributes more to citizenship in the country than that which is done by the boy scouts and the girl guides. With that, perhaps nothing more need be said.

Items agreed to.

Miscellaneous grants and contributions—

67. Royal Canadian Academy of Arts, $2,025.

68. Canadian Writers Foundation, $2,500.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I wish to say a word about items 67 and 68. I want to ask the minister whether this is a small grant. I blush to ask for any extra expenditure. I do not suppose we shall get it. I want to ask whether, with regard to these small grants to the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts and the Canadian Writers Foundation,

the minister has been asked to increase them in any way. It seems to me that we are in danger of spending our money, as we must, on all kinds of things for material welfare and are spending too little on these things.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am glad my hon. friend has asked that question. When we were considering the main estimates this year, the question of grants came up. There are various grants for various purposes scattered throughout the estimates, some under the Department of Finance, some under other departments. A good many of the grants have a historical background. When I looked at them I came to the conclusion with my colleagues on treasury board that we ought to examine the whole picture with respect to grants by the dominion government. In many cases representations were made that the grants for the particular organizations should be increased, and at the time they were made I came to the conclusion that the whole question ought to be looked at and that this year I would adopt as a policy that the grants would stay as they were; that there would be no increase and no decrease in the grants to these various organizations beyond what they had been a year before; that between now and the preparation of next year's main estimates I would have a committee of treasury board look at this whole question of grants. My colleagues in the cabinet approved that suggestion, and that is what we propose to do. If the committee will look through the estimates they will find there are grants to various institutions and organizations which have been there for a great many years. Some of those grants may be out of line with present-day conditions. There is, for instance, a grant to the Red Cross Society. There is no more worthy body I suppose in the whole list but it is relatively small. Since that grant was first made, circumstances have changed. The funds of the Red Cross Society have been raised in a different way. I use that simply as an illustration. The point I am making is that the whole list of grants should be looked at to see whether they are in proper proportion to each other and in proper proportion to what the dominion government as such should contribute to these various organizations.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): By the way, I suppose I can tell my friends in the Canadian Writers Foundation that if they come to the minister next year they will find his heart much softer than it was before. I do want to say this. I hope when the minister is reviewing these grants he will bear in mind that our tendency has been to do far too little for those who are doing work for academic and artistic purposes.

Items agreed to.

General—

69. Tariff board, including the dominion trade and industry commission—payments may be made notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act or regulations, $74,148.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Will the minister say a word about this item? I presume it refers to some special feature of their functions.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am informed that this is the form in which this vote has always been passed. The employees of this board, including the dominion trade and industry commission, are not under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I would assume that to be the case, but I should like to know a little more about it.

Mr. ABBOTT: Well, I do not know that I can give my hon. friend the reason.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): To how many does it apply?

Mr. ABBOTT: The total budget, as my hon. friend will see from looking at the estimates, is $74,148, which is a reduction of some $1,052 from last year.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Can the minister say whether it applies merely to a small group in the finance department?

Mr. ABBOTT: Fifteen employees of the tariff board and the dominion trade and industry commission.

Item agreed to.

General—

70. To provide for the expenses of the comptroller of the treasury's office, $8,652,153.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): There is a large increase in this vote. Does that represent merely a transfer of expenditures from one department to another, or is it an actual increase?

Mr. ABBOTT: This is one of the few items in which there appears to be an increase in my own department, the Department of Finance.

Although it is apparent that there is an increase of $1,338,408 herein, it is necessary to consolidate the provision for this item

with its counterpart, vote 479, in the demobilization and reconversion estimates if we are properly to compare the provision required for the current year with that of 1946-47. It is necessary, because the increase in this item merely provides for certain temporary staff who were formerly paid from the demobilization vote, but whose duties and responsibilities are now clearly of a continuing nature.

Looking at the consolidated picture, we find, however, that, whereas the total provision for 1947-48 for the comptroller's office is $11,135,353, the comparative estimate for 1946-47 was $13,647,025. In fact, therefore, the current year's provision reflects a decrease of $2,511,672 as compared with 1946-47. The reduction is primarily due to a decrease of 3,634 in staff, which is the result of the resignation and superannuation of twenty-three permanents and the closing out of many wartime and demobilization functions affecting 3,611 temporary employees.

Item agreed to.

General—

72. Foreign exchange control board—administration, $112,000.

Mr. ABBOTT: This item is to provide for certain administrative expenses of the foreign exchange control board as set out in the Foreign Exchange Control Act, 1946. In general, the increase results from provision being made for a full year during 1947-48 in lieu of part of the year during 1946-47. The actual increase is $54,500, and it results from the reflection of a full year's operations as against a part year's operations last year when the balance was covered otherwise, the war vote and the demobilization vote.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): What is the relevant current cost as compared with a year ago?

Mr. ABBOTT: It is approximately the same. It is somewhat down on balance, because the staff is somewhat down.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I am relieved to hear that. I wanted to ask whether, in fact, the work of the exchange control board has not somewhat lessened as compared with the war period.

Mr. ABBOTT: It has materially lessened. The actual expenses as contrasted with 1946-47 and the estimate of 1947-48, is somewhat down.

Item agreed to.

General—

73. To provide, subject to the approval of the treasury board for salaries, reclassifications and increases, $500,000.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mr. BOUCHER: I see there is a reduction of over $4,600,000. I suppose there is an explanation.

Mr. ABBOTT: In the supplementary estimates there will be found a further item of $5 million which, added to the $500,000, will, in fact, make this $400,000 higher than last year

Mr. BOUCHER: Why is it done in this way? Here we have a main estimate indicating a reduction of $4,600,000, and we have a supplementary estimate increasing it.

Mr. ABBOTT: The explanation is simple. The new legislation providing for increases for temporaries was passed only a few days ago These estimates were prepared last January?

Mr. PROBE: Is the reclassification of the civil service generally being implemented, or when can we expect to have it implemented?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not particularly competent to answer that question, which should be directed to the Secretary of State. I have to provide in my estimates the means for increasing salaries, but the matter of reclassification is under my colleague. Perhaps my hon. friend would address that question to him on his supplementaries.

Item agreed to.

Demobilization and reconversion—

507. To provide, subject to the approval of the treasury board, for miscellaneous and unforeseen expenses: for supplementing any of the appropriations in the demobilization and reconversion estimates; and for the temporary provision of recoverable advances for working capital purposes and for the re-advancing of any such advances repaid, $1,000,000.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): This is a large amount, although there is a substantial decrease. Perhaps the minister will let us have a word about that.

Mr. ABBOTT: This item provides the fund from which difficulties that arise through transition from bulk wartime appropriations to specific votes and other unforeseen items may be met. It is considered that the majority of the transitional hardships have been overcome during the past year, and a proportionate decrease in the provision for such purposes is currently possible.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): What was spent last year out of the $10 million?

Mr. ABBOTT: Of the $10 million which was provided last year, I am advised that approximately $1,232,000 was charged to that vote and some later recovered from the sup-

plementary estimates. We take these estimates in three bites—main estimates, main supplementaries and further supplementaries —and in preparing the main estimates the department has a contingency vote in there which is put in, not knowing whether the various items will be sufficiently clarified by the time the further supplementary estimates are brought down, to enable them to be specifically provided for. Something of the order of $1,200,000 in round figures remains to be charged against that vote.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): That makes how much altogether out of the $10 million?

Mr. ABBOTT: The figure is $1,200,000.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): With the $1,200,000 you will have spent the whole of the $10 million?

Mr. ABBOTT: Only $1,200,000 was spent out of the $10 million.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I was interested in the minister's statement in regard to supplementaries and supplementaries to supplementaries. Perhaps these reserves, these amounts appropriated in such large figures, would indicate that we might have more accurate estimating than there is, because that puzzles me.

Mr. ABBOTT: I agree with my hon. friend, and I have been pressing all the departments for the last six or seven months to estimate as accurately as possible; but on reflection any member will agree that where you have a large number of departments and votes for specific purposes, which have to be estimated eight, nine, ten, and eleven months before they are spent, it is hard to get down to absolutely accurate estimating. Last year is an excellent example of that. The main estimates, I believe, speaking from memory, were $2,750,000,000. The main supplementaries were $400 million and the further supplementaries another $100 million on top of that. The total estimates ran close to $3 billion. Actually, our expenditures, when the final accounts were cast, were from $150 million to $200 million under the original main estimates. While today we have main estimates of $2,000,000,000 and these further supplementaries of $115 million, they are now of the order of $2,250,000,000, and as usual there are bound to be, toward the end of the fiscal year, further supplementaries.

I seldom indulge in prophecy, but I predict that the total over-all expenditures for the current fiscal year will not exceed my original estimate of $2,100,000,000 which I made in my budget speech on April 29. It is inevitable that that should be the case because we do not have a lump vote. If we could have a lump vote it would be possible to estimate very much more accurately; that is, in a system of transfers between votes, but that would diminish parliamentary control over expenditures. It is inevitable, in the system of breaking down your expenditures into relatively small departmental estimates, that you will overestimate. It cannot be avoided.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I will not labour the point. Will the minister, now that we are on, we hope, the last day of the session, give us, not a solemn undertaking, but a statement of intention that next year we shall have these estimates a little earlier so that we shall not feel every minute that we take up that we have a lot of hostile eyes on us.

I just want to make this statement. I recognize that it is difficult to estimate with absolute accuracy; nonetheless, when you find $10,000,000 in the estimates and $1,000,000 spent, that seems to be a large and fat cushion to rest on.

Mr. BOUCHER: Is the difference between what is actually spent and what is estimated largely on account of the government not completing constructive programmes which they had previously planned?

Mr. ABBOTT: No, that was not it at all, This was purely a contingency item. As I said a moment ago, it was put in in order to cover this transitional period between war appropriations and specific items under the peace-time system. Last year $10,000,000 was included in the estimates in this transitional floating vote. Actually $1,200,000 was used. In the light of that experience, treasury board has allotted a vote of only $1,000,000 this year. We are still not quite out of that transitional period from demobilization and reconversion expenditures and into regular ordinary peace-time expenditures.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I think it is a big improvement.

Mr. ABBOTT: So do I.

Item agreed to.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the minister a question on item 503? It went through like dew disappears in the morning, and I missed it. But is this item, to provide for expenses of the cabinet committee on dominion-provincial relations, meant to be a delicate suggestion that perhaps there is

to be a another general convening of the provinces in a dominion-provincial conference?

Mr. ABBOTT: Not necessarily. I do not want to establish the principle of going back to votes which have already been passed, Mr. Chairman, but this is a committee which has accumulated statistical data and information which is available to both the dominion and the provinces. It has been in existence for some two or three years, I think, and the amount this year is less than it was in the past.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I suggest that we ought to call that conference so that the money will not be wasted?

Mr. POULIOT: I have a quotation I wish to put on Hansard. It is from a speech which was delivered to the senate by Senator Nicol, the thinker, on July 15.

Let us make no mistake about it. Canada is now facing a divided path. Rightly or wrongly, certain provinces have been given money. They want more. Only two provinces can provide it. Others will contribute as much as they can, but the main burden will fall upon two provinces. Do you not think that under those circumstances it might be well to discuss the subject fully with these provinces, to bring them around a table to hear arguments for and against, and to proceed in a spirit of conciliation and comprehension, because we know that they cannot be forced into a deal if they believe it, even wrongly, to be unfair, unjust and unnecessary.

I leave it to the consideration of the minister and the other members of the committee; and I hope that, in the near future, if it is not possible to have all the provinces meet together in an interprovincial conference, at least there will be a conference of the two major provinces.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would ask members to turn now to the supplementary estimates, page 30.

Miscellaneous grants and contributions—
728. Canadian Olympic Association, $17,500.

Mr. CHURCH: Will the minister explain this item? I have a great deal of confidence in him as a sportsman whom I have known for a great many years. Does he recommend this $35,000, half now and half again?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes, that is correct; in accordance with the suggestion made by the Olympic committee, half of it in this year's vote half in next year's vote. While I could not give an undertaking I assured them that next year's committee would have a similiar estimate. If I am still Minister of Finance, I would recommend it.

[Mr. Graydon.]

Mr. CHURCH: Will it be limited to amateurs, or will professionals as well as amateurs go? I should like to see the minister himself go.

An hon. MEMBER: He is a professional.

Mr. CHURCH: Is it limited to amateurs?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is something over which I have not much control.

Item agreed to.

General—
729. Foreign exchange control board,—administration—further amount required, $35,000.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I should like the minister to comment on this item, because here is a case in which I find it hard to understand why it is not possible to budget more accurately. I would have thought that this is a small department, doing a rather routine job; yet suddenly it needs $35,000 more.

Mr. ABBOTT: In my memorandum here I have an elaborate explanation, but the breakdown of the estimated additional expenditure is as follows: additional amount for printing, $20,000. This is in addition to the original estimates of $30,000 and covers the printing of application, permit and report forms, instructions to authorized dealers and other agents of the board, the annual report to the minister and so on. The increased volume of transactions since the original estimate was made, together with certain changes in regulations and policy, have necessitated the increase in the estimated expenditures for these purposes.

Then there is an additional estimated expenditure of $10,000 for telephones and telegrams and an additional expenditure of $5,000 for enforcement. That makes up the $35,000 for which I have provided.

General—
730. To provide hereby, notwithstanding the provisions of the Civil Service Act, or any other act or law, subject to the approval of the governor in council in each case, of a secretarial allowance in an amount sufficient to provide total compensation equal to the rate approved by the governor in council for principal private secretaries, to each permanent civil servant appointed to perform the duties of a principal private secretary to a minister of the crown or other member of the government, or to the leader of the opposition, $1.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is the reason for this, and what are the circumstances?

Mr. ABBOTT: The explanation is this. Under the Civil Service Act it is provided that a minister may appoint a permanent

civil servant as his private secretary. The act provides that, in the case of a person who is appointed who is not a permanent civil servant, the remuneration shall be such as may be fixed by the governor in council. In the case of a permanent civil servant who is appointed by the minister, the remuneration shall be, of course, the remuneration fixed for the civil service position, plus an amount of not more than $600. There are a few cases, I believe, where the salary of the permanent civil servant is such that, even adding the $600 provided in the Civil Service Act, the remuneration would be less than that provided for the other private secretaries who are not civil servants. It was felt desirable that all private secretaries should be on substantially the same basis, although some of them might be permanent civil servants. That is the reason why this item is placed in the estimates. I would think that next year it might be desirable to introduce an amendment to the Civil Service Act to provide for that. But the point was raised too late this year for us to be able to do that.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is the distinction between a "minister of the crown" and "other member of the government"?

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend raises a point which I must confess I had not considered. This item was drafted by one of the staff who are expert in drafting these estimates and, as I say, I had not given consideration to that point. I do not see how a member of the government could be other than a minister of the crown. I am glad my hon. friend has raised that point. I will ask them about it.

Mr. MacNICOL: May I ask the minister a question, inasmuch as he mentioned the civil service. Many of the stenographers around this building have been here for twelve, fifteen or more years. I believe my own stenographer has been here for fourteen or fifteen years, or maybe more. Is there any intention at any time of giving them some sort of permanency more than they have today?

Mr. ABBOTT: If my hon. friend will allow me, that should be brought up under the item of legislation. I know it is a matter in which His Honour the Speaker is interested.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Why is this a token amount of $1?

Mr. ABBOTT: Because this is a statute; in order to enable the specific provisions of the Civil Service Act to be carried out. There is a sufficient appropriation in the general salaries vote to enable the money to be paid, but my hon. friend will see that this occurs in a number of cases where it is necessary to provide statutory authorization for what is to be done.

Item agreed to.

Wartime prices and trade board—
909. Administration — further amount required, $450,000.

Mr. ABBOTT: This item should stand, if I may say so. It is to be considered together with items 457 and 458, relating to the wartime prices and trade board.

Item stands.

Auditor general's office—
38. Salaries and expenses of office, $451,484.
Insurance—

Mr. MacNICOL: I consider it only fitting that those of us who in the past have criticized the reports of the auditor general should take this opportunity to compliment him on the great improvement that has taken place. My good friend the hon. member for Temiscouata was the leader of the battle to have the reports made more complete, and perhaps he and the hon. member for Broadview, who also criticized them, will join me in this word of commendation.

Item agreed to.

Insurance—
94. Expenses of work in the interests of fire prevention, $22,734.

Mr. GRAYDON: What is this?

Mr. ABBOTT: The increase of $9,000 in this item provides for the printing of a textbook on fire prevention for use in schools across the dominion, and for the travelling expenses of the dominion fire commissioner, Mr. W. L. Clairmont, to attend a meeting of the dominion council on fire prevention. Of course the dominion is interested in proper fire prevention measures throughout the country.

Item agreed to.

Wartime prices and trade board—
498. Administration, $6,410,000.

Mr. McLURE: Under this item I want to take up a matter concerning sugar, which will be a sweet subject. I make this little statement because I had the matter up with the deputy minister of finance and other officials as well as the minister himself. Last December the manager of the J. W. Windsor Company of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island,

made application to the government for sugar under the following circumstances. This firm had been large buyers of cranberries in Prince Edward Island, and were shipping these cranberries for counter sale to Montreal, Toronto and other places. One of their shipments was frost-bitten, whether in transit I do not know, and they were not allowed to put those berries out for counter sale, because they were perishable. Consequently the cranberries were put in cold storage and the company made application for a quota of sugar to turn these berries into cranberry sauce. As the minister knows, cranberry sauce is made from cranberries, sugar and water.

The matter was taken up and referred from one department to another. Finally the sugar controller, someone in Montreal, said no, notwithstanding the fact that in 1944, under the very same conditions, some eight tons of sugar were allocated to this firm for the processing of cranberries. No legitimate reasons were given by the controller, who seems to have control of the finance department in reference to sugar. Now this man has to take a loss of from $4,000 to $5,000 if he dumps these berries, and as a young man in business that loss is too great for him to take. At the present time there is a big demand in the maritime provinces for cranberry sauce. You will find it in all the stores there, brought in from the Boston canneries; it is all imported. If the Boston canneries can obtain all the sugar they wish for processing, and since the two countries are supposed to be a unit in this regard, I cannot see why this firm of J. W. Windsor should be refused this sugar by the controller after a similar request was granted two years ago. As I say, it was impossible to get any logical reason as to why the request was refused; in fact there was only one conclusion that could be reached, and that was that they were dealing with a bunch of men who made no use of their heads for anything but common hatracks. I would like the minister to look into the matter and see that this firm is given an allocation of sugar sufficient to take care of the quantity of cranberries they have still on hand, in cold storage in the city of Toronto.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall be very glad to look into it. I know the firm very well, and used to know them in a professional way.

Mr. McLURE: I hope you will see that they get justice.

Mr. ABBOTT: Oh, you may be sure they will get justice.

[Mr. McLure.]

Mr. McLURE: They will never get justice from the wartime prices and trade board.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall be glad to look into the matter.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I should like to ask two or three questions about the beet sugar policy of the country. The government's management of the beet sugar industry in Canada during the last ten years has left much to be desired. Perhaps in the last year the government's policy in this respect has been more reprehensible than during any other year. The result of it all has been that during the war the government managed to deprive Canadians of considerable quantities of sugar they might as well have had the use of, and managed to lose for Canada a substantial amount of national wealth. Canadians are now in a position where they must pay $28 million during 1947 in United States dollars for sugar which is being imported from non-British countries. In addition to that, they have the beet sugar industry as a whole in a position in which, should we have a war, we would be in grave danger of being cut off from supplies which we would need to support our ordinary standard of living.

I consider those four misdeeds of the government are more than serious. In my judgment the present sugar administrator has been a sabotaging influence on the Canadian beet sugar industry ever since he assumed the position he now holds. I now wish to go into some detail to demonstrate that fact.

In 1946 the sugar administrator granted sixty and three-quarter cents per hundred pounds of beet sugar to the beet growers. This was far too low a subsidy; it should have been much higher than that. In 1947 the sugar administrator granted a further sixty-four and one-quarter cents per hundred pounds, again far too low.

Mr. Sulkers, president of the Manitoba beet growers association, argued on January 27 that the 1947 increase should have been $1.08 instead of sixty-four and one-quarter cents. Mr. Sulkers was estimating the price, as near as he could, from the cost of raw which it was expected the sugar administrator would be buying from British and non-British countries. That is, Mr. Sulkers was arguing that the total dominion subsidy for 1947 should have been $1.68¾, considering the estimated cost by the administrator of British and non-British raw.

After obtaining more accurate information as to the cost of general tariff sugars, the

delegation which met the sugar administrator in January were all agreed that $1.08 was still below parity. The reason for that was that Mr. Noble stated that he estimated the British West Indies 1947 sugar would cost eighty-five cents per 100 pounds more than the 1946 British West Indies sugar; and that general tariff sugars in 1947 would cost more than a dollar more than the 1946 general tariff sugars.

Mr. Noble refused to take the cost of general tariff sugars into the calculation, because he stated that before the war Canada had not had to import such sugar. I should like to speak for a moment or two on this general situation. For many years in Canada the price paid for beet sugar has been governed by the price which had to be paid for raw sugar from non-British countries and raw sugar from British countries. The two were taken together, considering the cost laid down at Canadian ports, the freight, the cost of refining and all other costs entering into production. Then the beet sugar price was fixed in accordance with the combined prices of empire raw sugars and non-empire raw sugars.

Mr. Noble in 1947 took the stand that he should not take into consideration the cost of non-British sugars. He insisted that the price paid for beet sugar should be on a parity with the price paid for only British empire sugar. This was a serious blunder, and I do not believe it was accidental. I shall read one or two quotations to show that what I have said is correct in respect of the way in which the price on beet sugar was arrived at in years past.

In the Ontario sugar beet producers association's submission on February 26, 1947, in paragraph 4, commencing at the seventh line and speaking of the price, they say:

> That figure is arrived at by taking the average laid down cost of imported raw sugar from all sources, adding thereto the normal statutory duty of $1.29 per one hundred pounds and further adding the spread or margin allowed to the cane refiners, which currently we understand is $1.57 per hundred pounds. This was the basis upon which beet sugar in Canada was sold for many years pre-control, and surely is unassailable from my viewpoint since it was adhered to through a number of changes in the government and was never even challenged.

I shall read one more statement from beet sugar producers to demonstrate the truth of what I have said in respect of the method of determining the price of beet sugar. At page 3 of a document called "Notes on the Dominion Subsidy on Domestic Sugar Production," prepared by the delegation which waited on Mr. Noble on January 27, 1947, we find this:

> For many years pre-war, in fact probably from the inception of the beet sugar industry in Canada, beet sugar was sold at a price which was practically the same as the price (at any given point) which could be obtained by the cane sugar refiners for their sugars. (There was a slight differential of five cents to eight cents per hundred pounds against beet sugar.) The cane sugar price was made up of the following components: first, the laid-down price of raw sugars imported from all sources (including freight), plus the normal general tariff duty of $1.29, plus the refiners' margin or spread. This was the basis on which the beet sugar in Canada was sold and it is considered unassailable from any viewpoint, since it was adhered to through a number of changes in the government and was never challenged.

Those two statements by men who were in the beet sugar industry for many years should carry a tremendous amount of weight. But those contentions were disregarded by the sugar administrator in 1947, and apparently in previous years. The chairman of the Canadian Sugar Beet Producers Association in a letter of March 6, 1947, asked for $1.02 per 100 pounds more, instead of the 64¼ cents, which would raise the total subsidy in 1947 to $1.66 per 100 pounds.

I have Mr. Baker's letter; perhaps I should read a portion of it into the record. Mr. Baker says:

> We further request that the benefit payment increase on sugar beets for 1947 granted by the W.P.T.B. be raised from $0.64¼ to true parity as outlined above, which is $1.66 per 100 pounds of white sugar.

I am not saying that Mr. Baker is absolutely right in his calculation, because the beet producers do not all agree as to what the price should be, but they are all certain that it should be far more than what was granted them. I am certain of that too.

Mr. MacNICOL: Mr. Baker is a big beet producer.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes, he is president of the Canadian organization of the sugar beet producers. As I have said, the contention of the beet producers is that the price of the non-empire sugars and the price of the empire cane sugars should be combined to form an average upon which the price of beet sugar should be based. It is at this point that the difficulty has arisen, and I want to give the minister a chance to explain. According to the information which I have from these gentlemen, the duty paid price of raw sugar imported into Canada pre-war was the same for sugar from empire sources as from foreign countries,

except for the slight concession of one or two cents to capture the business. I take that statement from page 4 of the notes on their interviews and I quote that as my authority. The costs of cane sugar refined as prepared for me by an authoritative source are as follows:

Costs of refined sugar at Montreal based on 40 per cent G.T.'s and 60 per cent preferentials (1946 allocation).

Cuba and Domingoes $4.935 x 40 per cent B.W.I.'s .....$4.38 x 60 per cent Average	$4.61
Freight to Canadian seaport	.55
Duty (a)	1.29
Refining spread	1.57
	$8.02

The British West Indies sugars had had a duty of $1.29, and a dollar had been allowed to empire producers as empire preference. That dollar had been given to the empire producer in whatever island the sugar came from. This is no longer done, but the duty on empire sugars should be exactly the same as the duty on non-empire sugars; that is, $1.29. When that fact is established and borne in mind and accepted, then the computation is as I have indicated. The price of cane sugar refined should be $8.02, and that means that the price of beet sugar refined should be $8.02.

Instead of this, these are the returns allowed for beet sugar in 1947: Ceiling wholesale refined, list price Montreal, net $4.89; reduction of excise tax, on sugar $1.00; total beet subsidy for 1947 crop, $1.25, which includes various items which the minister knows about and which I shall not mention. This brings the total price allowed for beet sugar to $7.14. It should be obvious to any hon. member that if cane sugar refined costs $8.02 and beet sugar is allowed only $7.14, then beet sugar is deprived of 88 cents of what it should have in order to have a parity. That point is exceedingly important to the beet sugar industry in Canada this year.

I am going to follow this a little farther. According to a bulletin from Czarnikow Limited of June 12, 1947, raw sugars from the British West Indies have been reduced, while imports from Cuba and Santo Domingo have been speeded up by 100,000 tons. These extra general tariffs at $4·925 (United States currency), f.o.b. the islands, will greatly increase the proportion of general tariffs and considerably increase the cost of cane sugar this year. This would raise the parity price increase of beet sugar still further beyond what had been granted.

It is quite obvious that there is something seriously wrong with the way in which Canada is treating her beet sugar industry. I should like to show hon. members what other countries are doing for their beet sugar industry, for instance, Great Britain and the United States. I am reading from the *British Sugar Beet Review* of June, 1947, page 121, as follows:

Announcement of a new increase in the United Kingdom beet price makes British payments for 1947 the highest of those offered by the "Big Three" members in the international sugar pool.

The British government has added five shillings (about $1.20 at par) to the 1947 price for a long ton of sugar beets. This is the second increase given for this year's crop, and brings the price to over $21 per short ton of sugar beets of 15½ per cent sugar content (exchange at par).

Reason given for this extra payment is the concentration of delayed work undertaken by the farmers, the extra expense, and the risk of reduced yields—all caused by the late spring.

May I pause right there to point out to hon. members the contrast between what Great Britain has done for her beet producers and what the Canadian government have done for the producers in this country. There are people in Canada who did everything in their power to get the government to give even slight consideration to the beet sugar industry this year. Even when Ontario was having a wet spring, it was impossible to get any move whatsoever from the Canadian government. That attitude simply does not compare favourably with what the British are doing. I quote:

The United States government has guaranteed to growers a national average of $14.50 per ton of beets with 16·2 per cent sugar content. In Michigan the best producers' return will be almost $16.

While the Canadian government does not guarantee a floor price, present sugar ceiling prices will give Ontario growers $12.11 per ton of 16·2 per cent sugar beets. Inclusion of the Ontario subsidy will improve this figure, but sugar beet prices in Ontario will still lag behind those of Michigan and United Kingdom by approximately $3 and $8 respectively.

I should like to know and I think the people of Canada have a right to know just how it is the Canadian government seems to feel that it is justified in kicking the beet sugar industry around. Why is it that the government can find no value in the beet sugar industry? Beet sugar in Canada is just as valuable as any other kind of sugar, just as valuable as it is in the United States, especially when we are buying raw cane sugar from Cuba and other non-British countries and paying United States dollars for it. This year we are probably paying $28 million, as I indicated a moment ago, and we cannot afford to spend this money in that way. The fact that we are doing this is another bit of evi-

dence that there is something radically wrong with the Canadian way of dealing with the beet sugar industry. One would imagine that the people in the administration had not cut their wisdom teeth at all.

I wish to point out two or three matters which I think need special clarification by the minister. I do not suppose the minister will remember all these things, because he is a very busy man. In order to recall to him some of the things that he has said and written, may I read an excerpt from a letter which he wrote on March 19, 1947, to Mr. Philip Baker, chairman of the Canadian Sugar Beet Growers Association of Lethbridge, Alberta. In the third paragraph of that letter the following words appear:

> In reply may I say that the policy of the wartime prices and trade board has been to assure the producers of sugar beets a return equivalent to the laid down duty paid cost of preferential sugars.

I am going to stop there, and I shall have more to say about that later on. On what authority and under what justification did the wartime prices and trade board lay that down as a policy? That policy had not prevailed in Canada before. All the time in Canada before, the price of beet sugar had depended upon the sugar imported from British preferential countries and from non-British countries; when the war broke out, when people having anything resembling common sense would know that we ought to be able to produce sugar to the utmost of our capacity, because of the exigencies of the situation, the wartime prices and trade board had to make a ruling of this sort!

The minister goes on and says this:

> Traditionally, Canada never bought any full-duty sugars for domestic use; such full duties as were purchased in pre-war years were invariably for re-export as refined.

Possibly the minister is not responsible for that statement. The minister quoted what was given him; but the minister was given a lie. That statement is utterly false. Whoever gave the minister that lie committed a serious offence. That is quite clear. I have figures which will establish the statement I have just made.

Mr. ABBOTT: These figures are accurate.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The figures that I have are accurate, but the statement the minister made is inaccurate.

Mr. ABBOTT: That statement is accurate.

Mr. BLACKMORE: We will just see, Mr. Chairman. I have sent the minister a copy of a set of figures, and I am going to put this set of figures on *Hansard* if the committee will permit me to do so. This set of figures shows the imports and exports from British countries and from non-British countries and the totals from 1916 to 1939 inclusive, covering far enough back to substantiate the statement which I made. If I have the permission of the committee I shall put this long list of figures on *Hansard,* so that everybody can see it who wishes to do so tomorrow.

Mr. ABBOTT: Would my hon. friend state the source of these figures?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I will give that in just a few minutes.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think we ought to have that before it goes on *Hansard.*

Mr. BLACKMORE: I will tell the minister where they come from. The source of the figures is as follows: From 1916 to 1920 the source is from the Dominion of Canada, Department of Trade and Commerce, Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Imports are shown on pages 247, 248 and 249; exports, on page 1055; annual report of the trade of Canada, fiscal year ended March 21, 1920. The figures for 1921 to 1925 inclusive are from the same publication, fiscal year ended March 31, 1925. The imports are shown on pages 206, 207 and 208; exports, on pages 1128 and 1129. For the years 1926 to 1930 inclusive, Canada, Department of Trade and Commerce, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Trade of Canada, fiscal year ended March 31, 1930. Imports are shown on pages 122, 123 and 124; exports, on page 648. For 1931 to 1935 inclusive, same publication, fiscal year ended March 31, 1935; imports on pages 314, 315 and 316; exports, on pages 87 and 88. For 1935 to 1939, fiscal year ended March 31, 1939, imports are given on pages 321 and 322, and the exports on pages 89 and 90. I could have brought down these documents; I have them in my office. I have gone through them. If it is agreed that these figures should be put on *Hansard,* Mr. Chairman, I will do so.

Mr. ABBOTT: Agreed.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The table is as follows:

CANADIAN IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF SUGAR, 1916-1939

(SOURCE: DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE REPORTS)

Year ending March 31	—	British countries	Non-British countries				Total of all countries
			Cuba	Dominican Republic	Others	Total	
		(pounds)	(pounds)	(pounds)	(pounds)	(pounds)	(pounds)
1916	Imports	316,896,735	33,259,228	114,376,697	134,418,010	282,053,935	598,950,670
	Exports	628,532	.....	.....	.....	742	629,274
	Difference	316,268,203	.....	.....	.....	282,053,193	598,321,396
1917	Imports	453,823,212	.....	82,541,947	197,801,045	280,342,992	734,166,204
	Exports	35,258,691	.....	.....	.....	22,529,440	57,788,131
	Difference	418,564,521	.....	.....	.....	257,813,552	676,378,073
1918	Imports	288,803,915	7,514,589	134,909,821	307,796,309	450,220,719	739,024,634
	Exports	54,541,872	.....	.....	.....	82,403,503	136,945,375
	Difference	234,262,043	.....	.....	.....	367,817,216	602,079,259
1919	Imports	209,634,096	46,745,693	94,392,428	368,210,199	509,348,320	718,982,416
	Exports	535,533	.....	.....	.....	1,517,402	2,052,935
	Difference	209,098,563	.....	.....	.....	507,830,918	716,929,481
1920	Imports	220,440,374	264,087,412	168,798,993	429,403,905	862,290,310	1,082,730,684
	Exports	140,654,088	.....	.....	.....	104,667,819	245,321,907
	Difference	79,786,286	.....	.....	.....	757,622,491	837,408,777
1921	Imports	103,979,717	311,567,453	64,941,165	199,337,368	575,845,986	706,825,703
	Exports	8,582,400	.....	.....	.....	57,124,100	65,706,500
	Difference	122,397,317	.....	.....	.....	518,721,886	641,119,203
1922	Imports	295,031,156	180,153,276	149,280,821	258,817,859	588,251,952	883,283,108
	Exports	119,265,600	.....	.....	.....	21,617,500	140,883,100
	Difference	175,765,556	.....	.....	.....	566,634,452	742,400,008
1923	Imports	386,031,914	379,284,729	191,055,005	190,171,700	760,511,434	1,146,543,348
	Exports	214,171,500	.....	.....	.....	78,269,800	292,441,300
	Difference	171,860,414	.....	.....	.....	682,241,634	854,102,048
1924	Imports	259,058,035	170,617,055	156,135,401	274,339,666	601,092,122	860,150,157
	Exports	89,858,600	.....	.....	.....	25,862,000	115,720,600
	Difference	169,199,435	.....	.....	.....	575,230,122	744,429,557
1925	Imports	451,182,358	173,783,614	76,342,572	181,020,950	431,147,136	882,329,494
	Exports	95,999,700	.....	.....	.....	8,535,000	104,534,700
	Difference	355,182,658	.....	.....	.....	422,612,136	777,794,794
1926	Imports	387,137,700	413,220,100	263,593,500	110,491,900	787,305,500	1,174,443,200
	Exports	284,084,500	.....	.....	.....	42,096,100	326,180,600
	Difference	103,053,200	.....	.....	.....	745,209,400	848,262,600
1927	Imports	461,252,500	261,752,500	237,794,500	113,167,100	612,714,100	1,073,966,600
	Exports	208,446,900	.....	.....	.....	85,663,100	294,110,000
	Difference	252,805,600	.....	.....	.....	527,051,000	779,856,600
1928	Imports	680,546,600	136,300,400	87,109,400	62,832,900	286,242,700	966,789,300
	Exports	93,714,300	.....	.....	.....	35,695,200	129,409,500
	Difference	586,832,300	.....	.....	.....	250,547,500	837,379,800

CANADIAN IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF SUGAR, 1916-1939—*Conc.*

(SOURCE: DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE REPORTS)

Year ending March 31	—	British countries	Non-British countries				Total of all countries
			Cuba	Dominican Republic	Others	Total	
		(pounds)	(pounds)	(pounds)	(pounds)	(pounds)	(pounds)
1929	Imports	653,477,200	142,695,600	43,082,700	62,891,300	248,669,600	902,146,800
	Exports	37,616,400	.....	.....	.....	4,378,600	41,995,000
	Difference	615,860,800	.....	.....	.....	244,291,000	860,151,800
1930	Imports	661,628,400	112,792,400	91,148,000	109,237,700	313,178,100	974,806,500
	Exports	26,774,400	.....	.....	.....	2,707,900	29,482,300
	Difference	634,854,000	.....	.....	.....	310,470,200	945,324,200
1931	Imports	812,288,500	60,534,800	28,514,700	21,049,600	110,099,100	922,387,600
	Exports	17,999,800	.....	.....	.....	775,600	18,775,400
	Difference	794,288,700	.....	.....	.....	109,323,500	903,612,200
1932	Imports	898,270,200	23,373,300	41,323,200	6,792,200	71,488,700	969,758,900
	Exports	13,842,500	.....	.....	.....	240,000	14,082,500
	Difference	884,427,700	.....	.....	.....	71,248,700	955,676,400
1933	Imports	824,365,100	45,020,700	12,418,200	2,358,300	59,797,200	884,162,300
	Exports	8,276,600	.....	.....	.....	148,600	8,425,200
	Difference	816,088,500	.....	.....	.....	59,648,600	875,737,100
1934	Imports	590,269,400	80,730,000	18,699,500	8,528,600	107,958,100	698,227,500
	Exports	15,813,800	.....	.....	.....	3,258,300	19,072,100
	Difference	574,455,600	.....	.....	.....	104,699,800	679,155,400
1935	Imports	694,511,900	49,385,100	127,700,400	8,678,900	185,764,400	880,276,300
	Exports	9,224,700	.....	.....	.....	109,100	9,335,800
	Difference	685,287,200	.....	.....	.....	185,655,300	870,942,500
1936	Imports	915,278,900	3,343,400	.....	4,614,800	7,958,200	923,237,100
	Exports	2,951,900	.....	.....	.....	580,000	3,531,900
	Difference	912,327,000	.....	.....	.....	7,378,200	919,705,200
1937	Imports	1,014,726,200	5,797,100	.....	5,844,300	11,641,400	1,026,367,600
	Exports	2,162,200	.....	.....	.....	1,529,200	3,691,400
	Difference	1,012,564,000	.....	.....	.....	10,112,200	1,022,676,200
1938	Imports	878,182,100	34,253,000	.....	6,788,300	41,041,300	919,223,400
	Exports	2,434,400	.....	.....	.....	556,300	2,990,700
	Difference	875,747,700	.....	.....	.....	40,485,000	916,232,700
1939	Imports	946,293,300	4,031,700	.....	4,654,800	8,686,500	954,979,800
	Exports	3,056,400	.....	.....	.....	3,100	3,059,500
	Difference	943,236,900	.....	.....	.....	8,683,400	951,920,300

A word of explanation should be given so that it will be possible for hon. members to check readily the exports and imports. They are not easy to check from the records. It will help hon. members to do the checking, if they remember that the imports of raw cane sugar into Canada fall into three classes. The first is sugar n.o.p. not above No. 16 D.S. in colour, sugar drainings, or pumpings drained in transit, melado or concentrated melado, tank bottoms and sugar concrete. Second, sugar above No. 16 D.S. in colour, when imported or purchased in bond in Canada, by a recognized sugar refiner for refining purposes only. Third, all

sugar above No. 16 D.S. in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, not covered by tariff item No. 135, and sugar syrups testing over 56 degrees of polarization, when not exceeding 88 degrees of polarization.

When one checks the imports under each of these three headings and adds them all together he will arrive at the figures which are on this table.

Then, to show the basis for what I have said, I am going to read to the committee the imports from non-empire countries and the total exports in each year. The stand the sugar administration took, the stand the minister takes, and the stand the Minister of Justice took in what he said on April 22, 1947, is this, when the sugars were imported from non-empire countries they were imported to be refined and reexported again for sale. Let us see. In 1916, 282,053,935 pounds of sugar were imported from Cuba, San Dominican Republic and other non-empire countries, and the total export of sugar that year was 629,274 pounds; in other words, 400 times as much sugar was imported from non-empire countries as was exported by Canada. Therefore 1916 does not bear out the statement of the minister, does it? In 1917, 280,342,992 pounds were imported from non-empire countries, and 57,788,131 pounds were exported. Therefore we have five times as much sugar imported from non-empire countries as was exported altogether from Canada.

In 1918, 450,220,719 pounds were imported from non-empire sources and 136,945,375 pounds were exported. That is three times as much sugar was imported from non-empire countries that year as was exported altogether. In 1919, 509,348,320 pounds were imported from non-empire sources and 2,052,935 pounds were exported; that is 250 times as much sugar was imported from non-empire countries as was exported altogether.

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend has put all these figures on *Hansard?*

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes, the figures are going on *Hansard.* I am picking them out for the benefit of hon. members.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am wondering why my hon. friend is going over them again, because he has put them on *Hansard.*

Mr. BLACKMORE: Probably it would be well for me to read some of these items, so that hon. members who have not access to the sheet will be able to follow me.

Mr. ABBOTT: They can read it in *Hansard.*

Mr. BLACKMORE: I will give just a synopsis. In 1920, there was three times as much sugar imported from non-empire sources as exported altogether; in 1921, eight times as much; in 1922, four times as much; in 1923, three times as much; in 1924, five times as much; in 1925, four times as much; in 1926, more than twice as much; in 1927, more than twice as much; in 1928, twice as much; in 1929, six times as much; in 1930, ten times as much; in 1931, six times as much; in 1932, five times as much; in 1933, seven times as much; in 1934, six times as much; in 1935, twenty times as much; in 1936, twice as much; in 1937, three times as much; in 1938, fourteen times as much; in 1939, three times as much.

It is obvious that in every single year, from 1916 down to 1939 when the war broke out, the statement of the minister in that letter is proved to be completely false. As I said, the minister is not responsible but someone supplied him with false information.

Here is a statement that comes from another minister of the crown on beet sugar production:

> It (beet sugar production) could be driven up further and the imports from empire countries—they are mainly from empire countries, certainly in time of peace—can be pressed down if we want to spend enough money to do it.

Those are the words of the Minister of Justice as reported in *Hansard* of April 22, 1947, at page 2284. It is falsification. That minister was not responsible for these figures, but someone supplied them to him. Let me go farther. When the prices board made its announcement on February 7, 1947, it falsified. I wish to read two paragraphs from the press release of the Canadian Press on February 7, 1947. Paragraph 2 of the announcement is as follows:

> The board's announcement confirmed recent reports that the subsidy would be increased in line with requests made by the sugar beet growers association.

Now the requests of the sugar beet growers association I have already put on *Hansard.* They range all the way from 88 cents to $1.08, whereas all that was given was 60¾ cents; yet the prices board makes a statement in that paragraph which leads the people of Canada to believe that they had granted the request of the beet producers, such deception almost anyone will admit is a reprehensible thing in a high degree. I continue the quotation:

> Board officials said the payment of $1.25—

Which, of course, is the 60¾ cents which were granted in 1946 and the 64¼ cents granted in 1947.

> —would place domestically produced beet sugar slightly above parity with the estimated laid-down cost of empire cane sugars plus preferential duty.

Once more there is complete fabrication, falsification evidently emanating from the same source that the misstatements given by the two ministers had emanated from.

Mr. Noble's statement to the joint delegation of the Canadian beet growers association and the beet sugar processors of Canada I will read into *Hansard*. This is from notes of that interview prepared by both the producers and processors and signed by responsible officials representing both. Here is the statement:

He—

Speaking of Mr. Noble, on page 2.

—stated that pre-war Canada had not had to import such sugars.

Of course he may have a way out there when he says she had not had to do so, but I am not sure about that. Certainly the impression he tried to give was that Canada had never imported non-empire sugars for Canadian domestic use. Once more there is complete falsification. All these four statements must have originated with the sugar administrator, S. R. Noble. They prove that man to be either culpably ignorant or downright dishonest. The obvious object of his mendacity has unquestionably been to cheat the beet sugar industry out of a considerable share of money to which it was entitled. In other words, his object was to discriminate against the beet sugar industry.

The Minister of Finance, in his letter on March 19, 1947, to Philip Baker, said:

The policy of wartime prices and trade board has been to assure the producers of sugar beets a return equivalent to the laid-down duty paid cost of preferential sugars.

I submit that when the sugar administrator laid down that policy for determining the price to be paid to the producers of beet sugar he committed a crime of discrimination against the beet sugar industry. Hon. members will recall that when we were discussing this matter on April 22 and the Minister of Justice was defending Mr. Noble, the Minister of Justice said, at page 2285 of *Hansard:*

I see no evidence whatever of any discrimination on the part of Mr. Noble against the beet sugar industry. I regard Mr. Noble as one of the best public servants in Canada.

It is astonishing how a man of the intelligence of the Minister of Justice can be so deceived, is it not? By laying down that rule, the sugar administrator precluded the possibility of paying fair prices to the beet sugar producers in war time. No man with any sense will fail to know that during war time there were a great many difficulties that do not exist in peace time. It would be hard to get labour and materials; the cost would be more. There would be many difficulties increasing the cost of production. And yet, by tieing the price of beet sugar to the cost of sugar from empire countries alone, the islands where they produce cane sugar, he rendered it impossible for him to give a price which would allow for increased costs of production, a price which would stimulate production in Canada, as production ought to be stimulated.

On both these scores I think the sugar administrator deserves the roundest kind of condemnation. By laying down that rule, he paved the way to more flagrant abuses and soon followed that rule by an act of perfidy natural to a man who would draft the first rule. Effective on April 1, 1942, he caused all tariffs or duties against cane sugar entering Canada to be abolished by order in council P.C. 6582 of July 27, 1942, retroactive to April 1.

It may be said that the sugar administrator had nothing to do with the passing of the order in council. Well, if he was administering sugar I presume he had a good deal to do with the cabinet. The cabinet was acting probably on the advice of the Department of Finance, which was acting on the advice of the trade board, which was the tool of the sugar administrator as regards sugar. The normal duties on raw cane sugar have not been restored, and this is another astonishing thing. The duties against sugar entering the United States and Britain have been restored. We are entering the third year after the war; at least we are closing the second year after the close of the war and still these duties have not been reimposed. What does it mean? Does it mean that under a smoke-screen or behind a smoke-screen of war conditions it is the intention of the government or the Department of Finance to remove the tariff protection behind which the beet sugar industry has functioned? Has their determination to destroy the beet sugar industry in Canada driven them as far as that sort of injustice?

The Minister of Justice, in his remarks on April 22, was extremely offensive in his insinuations against the beet sugar industry. He spoke there as though the beet sugar industry, in receiving some sort of tariff protection, was receiving something to which it had no possible title whatever. In this connection I believe it would be interesting for the people out in the country, in reading *Hansard*, to know how well we protect all kinds of vegetables in this country. Let us take apples, for example. According to tariff item 150, under the general

tariff there is a twenty per cent duty against them; under the intermediate tariff, fifteen per cent. Barley has a twenty-five cents a bushel general tariff and 22½ cents a bushel intermediate tariff. Beef has four cents a pound British preferential tariff, eight cents a pound general tariff and six cents a pound intermediate tariff. Butter has eight cents a pound preferential tariff; fourteen cents a pound general tariff, twelve cents a pound intermediate tariff. Then we come to carrots. One would certainly think that we could raise carrots without having tariff protection. On carrots there is a thirty per cent general tariff and 27½ per cent intermediate tariff. On cherries there is a twenty per cent general tariff and fifteen per cent intermediate tariff. One could easily see why cherries might be protected, but when you come to protect carrots, it is not so easy. Cheese has three cents a pound British preferential tariff; general tariff of seven cents a pound and intermediate tariff of seven cents a pound. Condensed milk has a 2½ cents a pound British preferential tariff; 3¾ cents a pound general tariff and 3¾ cents a pound intermediate tariff. Eggs, two cents a dozen British preferential tariff, ten cents a dozen general tariff and five cents a dozen intermediate tariff. Flax has 7½ cents a bushel British preferential tariff, ten cents a bushel general tariff and ten cents a bushel intermediate tariff.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. LOW: In view of the fact that this case is a very important one, Mr. Chairman, and can be finished up shortly, would it be possible to allow the hon. member to finish?

Mr. ABBOTT: Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will probably conclude his remarks in a few minutes?

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes. I have a complete right to talk for another forty minutes, but I do not think I shall talk that long. This is a most important matter. There has been a reprehensible attempt on the part of the government authorities in the Dominion of Canada to destroy the beet sugar industry. The beet sugar industry is just as good an industry, just as economic an industry, just as worthy of protection and just as valuable to Canada as any other industry we have. All it requires is more development. I want to put on record information which will cover the whole situation, so that we shall not have any more of this misrepresentation. Since I came into this house, I have been absolutely astonished at the various kinds of downright lies which have been told and spread over the country trying to discredit the beet sugar industry, talking about salt fish and all that kind of thing. They tell one lie just as long as they can get away with it, to use a common expression, and then get another one.

Mr. ABBOTT: Surely my hon. friend does not intend to indulge in extreme language and general terms such as that. I know we are trying to complete proceedings this evening. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the figures he has put on record with respect to the beet sugar industry. I would hope that he would confine his remarks at this stage to that particular topic which I understand is the one he wishes to place before the committee.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am speaking directly on the beet sugar industry. And if "lie" is a little too strong expression, I will say a downright prevarication, which will satisfy me.

Mutton, 4 cents a pound British preferential tariff, 8 cents a pound general tariff and 6 cents a pound intermediate tariff. Oats, 16 cents a bushel general tariff and 9 cents a bushel intermediate tariff. Peaches, 20 per cent general tariff and 15 per cent intermediate tariff. Pork, 2 cents a pound British preferential tariff, 5 cents a pound general tariff and 2½ cents a pound intermediate tariff. Potatoes, 75 cents per hundred pounds general tariff; free intermediate tariff. Wheat, 30 cents a bushel general tariff and 12 cents a bushel intermediate tariff. Woodpulp, a thing which we produce better than any other item we have, 25 per cent general tariff and 22½ per cent intermediate tariff. Tobacco, which we seem to excel in, has a substantial tariff. Green peas and green beans have tariff protection.

Let us hear no more, Mr. Chairman, from anyone who desires to tell the truth in this country disparaging tariff protection on the beet sugar industry, with the implication that the industry has no right to have tariff protection; and if it does have tariff protection then it has no right to exist in Canada. That seems to be the idea behind some of these remarks and it is just about time it was stopped.

I now go on to another aspect of the question. The removal of these tariffs against cane sugar coming into Canada is estimated to have cost the Canadian people between April 1, 1942 and December 31, 1946, $25,035,-871.98. That would be the duties at preferential rates on empire sugars and the duties on general tariff sugars if they had been charged

the regular duty all during these years. I am not saying it was not a good policy to remove those tariffs. It might have been quite all right. But the point is that just as soon as they removed those tariffs they gave the sugar administrator absolute authority to charge the cane producers whatever he chose, giving almost complete discrimination in favour of them and giving complete discrimination against beet sugar producers. The way was clear now for the sugar administrator to fix arbitrarily the price he would charge the cane refineries for raw cane sugar. He fixed that price at $4.32 per hundred according to my information. This put him in position to discriminate in favour of cane refiners on an extensive scale which I take it was the reason he was put there; while by his rule for fixing price of beet sugar he had placed himself in position to discriminate against beet sugar producers, which I take it was the second reason he was put there. He then had to accumulate a considerable stabilization fund to enable him to absorb the shock and keep the consumer's price from rising. We will grant that he has done that well, but what price has been paid for it? The Canadian people ought to know this because it cost $25,000,000 in their taxes or in other revenues to keep the prices stable. Prices can be kept stable with a substantial fund like that to accomplish the objective. The sugar administrator levied 29 cents per hundred from April 1, 1942 which was to be collected from the Canadian refineries. He adopted other means also whereby he built up a considerable fund. He managed to conceal from the people the mischief he was making in the Canadian economy.

I have very little more to say and what I do say takes the form of certain suggestions which I believe will have something to do with the sugar administrator and certain others. First of all I recommend to the government that the control of the Canadian sugar supply has been committed to the mischievous clutches of a gang of saboteurs who have been striving to mismanage the beet sugar industry to death. I recommend that the government forthwith rescue the valuable Canadian beet sugar industry from the malicious grasp of this gang of self-seeking racketeers and turn the industry over to the Minister of Reconstruction or some other man who has sense enough to recognize a national asset when he sees one, and who has public spirit and honour enough to seek to provide for Canadians their needs of vital sugar supplies in the years to come. I recommend that at a very early day the Canadian government make Mr. S. R. Noble ambassador to China or Japan or some other place far enough away to keep him from further exercising his malignant influence on the Canadian economy.

Mr. MacNICOL: Would Timbuctoo be a good place to send him?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I would suggest that the beet sugar producers be called together to decide what price should be paid in order to stimulate the production of beet sugar in this country, so that it will supply at least thirty per cent of the Canadian consumption. It would be a most pleasant change—they say variety is the spice of life, and this would be a most pleasant variety—to call the beet sugar producers together for once and let them have a voice in dictating the policy with respect to sugar in Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I trust that from this time forward the Canadian people will become so aroused that no longer will they tolerate this tampering with an exceedingly valuable industry. Let it be known that next time we shall have a super-global war. We had a global war this time; we shall have a super-global war next time, and who can say that if that time comes we are going to have access to the empire countries which are producing sugar? Would it not be of tremendous value to the economy of Canada and the economy of the whole British commonwealth if we had in this country a beet sugar industry capable of producing all the sugar we need? Certainly the Canadian economy is completely capable of producing all the sugar we need and, indeed, of producing enough sugar to supply people in other countries which cannot produce sugar. I trust that greater wisdom will reign in the councils of this nation with regard to sugar.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have just one question in connection with this matter. According to the latest reports from the bureau of statistics, this year Canada has on hand 35,344,000 pounds of sugar more than we had a year ago. On June 14, 1947, according to the record I have, the raw and refined sugar in Canada was 272,197,000 pounds, while on June 14, 1946, the figure was 236,852,000 pounds. Has the minister any additional information to give the committee to the prospect of any increase in the ration.

Then I wish to join with what has just been said by the hon. member for Lethbridge in regard to the need of encouraging beet sugar production in this country. In the United States a new sugar act has been adopted within the last few days by the house of representatives, and apparently no difficulty is anticipated in having it adopted also by the senate. Under that legislation the United States beet sugar industry will be assured of

a twenty per cent increase in production over the average production in the years 1935 to 1939. I ask the minister whether or not it is intended in Canada to follow the lead of the United States in this regard, and encourage an increase in the production of beet sugar in this country. I point out that in 1947, according to the statistics I have before me, Canada will require $28,000,000 in United States currency for raw sugar imported from Cuba and Santo Domingo; and with the shortage of United States dollars to which the minister referred today, and with very little hope that this shortage will become any less during the next year, I ask whether it would not be a wise economical course to endeavour to encourage the production in Canada of as large a share as possible of our sugar consumption. I realize the difficulties in the way, but I suggest that since the United States has extended encouragement for a twenty per cent increase in production over and above the pre-war years, something similar should be done in Canada.

Mr. ABBOTT: In point of fact, we have given encouragement to sugar beet production in Canada, and I am advised that 1946 showed a greater increase in beet sugar production in this country, as compared with pre-war, than in any other beet sugar producing country in the world. That is the actual position. Of course there is no doubt an increase in the production of beet sugar would have to be at the expense of some other field crops.

On the question of the sugar stocks, it is true they are slightly higher than last year, but not higher than normal. I have before me a chart which shows that our normal sugar stocks at this time of year, and the stocks we have now are not above normal. It so happens that we had larger importations of Cuban sugar, I think it was, in the last month or two than we had at the same time last year, which accounts for the temporary increase in the sugar stocks on hand. As to the prospects for any increase in the sugar ration, I have nothing to add to the statement I made not so long ago.

Mr. HACKETT: Can the minister state to what extent the sugar crop in Ontario is estimated to be less this year than in 1939?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am advised that it is a little hard to say. The acreage has been delayed by the unfortunate season, and I am afraid I cannot give any estimate.

Mr. HACKETT: It is a fact, is it not, that the great factory at Wallaceburg is still closed, and that it is anticipated the crop will be something less than fifty per cent of pre-war?

Mr. ABBOTT: I understand that the factory at Wallaceburg is still closed. I am told the contracted acreage is a little more than half pre-war.

Mr. HACKETT: The point I should like to make follows the statement of the hon. member for Lake Centre. He pointed out that $28,000,000 in United States funds would have to be paid out this year for raw sugar imported from Cuba and Santo Domingo. If the Wallaceburg area were producing to the extent that it produced before the war, at least twenty-five per cent of this $28,000,000 could be saved to Canada.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I am not in a position to comment offhand upon those figures.

Mr. HACKETT: I suppose the question is not one to which I should anticipate a correct and definite answer offhand, but there would be a substantial saving in United States dollars if the Wallaceburg area were producing what it produced before the war.

Mr. ABBOTT: Obviously the extent to which we replace sugar from Santo Domingo or Cuba with Canadian sugar would mean a saving.

Item agreed to.

499. Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation, $35,000,000.

Mr. FARQUHAR: I wish to make a few remarks under this item in reference to the government policy of paying subsidies on feed grain shipped from western Canada to the eastern provinces. I particularly wish to refer to a remark made by the hon. member for Melfort. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not in his seat at the moment, but his statement was as follows:

> The minister had a word to say with regard to the increased production of pork. He admits that this increase is in eastern Canada, and that it is due to the assistance given by way of freight rates and subsidies on feed grain to the east. I have maintained that the increase in production in eastern Canada is not economic. It is costing the government of this country $3 for every hog produced in eastern Canada, through freight assistance and subsidies on feed grain. That pork should be produced in western Canada, where the grain is grown. That is where you can get the most economic production of pork and poultry products in Canada; and until we get an agricultural policy under which we shall have economic production we shall not be able to compete in the world markets; we shall not be able to give our own people food

at an economic price; and until we change our policies so that we can do these things we shall not be any better off.

The hon. member states it is not economically sound for the government to pay subsidies on feed grains shipped from the west to the eastern provinces, and to pay freight rates from the head of the lakes on that grain. He states that pork and poultry should be produced in western Canada where the grain is grown.

Mr. MacNICOL: We have to pay subsidies on western coal, and we are glad to pay them.

Mr. FARQUHAR: The fact of the matter is that many of the western farmers prefer to sell much of their grain rather than to feed it to hogs and poultry, with the result that we are unable to fulfil our export contracts and to supply our home market. I have always given the hon. member for Melfort credit for trying to be fair. But in making this statement I feel that he is most unfair and most inconsistent. I have checked the record, and I note that during the war years the government at Ottawa has paid to the three western provinces almost $200 million in an effort to maintain production in those western provinces.

When those moneys were being paid to western Canada there were no complaints from the hon. member for Melfort or any other members of his group that such payments were economically unsound. But when the benefits are paid to the eastern farmers it would seem that, according to him, they become economically unsound.

There is no group in the house which has so persistently advocated the paying of subsidies as the group to which the hon. member belongs. In fact, this is the first time within my recollection that they have disapproved of the payment of subsidies, and just why they choose to pick on the farmers of the eastern provinces I am at a loss to understand.

The minister has stated that, in order to finish beef cattle already on the farms in eastern Canada, it is necessary for the farmers in the eastern provinces to buy fifty per cent more grain than they have bought in former years. Many of those feeders come from the western provinces. If we cannot buy our grain at reasonable prices, then we cannot continue to raise hogs and poultry and to feed beef cattle.

The hon. member for Melfort knows that, for reasons which need not be mentioned by me, the eastern farmers cannot compete successfully with western farmers in the growing of grain. He also knows that in this very year the farmers in many parts of Quebec and Ontario are facing the possibility of crop failure, owing to a wet season. He knows very well that in this very year there are many parts of Quebec and Ontario, and of the maritime provinces in which there is very little grain sown; and much of the grain that has been sown was put in the ground so late that it is almost certain to produce a light crop.

If the government were to do what is advocated by the hon. member for Melfort the farmers of eastern Canada would be put out of business so far as the raising of hogs and poultry, and the feeding of beef cattle are concerned. We would not be able to compete in the markets of the world.

The farmers in the eastern provinces, and especially those in Ontario and Quebec, should be most thankful that at this particular time we have not a C.C.F. government at Ottawa. They should feel fortunate indeed that a Liberal government holds office, with a policy which has assisted the farmers and which will continue to assist them, so that they will be able to buy their grain at prices which will permit them to compete in the markets of the world.

I wish to tell the hon. member for Melfort, who is the chief spokesman for the farmers in the C.C.F. that the farmers of Ontario and Quebec will not soon forget the statement he has made with respect to the payment of subsidies to farmers in the eastern provinces.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: It was just that it was not economically sound.

Mr. FARQUHAR: I am sure the statement of the hon. member for Melfort will be long remembered by the farmers in the eastern provinces. I trust the minister will give consideration to giving further assistance to the farmers in the east in order that they may be able to continue to raise hogs and poultry, and to feed beef cattle.

I know the government is trying to get away from wartime subsidies. However I would ask the minister, this year if possible, to give consideration to the matter. If he feels that he cannot continue to pay subsidies, I would ask him at least to continue to pay freight rates from the head of the lakes to the eastern provinces. I would ask him what that item amounts to.

Mr. ABBOTT: Speaking from memory, I believe the transportation subsidies on feed grains amount to about $16 million, so far as eastern Canada is concerned, and $1,500,000 on feed grains to British Columbia. As I said the other day, the matter of a straight subsidy

on feed grains will be considered; but I would not be fair if I held out any real hope that it would be continued after the end of the present crop year.

Mr. BENTLEY: We have all tried to cooperate this evening in expediting the business of the house. The matter about which the hon. member for Algoma East has spoken is one which would require a considerable amount of discussion. I would assume that his remarks flow from an honest conviction in the matter. The hon. member has not taken a great deal of time of the house, and I feel that in reply perhaps I ought not to subject the committee to the type of detailed statement which the occasion warrants. I cannot let his remarks go by without pointing out certain things so far as the subsidies received in western Canada are concerned. They were not paid to help us out of some difficulty into which we had got because of some stupid actions on our part. At tremendous cost the west has made tremendous contributions to the business wealth of Ontario through the incidence of tariff payments year after year, to the extent, in Saskatchewan alone, of between $20,000,000 and $30,000,000. Those are the duties that were paid on the manufactured goods from down here.

Mr. HOMUTH: That is absolute nonsense.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not want to intervene and I did not interrupt the hon. member for Algoma East, but his remarks with respect to these subsidies would have been in order under an item in the agricultural estimates. However, as I understood we were going to cover all these tonight I did not interrupt him. But I ask the committee, and I ask the hon. member for Swift Current, to not get into a discussion on tariffs.

Mr. BURTON: If we are to have cooperation there must be cooperation both ways.

Mr. BENTLEY: I would not have arisen if the hon. member, in the absence of the hon. member for Melfort, which, of course, is not his fault, had not made a political speech at this time. As I say, we are trying to cooperate this evening, and we will still continue to, but I cannot let a remark like that go by.

Mr. HOMUTH: Are the C.C.F.'ers free traders?

Mr. BENTLEY: If anyone wants to stay here until the middle of next week he is quite welcome. I will stay with him if necessary, but I want to be helpful.

[Mr. Abbott.]

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Swift Current has stated that he wishes to make a brief reply, and in view of the remarks that were made by the hon. member for Algoma East I think he should be given that opportunity.

Mr. FARQUHAR: I think the hon. member has misunderstood me. I found no fault with the assistance the farmers in the west have received; in fact, they received that assistance with the cooperation of the eastern farmers. I was not complaining that money had been paid to the western farmers; I was simply stating a few facts. I did not wish to be unfair about the east.

Mr. BENTLEY: We can go on and say, "I didn't", "you didn't" and so on. The hon. member may have had a good reason for saying what he did. If he feels as he has suggested he feels with his last few words, he should have kept those feelings that way. He did interject into the discussion a political atmosphere which we were trying to keep out in the interests of getting the evening over as amicably as possible. I could go on, but I am willing to stop now after having placed on the record that we do not feel in any way obliged because of the subsidies we have got from Canada as a whole. Whenever possible, we shall always make our contribution to the rest of Canada. We pay heavy freight rates on a great many things during good years and bad. The assistance we have had has been as much to assist and keep the Canadian economy together as it has been for us personally as provincial prairie people. I want that understood by the hon. member. I will let it go at that if the rest of the committee also lets it go.

Item agreed to.

Wartime prices and trade board—

910. Commodity prices stabilization corporation—further amount required, $5,000,000.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Will the minister say just a word about this further amount required?

Mr. ABBOTT: When we were preparing our main estimates I asked the prices board to estimate as closely as possible these subsidy items. Obviously they could not be estimated with complete accuracy because you are projecting yourself into the future. I asked them to estimate as accurately as possible in order not to create a misleading impression. After reviewing the situation, they feel that before the expiry of the current year they will need this additional $5,000,000

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Would the minister give the main items making up the total of $40,000,000?

Mr. ABBOTT: They are:

Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation Ltd.
Estimates for the Year Ending March 31, 1948

Subsidies—Domestic		
Coal and coke	$2,000,000	
Iron and steel	300,000	
Oils and fats	2,000,000	
Wood fuel ...	1,500,000	
Miscellaneous	2,800,000	
		$ 8,600,000
Subsidies—Import		
Coal and coke	$3,000,000	
Cotton	27,000,000	
Dried fruits ..	700,000	
General	9,300,000	
		40,000,000
Total subsidies		$48,600,000
Trading losses		
Coffee	$1,500,000	
Cotton	2,000,000	
Oils and fats	12,000,000	
Miscellaneous	1,000,000	
		16,500,000
Administrative expenses .		900,000
Estimated deficit		$66,000,000
Less cash balance April 1, 1947, and liquidation of accounts receivable and inventory April 1, 1947		26,000,000
		$40,000,000

Those were the original estimates for the year ending March 31, 1948.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): What percentage on the imports of cotton does that $27,000,000 item cover?

Mr. ABBOTT: As my hon. friend knows, that subsidy is being eliminated. There is a small percentage on raw cotton, but it varies tremendously on the finished products from a small percentage on certain types to a rather high percentage on others.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: The subsidy has been removed on sisal hemp, and we have been receiving complaints from the farmers over the increase of some 11 cents in binder twine.

Mr. ABBOTT: Between eight and nine cents.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: There seems to be a difference as between different dealers. How was that price arrived at and how was the subsidy collected?

Mr. ABBOTT: We were able to recover the subsidy content in the case of the manufacturers because there are only two or three. However, a retail dealer might have some subsidy stock on hand and then he might buy some new stock at the higher price. If he were absolutely honest he would sell his old stock at the old subsidized price and his new stock at the higher price. I discussed this matter the other day with the hon. member for Humboldt and I am writing him a letter giving him some more details on it. It is almost impossible to police individual retail dealers; a difference in price is no doubt found in western Canada and this would be due to the fact that dealers have old stock and new stock side by side.

Item agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I said that I would be pleased if the leaders of the parties opposite would ascertain as far as might be possible during the recess whether it would be possible to prorogue tonight. I am happy to say that the reports I have received give me every reason to believe that with the cooperation of hon. members it will be possible to have prorogation this evening and I have so advised His Excellency the Deputy Governor General. His Honour the Speaker has I understand an announcement from His Excellency as to the hour of prorogation.

Hon. members will realize that in concluding the business of the session there are a number of formal matters that have to receive attention. The other house is obliged to remain until our appropriation bill goes over. His Excellency has to be informed of the hour at which to arrive. The speech from the throne has already been printed, but the date has to appear upon it. I hope I am sizing—

Mr. HOMUTH: Can we help you put it on?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, very much. I have assumed that every hon. member will be pleased to see the date of July 17 on the speech from the throne and I have so advised His Excellency. I would like to thank hon. members for the cooperation they have given the government in arranging this matter.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following letter:

Government House,
Ottawa, July 17, 1947.

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Patrick Kerwin, acting as deputy of His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber on July 17 at 11 p.m., for the purpose of proroguing the present session of parliament.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,
F. L. C. Pereira,
Assistant Secretary to the Governor General.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on the remarks of the Prime Minister. As he indicated, we are desirous of helping him and the other ministers to conclude the work tonight if possible. I have canvassed our members on the points on which they would like some further information. I see no reason why we cannot conclude at eleven o'clock, unless more political speeches are made, in which case we can make no promises. I would ask that the chairman of the committee let us know when we come to the different departments. The hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) has some questions to ask of the justice department and others of the agriculture department with respect to the wheat situation, and one or two questions on mines and resources. I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) if he will make a statement with respect to the adverse trade situation with the United States and also with respect to the 1948 price of wheat. We shall have some questions following the statement of the minister, but they need not take very long. The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell) wants to touch on some matters in the Department of National Revenue, including the film board. The hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) and the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. White) each have some brief questions. I myself have three or four brief questions. One has to do with the Mines and Resources department, another, National Defence, another, Reconstruction and Supply and another, Transport. As far as I can see these are all the points that need take up much time from this side of the house.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I just say that there are very few questions that will be asked by this group so far as I know. We would like it to be generally understood, however, that if the house passes, as it probably will, a great many items tonight, it is not a case of this House of Commons passing huge sums of money without discussion. These matters have been brought up and thoroughly discussed on other bills and measures during the last several months.

Mr. LOW: We shall have just the odd question here and there as we go through the estimates.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION

AMENDMENT OF ACT WITH RESPECT TO AGE OF RETIREMENT, ETC.—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 415, to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

PRIVATE BILL

ROMAN CATHOLIC EPISCOPAL CORPORATION OF LABRADOR—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Mr. EDOUARD RINFRET (Outremont, for Mr. Dorion) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the senate to Bill No. 414, to incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Labrador.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Macdonaid (Brantford City) in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Railway service—

888. Strait of Canso—transportation improvements and facilities—capital, $250,000.

Mr. GILLIS: May I be permitted to ask the Minister of Transport a question? My question has to do with the strait of Canso project. I understand that a delegation came here within the last day or so headed by the premier of Nova Scotia on that particular project. Can the minister give us any information as to whether progress was made by that delegation, or just where the Canso proposition stands at the present time?

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): In order briefly to advise my hon. friend just where the matter stands perhaps I should place on the record the recommendations which have been made by the engineers of the department. It is a short statement which I think I can get through in two or three minutes, and then I will give my hon. friend the result of the meeting with the delegation.

The reconstruction of transportation facilities leading to and crossing the Strait of Canso has been under investigation by the engineer, design and capital construction, of the Department of Transport for the past year. This officer has now submitted a complete report covering his investigations.

The strait is approximately fifteen miles long with an average width of some 3,500 feet and with varying depths of from 150 to 200 feet in its narrow sections. Maximum surface velocities at certain tidal phases vary from four to five knots per hour. Both sides of the strait are flanked by high rocky country which rises from 400 to 600 feet above sea level on the west side and somewhat higher on the east. The high land of the latter is located farther back from the shore line than is the case on the west side with the result that much flatter slopes prevail on the east shore than on the west.

Early in the development of this region, a branch of the Intercolonial railway was extended from New Glasgow to Mulgrave. Subsequently, when the railway line was built in Cape Breton, a railway car ferry service was introduced near the mid-point of the strait connecting Mulgrave and Hawkesbury. Two car-ferries, each carrying three tracks on beam widths of 48 to 46 feet respectively, are in operation at this point.

Ten projects of varying types have been embodied in detail in the report of the engineer. Four of these have been reported by him as having no apparent merit and no further mention will be made of them. Four of the remaining six are similar in type inasmuch as they contemplate reconstruction of and revision to the main line railway on the west side of the strait in order to reduce existing grades with a consequent reduction in railway operating costs. The construction of a new ferry and associated ferry terminals form a part of each of these projects. The remaining two projects reported consist of (a) a bridge crossing the strait with the necessary revisions to highways and to the railway at either end and (b) the construction of a causeway and a lock structure connecting the two shores providing for through water-borne traffic together with the revisions to the railway and highways as required.

These two latter mentioned projects envisage very considerable difficulties in construction which are reflected to a great degree in the high estimated cost of these two types of facilities. The estimated cost of the causeway, lock and approaches at present day costs is given as $35,093,800 while that of the bridge and necessary approaches amounts to $54,208,000. The annual operating deficit on the former has been estimated to be $541,920 with that of the latter at $1,631,000.

In order to construct these projects at the estimated costs, as noted, they would have to be built some four or five miles north of the present ferry terminals thereby isolating the centres of population now located at these terminals from future traffic.

From the point of view of first cost, which is considered to be excessive and also, as a result of the high annual operating deficits of these two projects, the engineer has reported that neither one can be warranted at this time.

Of the remaining four projects considered the engineer has recommended that project No. 7, as embodied in his report, should be adopted as it provides the lowest estimated annual operating deficit of these four schemes. The total estimated cost of this project is given as $13,300,000 and the annual operating deficit is computed to be $252,900.

Project No. 7 embodies the following main features:—

1. Grade relocations between Lansberg and Hopewell combined with the elevation of main line track and railway yard at Stellarton.

2. The construction of diversions from the main line railway covering five separate sections between the above mentioned two points and the west side of the strait.

3. The construction of a new assembly yard and divisional terminal at Porcupine.

4. The construction of a new ferry similar in size to that constructed in 1927 for the Pere Marquette Railway for use on the St. Clair river.

5. The construction of a new ferry terminal about 300 feet south of the existing terminal at Point Tupper.

6. The construction of a new or revamped ferry terminal at Mulgrave together with railway yard extensions southerly toward Pirates harbour.

7. The remodelling of the newer of the existing ferries to suit new terminal conditions in order to provide a standby for the proposed new ferry.

Winnipeg and Flin Flon and my understanding is that it is in operation twice daily.

Mr. MacNICOL: Do the planes land at The Pas?

Mr. HOWE: That is between Winnipeg and The Pas. There is no airfield at Flin Flon. There is a service on floats and skis between The Pas and Flin Flon and it is operated by another company. These licences have been issued and good coverage is provided for the population in that area.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Railway and steamship service—
926. Steep Rock mines—construction—further amount required, $100,000.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Does this mean that a railway will be built?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No. It means additional facilities for loading of the ore.

Mr. MacNICOL: At Port Arthur?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes. It is for the purchase of necessary equipment.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF RECONSTRUCTION AND SUPPLY

Housing development—
573. Emergency shelter—administration, $2,000,000.

Mr. FLEMING: In this item, 573, we are voting $2 million and in the supplementary estimate, $1,100,000.

Will the minister give an explanation of the purpose of this item and the extent of the operations?

Mr. HOWE: The purpose of this vote is to assist the municipalities in providing temporary shelter to meet emergency requirements. The problem is becoming more difficult each year, as my hon. friend will appreciate. Immediately after the war we had a good many government war buildings which could be converted, and they were converted. In the initial stages, the cities largely bore the cost of conversion. Most cities reached the end of their resources fairly quickly. Since then it has been the practice for the government to make the buildings available and to pay half the cost of converting them into apartments. The practice is for the city to administer the emergency shelter and collect the rents to pay for cost of administration, schools and city services to people living in the temporary accommodation.

Mr. ADAMSON: Will the minister say whether he has resolved the difficulties or whether any agreement was reached with the mayor of Toronto with regard to the Long Branch situation?

Mr. HOWE: The mayor did not discuss the Long Branch situation with me. I know that all the temporary buildings in Long Branch have been made available for emergency shelter, and suitable financial arrangements have been made with the town of Long Branch and with the city of Toronto for the conversion of the buildings to apartments.

Item agreed to.

Housing development—
574. Wartime Housing Limited, $27,500,000.

Mr. FLEMING: The appropriation here is $27,500,000, and an additional $25,000,000 is sought by supplementary estimate 920. That makes a total of $47,500,000, which is an increase over last year. I understood that Wartime Housing Limited was not entering into any more contracts after July 1. Would the minister make a statement of policy on Wartime Housing Limited with regard to future operations?

Mr. HOWE: Wartime Housing attempts to get a programme for the current year established by July 1. That has been the practice for the past two or three years. It does not mean that Wartime Housing is finished for ever. It simply means that there is a practice of settling the programme by July 1. The houses started before that date are intended for completion in the current year about September, and then another Wartime Housing programme will be undertaken for completion the following year. That has been the practice for two or three years. It simply means that we have closed our programme for completions for the calendar year 1947. The reason that the vote is larger than in previous years is that the lack of entry of private enterprise into the rental field has forced the government to take a direct position in rental housing to an increasing extent in projects such as the Mann avenue project in Ottawa. Others are in contemplation. This will mean a direct government investment which requires an appropriation of $25,000,000 greater than was contemplated when the main estimates were prepared.

Mr. FLEMING: The contracts which have been entered into up to July 1 this year provide for how many units?

Mr. HOWE: If my hon. friend will allow that to stand for the moment, I will have the proper officer come down and will get that information.

Item stands.

Housing development—

576. Incentive bonus to industry to expedite production of strategic building materials, $400,000.

Mr. FLEMING: Will the minister say something about the intention of his department with reference to the incentive bonus? We had an announcement several months ago about assistance given in connection with the manufacture of bath tubs. I think it was extended to one firm, the Crane Company at Port Hope. Is there any thought of extending that incentive more widely in order to encourage the production of other building materials which are in short supply?

Mr. HOWE: The building supply situation is rapidly coming into balance. The incentive bonus was given to the Crane company because it was at that time practically the only manufacturer of bath tubs in Canada. There is a bonus of two cents a pound up to a maximum of $400,000 in consideration of the Crane company building an extension to their plant costing over $800,000. The only other incentive bonus was that given for cast iron soil pipe, which was another bottleneck in building. That incentive bonus in total will aggregate $600,000 and will result in a substantial increase in the production of soil pipe. It has already had that effect. Those are the only two incentive bonuses. The programme of building material is so nearly in balance at the moment that I do not contemplate that there will be other incentives necessary.

Item agreed to.

Housing development—

577. To provide for production and transportation subsidies for Canadian steel producers under such terms and conditions as may be approved by the governor in council, $5,000,000.

Mr. MacNICOL: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. GILLIS: That is what I was going to ask.

Mr. HOWE: Yes. The government maintains strict control of steel, its manufacture and distribution. The reason for that is that there is a lack of balance among steel producers in Canada; that is, between primary producers and secondary producers. The steel plants at Sault Ste. Marie and at Sydney, Nova Scotia, have greater productive capacity for primary steel than for secondary steel. The steel plants in the Hamilton area have much more capacity for secondary steel than for primary steel. The purpose of the subsidy is twofold. One is to keep the cost of steel and pig-iron down. There has been very little increase in those prices since pre-war days; and as they are the basis for practically all manufacturing, the government finds that it is an excellent investment to maintain those prices at a low and stable level. Further than that, the government pays the cost of transportation of primary steel moved from Sault Ste. Marie and from Sydney, Nova Scotia into central Canada; and it has increased the production of secondary steel by at least 20 to 25 per cent over what it would be without government intervention.

Mr. MacNICOL: Do we pay all the freight on the transportation?

Mr. HOWE: For all freight movement.

Mr. MacNICOL: From Sault Ste. Marie and from Sydney?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: To Toronto, for instance?

Mr. HOWE: Yes, to Hamilton.

Mr. GILLIS: I should like to find out specifically if it is the intention to use this $5,000,000 vote only for the purpose of transportation?

Mr. HOWE: No. It is used to maintain a stable price on steel. The production bonus varies as between Sydney and between Sault Ste. Marie. It is $12 a ton, I believe at Sydney, and $2.50 a ton at Sault Ste. Marie. The purpose of it is so that steel can be produced in those areas at a price which will permit the Canadian level to be kept constant.

Mr. HACKETT: Does that include freight?

Mr. HOWE: No. Freight is a separate item.

Mr. HACKETT: The usual freight bonus out of the maritimes?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Housing development—

574. Wartime Housing Limited, $27,500,000.

Mr. HOWE: I may say that 7,800 wartime houses will be completed in this calendar year. That is the programme which was closed at the end of June.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

785. Grants to military associations and institutions, as detailed in the estimates—further amount required, $7,000.

Mr. BRACKEN: May I ask if all the mines and resources items have been passed?

Mr. HOWE: Yes; they were passed at another sitting.

Mr. BRACKEN: I have a request here which would come under this department, and perhaps the minister would deal with it now if he can. I am raising it because I was asked to do so. It has to do with the question of wolves running wild in national parks. It has been represented to me that the department is busy counting these wolves instead of killing them. I will read the press report.

Members of the Windsor branch, Essex county sportsmen's association, will fan out over Point Pelee Saturday, April 12, to drive the coyote population—

Coyotes are wolves.

—of the national park to the end of the point and in a fact-finding census of the coyote population there. . . .

The census-taking drive will be conducted by the dominion Department of Mines and Resources, under the supervision of Doctor O. H. Hewitt, dominion wild life officer, who will be assisted by unarmed members of the Windsor branch. . . .

All coyotes driven to the end of the point will be counted.

I should like to ask why the department is wasting time counting these wolves instead of having somebody kill them.

Mr. HOWE: My duties as acting minister have not taken me into the wolf or coyote situation, but I shall be glad to make inquiries; and if the proper thing to do is kill them we will give immediate instructions to have this done.

Mr. BRACKEN: May I ask the minister if he has any opinion on the question of whether the department should be wasting time counting wolves, or whether they would not be better destroyed?

Mr. MacNICOL: I might tell the minister there is a great deal of dissatisfaction in all that area in reference to the way in which the department is dealing with the matter of exterminating the coyotes, not only on Pelee island but on Point Pelee.

Item agreed to.

786. Miscellaneous maintenance and adjustments (war of 1914-18)—further amount required, $5,000.

Mr. BRACKEN: Have all the other items in national defence been passed?

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRACKEN: I want to raise a question with respect to hospitalization in the municipality of North Cypress in Manitoba. Within that municipality is established Shilo camp, in which there are men in uniform and also civilians. When the civilians require hospitalization they go to hospitals outside the camp but within the municipality, and in some cases become a charge upon the municipality. The municipality has made representations to me that this is not a fair charge. In the first instance they are denied tax revenue from the large area included in the camp. In the second place there is an obligation placed on the municipality for hospitalization, to which they object. They have taken up the matter with the provincial authorities, who have advised them to come to the Canadian government and see what, if anything, this government will do. I suggest that it is an unfair burden to place on the municipality, and that it is a proper charge for the Department of National Defence. Perhaps the minister would make a statement with respect to this matter.

Mr. CLAXTON: I know the hospital in question, and I shall be very glad indeed to look into the matter raised by the leader of the opposition and let him have a reply.

Mr. BRACKEN: I wonder if the minister could not go a little further than that. This is not a proper charge upon the municipality. It is a proper charge upon the Department of National Defence, yet the obligation falls upon the municipality. I would urge the minister to say, if he can, that he will try to find a way to have the obligation assumed by his department, rather than have it unfairly left with the municipality, as it is now.

Mr. CLAXTON: I could not give such an undertaking offhand without having access to the necessary information. There are a good many places in Canada where the same situation arises, and we would have to see its general application. However, I assure the hon. member we will give the most sympathetic consideration possible to the point he has raised.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Architectural branch—Construction, repairs and improvements of public buildings—Nova Scotia—

820. Antigonish public building—improvements and repairs, $14,000.

Bridgewater public building—alternations and improvements, $12,500.

Glace Bay public building—improvements and repairs, $15,000.

Halifax customs building—improvements and elevator, $35,000.

Halifax federal building—improvements and repairs—further amount required, $45,000.

Halifax old post office building—improvement, $9,000.

Truro public building—improvements and repairs, $12,500.

Mr. GRAYDON: I have a complaint to make to the minister, though it is not very often I have to do so. Last fall I brought to his attention by correspondence the very bad condition of the entrance to the Brampton public building. The minister was prompt in his reply; his architects went out at once and investigated, and we understood that the matter would be taken care of before winter. It is a question of the entrance to the public building, something which is embarrassing to almost everyone who has to do business in the post office. As far as I know, nothing has been done, unless some action has been taken since I was home a couple of weeks ago. I am sure that when the minister finds that this situation has been allowed to continue so long he will at once have it remedied. That entrance should have been repaired before the winter came; that was one of the reasons it was brought to the minister's attention in the fall, and at this time I am complaining because that was not done. I do not want the thing to be running on, because it looks as though the ministry has forgotten all about it, which I hope is not the case.

Hon. ALPHONSE FOURNIER (Minister of Public Works): I am glad the hon. member has brought this matter to my attention, and I will give instructions right away that the work be proceeded with. I am sorry it has not been done before this.

Item agreed to.

Architectural branch—construction, repairs and improvements of public buildings—Ontario—

823. Barrie—site for public building, $20,000.
Bracebridge public building—addition and alterations—further amount required, $11,000.
Delhi—public building—site, $2,400.
Kenora public building—addition, alterations and improvements, $20,000.
Niagara Falls,—site for building for customs, $8,700.
Oshawa—addition to public building site (revote), $5,000.
Ottawa Daly building—improvements to ventilation—further amount required, $5,000.
Ottawa — Dominion Observatory — improvements to roadways, $7,400.
Ottawa—improvements to ventilation in House of Commons—further amount required, $5,000.
Ottawa—National Research building—improvements and repairs, $50,000.
Ottawa postal terminal building—improvements, $10,000.
Ottawa—storage building for national film board—further amount required, $9,000.
Port Arthur public building—improvements, $6,000.
Sudbury — public building site — further amount required, $60,000.
Timmins—site for public building, $35,000.
Toronto—Postal station "E"—site, $50,000.
Toronto—site for postal station on St. Clair avenue—further amount required, $25,000.
Toronto postal terminal "A"—battery charging equipment—further amount required, $7,000.
Winchester—purchase of and alterations to building for postal purposes, $14,500.

Mr. MacNICOL: May I ask the minister the location of the site for the postal station on St. Clair avenue?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): The Post Office Department reports that the most suitable location for the proposed building would be in the vicinity of Dovercourt road and Northumberland street.

Mr. MacNICOL: Northumberland street is a mile away from there.

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): That is the information I have here.

Mr. MacNICOL: Northumberland street would be almost a mile and a quarter from that location.

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): I am sorry; I had the wrong site. Here is the information. The property it is proposed to acquire consists of six lots on the south side of St. Clair avenue and one lot immediately behind, on Pleasant boulevard.

Item agreed to.

Engineering branch—Dredging—

829. Maritime provinces—further amount required, $152,500.

Mr. McLURE: I hope the minister has made provision in this estimate for the dredging at Rustico, for which I have asked on several occasions. I brought up the matter a year ago, and have had it up previously this session. I hope the minister will give me the assurance that this work will be carried out.

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): During the discussion of my main estimates I mentioned that we had Rustico on the list for dredging.

Item agreed to.

Engineering branch—Dredging—

831. Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Northwest Territories—further amount required, $32,774.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: When the minister's estimates were first under consideration some three weeks ago, the necessity of something being done for the preservation of Long lake was brought to his attention. At that time he stated he would take up the question with provincial authorities, and also, as I remember it, with the Department of Agriculture with a view to ascertaining what

could be and would be done. I should like a report, because the answer he gave me when I asked him for consideration of the matter has received approval both from the inhabitants and from the press in my province.

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): This question came up on June 23. Since that time I have discussed it with my deputy, and he is calling in engineers who will follow up the point developed by the hon member. There is nothing more of a definite nature I can say at the present time. However I am not losing sight of the matter. I shall submit the report when it is received from the engineer.

Item agreed to.

Engineering branch—Construction, repairs and improvements—harbours and rivers—Prince Edward Island—

838. Charlottetown—wharf reconstruction and improvements—further amount required (revote $53,000), $75,000.

Launching pond—Boat harbour, $50,000.

Souris—breakwater repairs—further amount required, $8,000.

Mr. McLURE: Is this for new work at Charlottetown wharf, or for continuance of work done last season?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): It is to complete the contract; it is not new work.

Item agreed to.

Engineering branch—Construction, repairs and improvements — harbours and rivers—Ontario—

841. Bracebridge—redredging, the provincial government to bear a like amount, $42,000.

Britt—wharf, $9,500.

Byng inlet, wharf, $9,600.

Fort William—dredging—further amount required, $45,000.

Grand River conservation scheme—contribution towards the cost of preliminary plans, test drilling, etc. in connection with proposed dam on the Conestoga river, $15,000.

Gull Bay—wharf—further amount required, $2,500.

Horse Shoe lake—wharf, $2,200.

Hudson—wavebreak boom—further amount required, $15,000.

Kenora—repairs to wharves—further amount required, $48,000.

Little Current—site for wharf, $25,000.

Meaford—revetment wall—further amount required, $22,500.

Morson—wharf replacement, $7,500.

Penetanguishene — harbour improvements, $50,000.

Port Hope—harbour repairs—further amount required, $27,000.

Port Loring—wharf, $5,000.

Rainy River—wharf reconstruction—further amount required, $15,000.

Redwood Road—wharf, $4,500.

Sheguindah—dredging, $85,000.

South Baymouth—dredging, $45,000.

Sturgeon Falls—wharf extension, $8,400.

Thames river—redredging—further amount required, $9,000.

Toronto—towards harbour improvements, $500,000.

Mr. MacNICOL: In respect of the Grand River conservation scheme, is the department proposing to put a dam on the Conestoga river?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): No; we have come to an understanding with the province of Ontario and the river conservation corporation. The amount is for cost of a survey and a report to be made as to the second part of that plan. The first part has been completed. This is to make a survey. The province of Ontario is paying 37½ per cent and the federal government the same amount. The corporation plans to make this survey.

Mr. MacNICOL: With respect to the redredging of the Thames river, I was in Kent county last Sunday, and was shocked to see beautiful farms more or less ruined because of the river having overflown its banks in recent floods. Something will have to be done to prevent flooding on the Thames river, just the same as is being and has been done on the Grand river.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the minister during the recess to give consideration to claims which from time to time have been put forward for harbour improvements at Port Credit?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): I will do that.

Item agreed to.

Engineering branch—Construction, repairs and improvements—harbours and rivers—Saskatchewan, Alberta and Northwest Territories—

843. Cold Lake, Alberta—breakwater, $6,000.

Great Bear River Road, N.W.T.—completion of payments for extension (revote), $10,000.

Mr. MacNICOL: For several years we have had an item in the estimates for the completion of the Great Bear lake river road. It is a short road, going around the rapids on Bear river. It is about time that job was completed.

Mr. JAQUES: Has the minister had the wharf at Pigeon lake examined, as he said he would do earlier in the session?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): During the discussion of the main estimates I undertook that in the recess the engineers would make a survey to see if the wharf at Pigeon lake is under the control of the Department of Public Works. If so we will do the necessary work to keep it in good repair.

Item agreed to.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

810. Departmental administration — further amount required, $175,000.

Mr. STOKES: Does this vote represent amounts to be applied to the cost of letter carrier delivery in any town in which it may be established?

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Postmaster General): This is the general administration item. It is in connection with the item at page 36 of the supplementary estimates setting out an amount of $968,766 to provide for the change in status of post offices to the staff post office basis and for the establishment of letter carrier service.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Marketing service—

708. Fruit, vegetables and maple products and honey—further amount required, $23,071.

Mr. GRAYDON: The matter about which I would speak has to do with the Department of National Revenue and the Department of Agriculture. If I may, I should like to place on record a letter I have received from Don W. Pallett, president of the Ontario Vegetable Growers and Ontario Food Council. This is a matter of extreme urgency, as both ministers will understand.

The letter is brief, and perhaps if I read it, it may not be necessary to have further debate in the matter. The letter states:

We are especially concerned at present over the large importations of American produce which are having a detrimental effect on our markets. We have never objected to out of season importations, but do object to competition caused by dumped produce when our fruit and vegetables are in season.

Enclosed is a recent market report which has several items illustrating what we mean. There may be several reasons for these excess importations:

1. Oversupply at shipping point encouraging dumping practices.
2. Extra activity on the part of importing brokers.
3. The threat of ad valorem duties justifying the wholesalers in stocking up.
4. Overzealousness and gambling spirit of the wholesaler, knowing that he can cover up losses with local goods on consignment later on.

There may be others too.

We have our problems on which we are working—better grades and packages, better distribution, longer seasons, et cetera. Our efforts are in vain when we often find our markets glutted before our crops begin. We do not need all this imported stuff. Why not save the money?

Best personal regards,

Don W. Pallett,
President, Ontario Vegetable Growers and Ontario Food Council

[Mr. A. Fournier.]

That man is a prominent grower in central Ontario. That letter emphasizes better than anything I can say, the urgent and extreme situation with which no doubt both ministers have been made acquainted within the last few days. I should like assurances from them that these matters will be looked into and dealt with effectively at once.

Hon. J. J. McCANN (Minister of National Revenue): The matter which the hon. gentleman has brought to our attention is one which has been brought to our attention by several other hon. members, particularly those from the agricultural, fruit and vegetable producing districts in western Ontario. It is a matter which is closely watched. The Department of National Revenue, customs and excise division, on the advice of the Department of Agriculture, put into effect such customs duties as will protect the market once we start producing those articles which are produced to the south probably a little earlier in the season. Immediately they come into production in any part of Canada, the customs duties go into effect.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is it not possible that on occasion the department applies these remedies a little late?

Mr. McCANN: That has not been our experience. We act within a very few hours on the recommendation of the agricultural officials. For instance, today I signed two, one covering beets and the other covering peaches.

Mr. CHARLTON: I just want to support what the hon. member for Peel has said. Yesterday I asked a question on the orders of the day, but I did not get a satisfactory answer. There are hundreds of cars of United States vegetables sitting on sidings in this country. If the minister says the situation is not serious, I would point out that it certainly is serious.

Item agreed to.

Special—

709. Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act and water storage (Item 30, of the main estimates for 1947-48, does not include the costs of survey and engineering work on the Medicine Hat irrigation and Red Deer diversion projects in Alberta and the South Saskatchewan river project in Saskatchewan, which costs are to be made available from the item of $5,000,000, No. 570, Department of Reconstruction and Supply, main estimates for 1947-48)—further amount required, $1.

Mr. MacNICOL: What is the explanation here?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Vote No. 570 was for $5,000,000. That is not appropriated to any specific project and this is to give final authority to the department to appropriate by

order in council any part of that $5,000,000 for any of these special items.

Mr. MacNICOL: The two matters referred to, the Red Deer and South Saskatchewan, are both important.

Item agreed to.

Special—

715. To authorize and provide for payment of subsidies on oats and barley used as feed for live stock under such regulations as may be approved by the governor in council—further amount required, $1,600,000.

Mr. CHARLTON: When the estimates of the Department of Agriculture were being taken up the Minister of Agriculture promised me a statement within three weeks in connection with the feed grain situation in eastern Canada. That was in the middle of June, and I wonder if we cannot get a statement before the house closes.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): I do not remember what the statement was.

Mr. CHARLTON: The minister promised me a statement within three weeks as to the freight subsidy policy.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): In connection with feed grains we cannot pay any more subsidy than has been paid up to this time.

Mr. CHARLTON: That is not the answer. The Minister of Agriculture has not seen fit to be in the house when his supplementary estimates totalling $3,000,000 are being passed. I understand that he is travelling in the west somewhere. I think he should have been here to answer this question, or at least some of his officials should have prepared a statement to be read before this house closed.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): I will see that the hon. gentleman gets an answer by mail.

Mr. GOLDING: The Minister of Finance made a statement in regard to the subsidy yesterday and again today.

Mr. CHARLTON: He said that the subsidy would not be continued any further. Is that the statement which is to be sent out to the country?

Mr. GOLDING: What statement does the hon. member wish?

Mr. CHARLTON: The price of small pigs and cattle in eastern Canada is away down to what it was. I could have brought little pigs for $3 two weeks ago. Surely we can get a statement.

Mr. GOLDING: What statement does the hon. member wish to have?

Mr. CHARLTON: As to whether the subsidies are to be continued after July 31, and about the freight subsidy.

Mr. GOLDING: The freight subsidy continues.

Mr. CHARLTON: We have not had a definite statement from the government that it will be.

Mr. BOUCHER: The committee will remember that last spring there was a great agitation in eastern Canada in particular, and all over Ontario in general, over the great shortage of feed grains. I think the minister stated that grains had been brought down in the fall by boat, but there was a shortage of cars at that time to bring any more in. Our agricultural areas will suffer severely from the shortage of feed grains. We have had a wet season and I think an attempt should be made to bring grain down by boat so that we will not have the same scarcity through a shortage of cars next year. Very little feed grain was stored in the elevator at Prescott last fall where ordinarily they would store quite a lot there. Poultry producers, and producers of live stock and meats were in a difficult situation because of the shortage of feed grains.

Mr. BRACKEN: The question asked by the hon. member for Brant sought to get information as to the subsidy on feed grain coming to eastern Canada from western Canada. The hon. member for Huron-Perth has said that the Minister of Finance answered that this afternoon. I understand that the minister left the impression that the subsidy would be continued until the end of July this year. But he gave no further assurance, and in fact he rather hinted that it might be discontinued.

Mr. GOLDING: That is the only information he gave.

Mr. BRACKEN: Is there anybody on the government side who can confirm that statement? If so, we could save a lot of time, because that is what the hon. member for Brant wanted. He wanted also to urge, in view of the feed situation in Ontario, that the subsidy should not be discontinued. I think someone should confirm the statement that is now made by the hon. member.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): If the hon. member wishes the question to stand until some of the officials of the Department of Agriculture can be consulted, I shall inquire and answer it.

Mr. BRACKEN: It would be an easy matter for some minister to make clear the answer to that question within the next half hour.

Mr. BENTLEY: In that connection, I remember the incident very well. It happened yesterday, and it was in answer to a question by the hon. member for Melfort who asked this question:

I wish to direct a question to the government. It should properly be directed to the Minister of Agriculture, but he is not here. In view of the extreme shortage of feed grains in eastern Canada, is the government giving further consideration to the matter of leaving the subsidies on coarse grains after July 31?

Mr. Bertrand (Laurier): May I take the question as a notice and answer later?

Mr. Wright: I believe the Minister of Finance was about to rise. Perhaps he can answer the question.

Hon. Douglas Abbott (Minister of Finance): The government is considering the matter. I seldom venture into the field of prophecy but it is unlikely that the subsidies will be continued for any stated period of time.

Mr. CHARLTON: Surely there should be someone on the government side who can give a definite statement regarding the continuation of the subsidy on feed grain and whether the freight rate policy is to be carried on. We have not any definite statement on that.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Mr. CHARLTON: It is not carried. This is a serious situation in eastern Canada. It is the most serious it has ever been, since it affects the production of practically everything. We notice that the consumption of butter is three million pounds above this time last year. If that situation is not remedied we shall not have any butter to supply ourselves in Canada next winter. It is important enough that surely the Minister of Agriculture should have left some statement.

Mr. KNOWLES: Telephone Jimmy.

Mr. GOLDING: I suggest that the item stand until we get the Minister of Finance to make a statement. He made the statement yesterday.

Mr. BRACKEN: All that is wanted now is a definite statement as to where the government stands with respect to the feed grain subsidies at the moment. Certain hon. members are recommending that it be continued. What we should like to have is the exact position the government takes on it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As I understand the statement of the Minister of Finance, it was to the effect that the matter referred to was under consideration by the government, which is correct. The minister said he would not venture into the realm of prophecy. He is obliged to wait until he has an opportunity of conferring with his colleagues in the government on it. Beyond that he could not go. That states the present position. The matter is still under consideration.

Mr. CHARLTON: The Minister of Agriculture made a definite statement when we were dealing with his estimates in the middle of June. He promised a statement before three weeks' time. It is now past four weeks, almost five weeks. Surely we can get something.

Mr. BRACKEN: If the matter is to be left over, is this the position? These freight rate subsidies are being continued, and the government is considering the other matter.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): He said, for the time being.

Mr. BRACKEN: The Minister of Finance left the impression that the feed grain subsidies probably would not be continued. I think that is the situation now. The hon. member for Brant and other hon. members are recommending that it should be continued.

Mr. ILSLEY: I am sorry to project myself into this discussion, but there are two subsidies. One is the freight rates subsidy and the other is the subsidy on coarse grains.

Mr. BOUCHER: Tell us about the other.

Mr. ILSLEY: The freight rates subsidies are being continued for the year. That is provided for in the estimates, but the other subsidy is the one which is under consideration and to which the Minister of Finance referred yesterday.

Mr. CHARLTON: That is to be dropped after the 31st of July? The subsidy on feed grain is to be dropped after the 31st day of July?

Mr. ILSLEY: The Minister of Finance did not say that. He said that the matter was under consideration, but that he would not venture into the realm of prophecy, but that he did not offer very much encouragement to the thought that it would be continued.

Mr. CHARLTON: He certainly intimated that it would not be paid after that day.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Mr. CHARLTON: That is the only thing we can take from it.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

719. Representation abroad—including salaries of high commissioners, ambassadors, ministers plenipotentiary, consuls, secretaries and staff, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act or any of its amendments—further amount required, $829,852.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Why is there such a tremendously additional amount for representation abroad? We now have an amount practically twenty-five per cent of the original amount. Why is it that we have such an addition at this time? Has there been a substantial increase since the first estimate?

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I will give the hon. member the break-down of this amount. There are for permanent salaries, $13,751; for temporary salaries, $38,164; for allowances, $27,065; for telegrams, $4,000; for sundries, $45,872; for new offices, $265,000; to build or purchase premises for offices or residences for missions abroad and furnish and equip premises, $411,000, of which $301,500 is for the purchase of the property in Washington; further amount required other than those voted to allow for adjustment in allowance scales to meet rising costs abroad, $25,000. That makes a total of $829,852.

Mr. BOUCHER: Does the amount of $411,000 include the expenses of taking material over to build a home for the ambassador in Japan or China?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No. The break-down would be as follows: for four new consulates, four months at $7,500 a month, $120,000; for Turkey, $60,000; Yugoslavia, $35,000; Switzerland, $72,160; India, $112,800; Sweden, $37,940; Poland, $65,000. I have the break-down of each if they are required; Czechoslovakia, $47,000; Rome, $80,000; Denmark, $10,000; offices of Canadian delegates to the united nations, permanent, temporary salaries and allowances, $24,593. That makes a total of $664,000 against which there was an appropriation in the general estimates of $400,000, leaving a balance of $264,493, to which there is to be added the cost of the Washington premises, $301,500. There are commitments for furnishings for offices abroad, $269,830; air-conditioning in Washington, $8,000; necessary cipher equipment, $31,670. That forms, with the $264,493, $611,000. There was a second item of $200,000 in the general estimate, leaving a balance of $411,000, and the $269,000 includes, in respect of Nanking, $67,000.

Mr. BOUCHER: That is the estimated cost of building the residence for the ambassador in China?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: That is only a portion of it.

Mr. BOUCHER: What is the total cost calculated to be?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The total expenditure in Nanking is, for furnishings for residence and office, $38,270; purchase of land, $62,952; cost of three prefabricated houses, one being a double house, $43,968.55, or a total of $145,191.65.

Mr. BOUCHER: These prefabricated houses have been transported to be put up in Nanking?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Yes.

Mr. BOUCHER: Does that include the total cost of taking the material there, including transportation, or is it the bare cost of material?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: There are, in addition to that, freight charges on the prefabricated houses of $20,000 odd.

Item agreed to.

Canadian contribution to international or commonwealth organizations—

723. Canada's contribution to the united nations educational, scientific and cultural organization, $57,600.

Mr. JAQUES: I wish to quote two or three short statements because I have no desire to detain the committee with a speech. I begin with a statement which the Prime Minister made on June 19, 1947, when he said:

> We stand today at the cross-roads of the world. The release of atomic energy marks the opening of a new life. Whether the new age will be one of unprecedented progress in human welfare or one of unparalleled destruction depends more than all else on whether the affairs of the nations are to be based on a Christian or a pagan philosophy. If we cease to be Christian countries we are doomed.

I believe that the vast majority of Canadians will agree with that statement. There are very few Canadians who would venture to dispute those words.

But, with regard to UNESCO, which means the united nations educational, scientific and cultural organization, I may say that the director general is Julian Huxley and the magazine *Time* states that he is a scientific atheist. He has made the statement that Darwin made it possible to dispense with the idea of God. For the justification of our moral code we no longer have to have recourse to theological revelation. Freud, in combination with Darwin, suffices. This magazine further states that Julian Huxley, the director

of UNESCO, has placed on its agenda his proposal to reconcile the philosophies of communism and capitalism and to promote the study of psychoanalysis.

It is not a case of communism versus capitalism, but of Christianity versus paganism.

I should like to quote a few words by Professor Laski, who, I believe, is now a director of UNESCO, in his book, "Faith, Reason and Civilization." At age 63 he states:

> Given the fact of victory by the united nations, it seems to me inescapable that the Russian idea will play the same part as the principles of 1789 in reconstituting the outlook of the next age. Unless we claim that the churches will renew their hold on men's allegiance—and there is no serious evidence for the validity of such a claim—the Russian idea seems likely to be the pivotal source from which all values will find the means of renewal.

On page 72 he says:

> The Christian faith, in its period of power, overcame this consequence—

That is, the consequence of the inequality of fortune.

> —by offering to the common man the secret consolation of heaven. But now that the basis upon which that faith was built has crumbled before critical examination, neither the churches nor any other religious organizations can hope to effect the work of renovation.

Those are the views of pagan philosophers. I am not denouncing these men for the views they hold. They have, of course, as much right to their views as I have to mine. I object, however, to the spending of public money to give them the advantage of spreading those pagan ideas among the people of the world.

In contrast, I should like to give two brief quotations. One is by Christopher Dawson, and I take him to be the same Christopher Dawson who, some years ago was editor of the London *Times*. He said:

> By democracy we mean not merely self-government but rather that particular form of government which was based on the ideal of personal liberty. The roots of liberty lie deep in the soil of western Christendom, so that it is impossible to understand it right if we separate it from its religious and cultural background. The whole democratic tradition derived its strength from the Christian belief in the absolute and unique value of the human individual soul which infinitely transcends all wealth and power and glory of the world.

And, finally, the Italian Christian politician Luigi Sturzo wrote, quite recently:

> Without the basis of a true Christianity, a true form of Christian democracy could not develop, particularly because modern democracy is the fruit of Christian civilization and has little in common with the pre-Christian classico-Mediterranean forms of democracy.

Those are the views of Christian philosophers.

[Mr. Jaques.]

I wish to place that on the record for the benefit of the people, for I believe that with these two last statements, together with that of the Prime Minister, the vast majority of Canadians will agree. As the Prime Minister says, if we cease to be Christian nations we are doomed.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I believe in international cooperation and I believe in educational things. I should like to ask the minister if, in his opinion, the contributions under that heading are being used in a sensible and effective way?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The amount that is called for here is the difference in what is due by the Canadian government under the charter which was ratified last year on the apportionment that was effectively made of the 1947 budget.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Will the minister say what the total amount is?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I am just coming to that. The UNESCO budget for 1947 was $6,950,000, and we had calculated, in the further supplementary estimates that we passed before the end of the last fiscal year, that our contribution would be on the same scale as to the united nations, namely, 3·20 per cent. We provided in those estimates the sum of $255,672. But, as a matter of fact, our contribution was assessed at 3·92 per cent. It is the difference between our apportionment at 3·20 per cent and at 3·92 per cent which is provided in this supplementary vote. That is something which, under the undertaking we made last year, we owe as an international debt. This is required to pay that debt. As to whether Canada has received value for its contribution is a question about which I suppose opinions might differ. So far, the achievements of the organization have not been considered. Another meeting is to take place in Mexico in November. Canada will have a delegation at that meeting, but a most modest delegation.

Mr. MacNICOL: The smaller the better.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I would not care to engage in a controversy as to whether, up to the present time, there have been achievements commensurate with the expenditure which has been incurred. The aims are certainly high and noble ones, and I hope they will be achieved.

Mr. HACKETT: Why was our contribution raised from 3·20 per cent to 3·92 per cent? Did some country fail to pay its quota?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No. But on examining the basis, which is usually a complicated formula, account is taken of population, national income and ability to provide foreign exchange. On that basis the apportionment was made at 3·92 per cent instead of 3·20 per cent as we anticipated, because of what had been done in the other organizations. But the other organizations, I must confess, comprised a larger number of members. For instance, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is in the united nations and bears a proportion of the expenses, though not a large one, whereas it is not in UNESCO.

Mr. McLURE: I have spoken of this matter before. In all these estimates there are large sums of money for temporary assistance. I think next year we should have something to show what that temporary assistance is. For instance, running through these estimates there are over $156,000,000 under the heading of temporary assistance. I have asked almost every minister about that and some of them have given a partial answer, calling them temporary employees. That seems to me a tremendous amount for temporary employees. Why should they not be made permanent?

Item agreed to.

908. General post—UNRRA relief, including payment to the international children's emergency fund, subject to such terms and conditions as may be approved by the governor in council, $20,000,000.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I take just five seconds here to say that the parliament of Canada is really proud to be passing this item. We can only wish it might be larger.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

379. Departmental administration, $246,417.

Mr. HACKETT: I wish to ask the minister a question before we take up his estimates. I am informed that the ship *Innishowen Head* arrived in the port of Montreal this morning carrying 680 bags of flour which were returned to Canada from Britain. I should like to know if the minister can explain the reason for the return of this food which we understand is so desperately needed in England and on the continent.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I cannot conceive of this transaction having taken place. I cannot conceive of 680 bags of flour having been returned from the United Kingdom. I have heard nothing about it. It is true that our contract to deliver flour to the United Kingdom has been filled, but there is provision for an extra supply being sent. I am sure the United Kingdom would be delighted to receive an over amount. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is that I shall make inquiries. There must be some mistake.

Mr. HACKETT: Of course there is no mistake about the fact. There may be some as to the explanation.

Mr. FLEMING: I have some observations to make which I should like to compress into the space of about two minutes.

In the first place, I wish to say that I think it is deplorable that we are arriving now within a matter of thirty minutes of prorogation without there having been a really serious debate on Canadian trade policy, particularly when great events are occurring in the world today which may have an influential part in shaping the course of this country's future, particularly in the matter of her prosperity, her development and her relations with the world. I hope the minister will take at least enough time to impart to the committee an enunciation in clear terms of the trade policy of the government, and I invite him to do so with particular reference to two matters. The first is the preparatory conference at Geneva which has been in progress for several months looking to the formation of the international trade organization. We have had no report in the house on the progress made there. I can appreciate that there may be difficulties in making an extended report, in view of the negotiations there. But it is a matter of tremendous importance to this country. It would have been well, I think, if parliament had been invited to subscribe to some principles which might have been a guide to the Canadian delegation at Geneva. At the present time it seems to me that the head of the Canadian delegation there must be in some difficulty in proceeding to negotiate with the delegations of other countries, in the absence of some clear indication on the part of parliament as to where it stands with reference to future trade policies.

The other matter to which I wish to refer has to do with the dangers incident to the rather lopsided trade position in which Canada finds herself at the present time. I do not intend to belabour the point. It was touched on once or twice—altogether too briefly, I think—during the budget debate. I refer to the fact that our relationship with the United States, the country with which we do by far our biggest trade, leaves us in a position in which we have a substantial and growing adverse balance in respect of our commodity trade. That adverse trading balance last year was by far the largest in the history

of this country, and it is still growing. The deficit in 1946 jumped to $603,000,000; and in the first four months of this year, 1947, the trading deficit on commodity account only with the United States was $303,000,000. If the present rate continues, the deficit for the entire year 1947 will amount to $900,000,000. That is a serious situation. Different members of the house recently asked the Minister of Finance for some statement as to Canada's position in this regard, but we have not been given any such statement. This matter is of the utmost importance to Canada, and I hope the minister will take time to give the committee some clear enunciation of government policy in reference to it.

Mr. MacKINNON: The question regarding the international trade conference at Geneva was asked of my colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and his answer appears at page 2000 of *Hansard*, I can read that answer. The conference at Geneva is being participated in by officials of the Department of External Affairs, the Department of Finance and the Department of Trade and Commerce. At that time my colleague said:

> As to whether it will be possible for me to make or table a report on the discussions of the preliminary conference in London, that is something I would have to consider, because, being only one of the members of the conference, we shall have to see to it that we do not publicize anything which it might not be agreeable to the other conferees to have publicized before the line of conduct decided upon at that conference has been implemented in the negotiations at Geneva.

In connection with the matter of trade, Canada's over-all position with all countries practically balances. It is true that there is a very great adverse balance with the United States, and that is something which is giving myself and my colleagues of finance and external affairs, both of whom are closely connected with the matter, very great concern. We cannot stop our people from buying in the United States except by the usual way of imposing tariffs. But we can do our utmost to persuade our people to make their purchases in sterling countries, particularly the United Kingdom, and countries to which we have made loans. We are doing that, and the whole matter is receiving the earnest and serious consideration of the department. We are also pressing in every possible way our sales to hard currency countries such as South Africa. That is a sterling country, of course, but it is backed by gold. Our trade with South Africa has increased very greatly in the past few years, and at the present time that country is our second largest cash customer. We are also increasing our trade definitely and substantially with all the countries of Latin America.

I do not think I can say much further at the moment. The two main things I want to emphasize are that we are trying to buy as much as possible from the United Kingdom and the countries to which we have made loans, and to make as many sales as possible to hard currency countries.

Mr. FLEMING: If the department is seeking to expand our imports from the United Kingdom the figures do not indicate that it is meeting with very much success this year. Our imports from the United Kingdom in the first four months of 1946—I am speaking of commodities—amounted to $68,000,000. In the first four months of 1947 they had fallen to $51,000,000, or a drop of about one-quarter in our total commodity imports from the United Kingdom in the first four months of this year as compared with the first four months of 1946. This does not indicate that the department is experiencing much success in trying to redress our present lopsided trade position. We are continuing to increase our imports from the United States, boosting our adverse trade position with that country, and at the same time our purchases of commodities in the United Kingdom show a substantial decrease.

May I now return to the first point on which I asked the minister for a statement. All he has given us is a reiteration of a statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs a matter of about three months ago, in which that right hon. gentleman said, in effect, that he did not feel free to make any statement to the house concerning the preliminary conference at London which preceded the conference at Geneva of the nations meeting there with a view to laying the foundations of an international trade organization. We were not told anything about the outcome of the London preparatory conference. We have not as yet been told anything with regard to the progress of the Geneva conference. The point I am making is this, and to me it is a matter of the utmost importance, not only for today, but for the years ahead. Parliament has not been given any report on the instructions that were given to the Canadian delegates to Geneva. Parliament has not been asked to give them any guidance. Parliament has not been given any statement on government policy. Parliament has not been asked to give approval or disapproval to any instructions given those delegates. This matter is

far too important for Canada and the world to be ignored in that way. Even at this late hour I say it is most deplorable that there has not been a proper debate on this subject and a proper enunciation of government policy.

Mr. BRACKEN: I wish to ask the minister one question before the item is carried. It has to do with one feature of the British wheat agreement. I am speaking now from memory, but I understand that the price is fixed at $1.55 a bushel for the years 1945, 1946 and 1947, but that for the year 1948 it is fixed only as regards the minimum; that is, that it will not be less than $1.25. I understand it is required in the agreement that there be a meeting and a decision by December of this year with respect to the price for the 1948 crop.

I should like the minister to outline to the committee, if he will, the attitude of the government with respect to the price that will be fixed for the 1948 crop. The fact is that for three years the western wheat farmer has been receiving, under the British wheat agreement much less, about a dollar per bushel less than the world price. The government is now going to enter into discussions with the British government in December with respect to the price of wheat for next year. I would like the minister to tell us what he can as to the attitude of the government toward the settlement of that price. It is indicated in the agreement that the British government are to have regard to the conditions obtaining in previous years. I presume this means that they would have regard to the excess of the world price over the price Britain has paid. In view of the fact that the 1948 price will have to be settled; in view of the fact that we have been required to accept a price very much less than the world price, I ask the minister to tell us the attitude of the department and the government as to price in approaching that question next December.

Mr. MacKINNON: I think the leader of the opposition, in asking his question, has answered it. The attitude of the government is that we are relying on the "having regard to" clause in the contract, so that in our negotiations for settlement of the 1948 price some time before the end of this year the fact that wheat grown by the western farmer has been sold at a price less than the world price will be taken into consideration when the 1948 price is arrived at. These discussions will, I believe, be entered into late this summer or in the early fall.

Mr. BRACKEN: Can the minister say now that the price will be higher than the price at which the government has sold the crops of 1945, 1946 and 1947, in view of the fact that we have been taking a lower price? I expect the government will try to get a higher price for the 1948 crop. Can the minister say that?

Mr. MacKINNON: We have gone through only one year now of the two years at the $1.55 price. There is still another year to be taken into consideration. However I know that those who will be carrying on these negotiations for the govenment will endeavour to get as fair a return for the Canadian producer as can be obtained, always having regard to the price at which wheat was sold in the first two years of the contract.

Mr. BRACKEN: Can the minister say what the world price is today?

Mr. MacKINNON: Yesterday it was $2.63 a bushel.

Mr. BRACKEN: Can the minister say whether he will undertake to get as much as the world price now is for the 1948 crop?

Mr. MacKINNON: I cannot say what will be achieved or what will be undertaken; but I may say that the British minister of food, speaking in the house at Westminster, said on July 1:

> I feel confident that at the end of the four years both we and the Canadian farmers will find the prices negotiated and to be negotiated under that contract will have turned out to be a just and equitable bargain, immensely beneficial to both parties.

Mr. BRACKEN: That may be his opinion; but the Canadian people will need some persuasion if they are to be made to think that western farmers have been treated fairly in the matter of wheat prices in this arrangement. Can the minister say, in respect of this 160 million bushels a year that they have been selling at $1.55 per bushel under the British wheat agreement—I presume the world price has averaged more than a dollar more than that—whether in the 1948 price we shall get as much as the average of the world price during the first three years?

Mr. MacKINNON: I cannot say what we shall get. I know that the negotiations will be carried on to get the best possible deal for the wheat grower. The leader of the opposition mentioned that the average price was approximately $1 a bushel less. I believe it is about seventy-seven cents, on the average, less.

Mr. BRACKEN: If we have taken seventy-seven cents less than the world price for two or three years can the minister say—

Mr. MacKINNON: That is only one year.

Mr. BRACKEN: Well, whatever period it is. Will the minister try to get at least that much in addition to the present $1.55?

Mr. MacKINNON: Well, I did not negotiate this agreement, myself. But I know —at least I think—that my colleague who did negotiate it and who will be carrying on the negotiations will be endeavouring to get what the hon. member is suggesting.

Mr. HACKETT: Who negotiated it?

Mr. MacKINNON: The Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): I should like to speak, Mr. Chairman, but it has nothing to do with wheat.

Mr. BRACKEN: Let us finish this first, please.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The minister said he had nothing to do with negotiating it.

Mr. MacKINNON: I did not say I had nothing to do with it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The minister said he did not negotiate it.

Mr. MacKINNON: That is correct.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Who did?

Mr. MacKINNON: The preliminary negotiations were carried on by me and by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture. In the later negotiations, when the final arrangements were arrived at, the Minister of Agriculture carried on those negotiations.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Were the final negotiations and prices arrived at communicated to the minister before they were accepted by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. MacKINNON: Yes, they were.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There are a number of questions I should like to ask the minister in connection with what he has said to the leader of the opposition. He has stated that the average world price during the past year has been approximately seventy-seven cents higher than that paid under the British agreement.

Mr. MacKINNON: Correct.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: How does he arrive at that figure of seventy-seven cents? He has told my leader that the world price today is approximately $2.63. Has it not been higher than that during the past year?

Mr. MacKINNON: Yes.

[Mr. MacKinnon.]

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What has been the high point in world price during the past year?

Mr. MacKINNON: When the contract was under negotiation the price was $1.80 to $1.90.

In answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Lake Centre, I should like to place on *Hansard* a statement showing the price of class II wheat for the month of June, and also the price for each date during the month of June. Then, I would also place on *Hansard* a record of wheat and flour sales to the various countries to which wheat and flour have been sold. If these can be placed on *Hansard* I believe they will answer the hon. member. The tables are as follows:

The price of class II wheat for the month of June is as follows:

Date, 1947 June	Price of class II wheat, basis No. 1 northern
1	$2.89
2	2.79
3	2.78
4	2.78
5	2.76
6	2.76
7	2.72
8	2.72
9	2.72
10	2.64
11	2.59
12	2.58
13	2.56
14	2.55
15	2.55
16	2.50
17	2.50
18	2.53
19	2.54
20	2.53
21	2.53
22	2.53
23	2.53
24	2.49
25	2.49
26	2.50
27	2.48
28	2.45
29	2.45
30	2.45

Class II Wheat and Flour Sales June 1 to June 30, 1947

(Excluding bonded mills)

June, 1947

	Wheat, Flour Wheat (bus. of wheat)
British	
Br. Ship Stores	918
Br. W. Africa	8,460
Gold Coast	1,089
Nyasaland	1,378
Sierre Leone	15,842
Bermuda	16,274
Br. Guiana	71,662
Br. Honduras	6,412

Class II Wheat and Flour Sales June 1 June 30, 1947—Con.
(Excluding bonded mills)

	June, 1947	
	Wheat, Flour Wheat (bus. of wheat)	
Br. W. Indies		
Antigua	5,405	
Bahamas	13,770	
Barbados	32,434	
Dominican Isls.	5,062	
Grenada	12,944	
Jamaica	111,600	1,248
Montserrat	1,800	
St. Vincent	9,000	13
Trinidad	230,625	
Newfoundland	92,247	
Belgium		2,419,310
Belgian Congo	3,674	
Brazil	75,157	
China	4,592	
Colombia	11,480	
Costa Rica	19,630	
Dominican Republic	15,497	
Ecuador	459	
Eire	190,266	
France	329,118	
Fr. W. Africa	34,900	
St. Pierre and Miquelon	1,823	
Guatemala	2,525	
Haiti	6,887	
Holland	9,184	
Iceland	24	
India	1,061,220	
Italy	656,062	
Liberia	1,378	
Netherlands	1,837	1,044,397
Netherlands W. Indies	21,178	
Netherlands Guiana	29,219	
Nicaragua	2,295	
Norway	375,426	
Panama	10,709	
Philippines	12,352	
Poland	8,100	
Portugal	32,373	
Azores and Madeira	13,314	
Port. E. Africa	1,261	
Port. India	2,295	
Spanish Honduras	2,754	
Switzerland	8,093	
Syria	17,494	
UNRRA	54,709	
United States (Feed)		8,137
Venezuela	124,424	
Virgin Islands	1,836	
Totals	3,780,467	3,473,105

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The tables the minister has placed on *Hansard* do not answer what I have asked, although they do answer a question of which I had given notice. I had asked as to how much wheat had been sold each week in the past three weeks to countries other than Great Britain.

The minister stated that over a considerable period of time the price was not more than $1.80 on the world market. When was the last occasion within the last year when the world price was as low as $1.80.

Mr. MacKINNON: I have not the figures in detail, but the crop year last August started at $2.05.

Mr. HACKETT: What was the high?

Mr. MacKINNON: The high during the year was $3.10.

Mr. HACKETT: In United States funds?

Mr. MacKINNON: No, Canadian funds.

Mr. ROWE: What is it now?

Mr. MacKINNON: It was $2.58 this afternoon.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I object strenuously to a department such as the Department of Trade and Commerce being brought in at the last moment.

Mr. MacKINNON: It was not my wish.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am not going to enter into a controversy, because no one wants to father the fact that this important department has not come in before. When the general discussion took place in regard to the wheat agreement, representations were made by the leader of the opposition and others on this side that reconsideration should be given to paying the participation certificates on the 1945 crop instead of waiting until 1949 or 1950. When the matter was brought up, the Minister of Agriculture said that, in the light of changing conditions, consideration would be given by the government to making some provision along that line. Having regard to the condition in which the prairie provinces find themselves as a result of drought this year, is the government giving consideration to paying the 1945 participation certificates this year?

Mr. MacKINNON: The government has not decided to change its policy, which is embodied in legislation, to include 1945 in the five-year pool.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We are approaching eleven o'clock and I would move that the committee rise, report progress and ask to sit again this day in order that I may move that the house do not adjourn at eleven o'clock today. I believe it is quite in order that we be allowed a little latitude, and I know the deputy Governor General is ready to accommodate hon. members.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I move:

That the house do not adjourn at eleven o'clock today.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East): I should like to say a word or two about the matter of export permits which was brought up a day or two ago, particularly with regard to registered breeding stock going to the United States. Several shipments from western Ontario were held up because the shippers had not export permits. An order in council was passed which cleaned up the matter, but one shipper had eighty head of dairy cattle which were held up for two weeks. At the end of that time some of the cattle were not in condition to ship and he had to take a considerable loss. We need United States dollars, and we should not put anything in the way of farmers who are trying to export our goods to the United States.

On the other hand, vegetables and fruits are coming into this country from the United States. Practically every year the dumping duties on tomatoes, early potatoes and other vegetables are put on too late. In other words, our Canadian farmer gets the raw end of the deal practically every time. Representations have been made this year with regard to certain articles, but action was not taken as early as it should have been. A week and a half ago there were thirty carloads of tomatoes on the Toronto market and field tomatoes were coming in from the Essex area. I called up the department about the matter, and they said that nothing could be done about tomatoes because they did not come under the dumping duties regulation. The farmer gets stung either way.

Blueberries are being brought into this country and yet they are grown here. We would save exchange if money was not being spent for United States blueberries, and there are other things that could be mentioned.

Before the war I and a number of others were interested in the export of honey to England. That is a thing of the past and I doubt if we shall be able to get back into that market. We are going to reach a time when there will be a surplus of honey in Canada. There is a market in the United States at the present time. I am not saying that the export restrictions on honey should be removed, but do not let us get into the fix where we are stuck with honey and have not a market. I believe a few token shipments should be permitted. I know of a man in California who would like to get some of our buckwheat honey, which is not usually used as a table honey in this country, for medicinal purposes. I took this matter up with the export permit people, but I was refused a permit today because they said there was a shortage in Canada.

The farmers in Middlesex county have a lot of good fat cattle. I attended a farmers' picnic yesterday and they told me that they are worried about the cattle business. They realize that we should retain the British market, but they do not like the idea of the packers being able to drop the price a cent or two in a week or a day. They believe that if the United States market were opened, say for a week, that would not occur. I would suggest that the first time the price of beef cattle drops the restrictions on shipments to the United States should be lifted for a week to see what happens to the cattle market. I am asking this for the protection of farmers in Ontario.

Mr. BRYCE: I should like to say a couple of words with regard to the wheat agreement. I wish to draw attention to the rising costs which are faced by farmers. Our farmers want stabilization more than anything else, and the wheat agreement was the finest thing we have yet got. It is the best break that has ever come to the western farmer, the stabilization of wheat prices and an agreement for five years. We know that $1.35 was never recognized as parity; it was only the price set with participation certificates over a period of five years. Parity to the farmer means a share of the national income, approximately equal to the proportion of the farmers to the national population. The government will have to see that the prices of things the farmer has to buy, his gas, his oil, his binder twine and so forth, are kept at reasonable levels. The prices of these things have gone up. If you are to bind the farmer to the agreement, which the farmer wants—he is quite pleased with the controlled market—you will have to control the other fellow's prices. If you let the other fellow set his own prices it will not be a square deal for the farmers. I do not want to take up a lot of time; I could speak for forty minutes on this. You have given the farmer the British wheat agreement which is the best step that has ever been taken. I have lived on the prairies for pretty nearly thirty years. I know what I am talking about. You have taken the speculation out of grain and the farmer is getting a set price for five years. The farmer is better off today than he has been for some considerable time. The war did that. I deplore the fact that we had to have a war to bring that about. If you want to keep the farmer in a healthy position, then you must

control the other fellows who are going to make that $1.35 look like nothing.

Item agreed to.

383. Industrial development division, $23,402.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Will the minister say just a word as to the nature of the industrial development division?

Mr. MacKINNON: This is a branch which has been established in the department, headed by a particularly able man to keep in close touch with all the industrial development work in the various centres throughout Canada, with the provinces and the railways.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): What does it mean "to keep in touch with the various centres"? Is he guiding or stimulating or what?

Mr. MacKINNON: I might give a formal answer. The industrial development division has recently been organized for the purpose of centralizing federal government cooperation with provincial and municipal agencies, industrial development branches of banks, railways, power companies, et cetera, interested in the establishment of new industries in Canada. The division will also endeavour to arrange for the manufacture of new products under licence or royalty by existing Canadian firms, and the finding of new products for manufacture.

Item agreed to.

390. Exhibitions, including a contribution of $1,000 to the International Bureau of Exhibitions, $329,407.

Mr. McLURE: Is this a travelling exhibition showing the products of Canada?

Mr. MacKINNON: This is for participation in various international exhibitions, including the British trade fair.

Item agreed to.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics—

392. Statistics, including contribution of $2,460 to the International Statistical Institute, $2,510,255.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Does it really cost $2,500,000 to provide statistics? Do I read that correctly?

Mr. MacKINNON: That is the cost of our bureau of statistics.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): The figure fairly staggers me. I wish it were earlier in the session to discuss it. It seems to me an appalling figure.

Item agreed to.

Canada Grain Act—

400. Canadian government elevators, including equipment, $737,277.

Mr. TOWNLEY-SMITH: I take it that these elevators earn considerable revenue. Does this item mean that this sum has to be poured in in addition to the revenue to make these elevators break even, or what is the explanation of this item?

Mr. MacKINNON: This item is the gross expenditure. The revenue goes into the consolidated revenue fund of the dominion.

Mr. TOWNLEY-SMITH: Where does one find the figure which will give an actual accounting of the operations of these elevators?

Mr. MacKINNON: In the board of grain commissioners annual report, which has been tabled.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Does this mean that what we charge for the use of these elevators is $700,000 short of what it costs us? I see that there is some equipment in the item. How much do we lose in operating these, and why do we need to lose anything? Why not charge enough to cover the cost?

Mr. MacKINNON: We do not lose anything; the revenue more than covers the cost shown here.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is the government still renting out some of the government elevators to private concerns?

Mr. MacKINNON: One elevator at the head of the lakes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: To whom?

Mr. MacKINNON: McCabe Brothers.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is the annual rental?

Mr. MacKINNON: I have not the figure before me; I can get it very easily.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I remember one time the government was renting an elevator to one of the companies, and paying that elevator company about $80,000 a year to store government wheat. Does that condition still prevail?

Mr. MacKINNON: The elevator in question was advertised for rental, and extensively advertised. Only one offer was received, and that was from McCabe Brothers. The board of grain commissioners were not quite satisfied with the offer and negotiated a better arrangement with McCabe Brothers, which is in operation now. Although I cannot give the figure, I know the contract is a very satisfac-

tory one from the point of view of the government.

Item agreed to.

Canadian government travel bureau—
401. To assist in promoting the tourist business in Canada, $650,000.

Mr. FLEMING: I wish to ask the minister if it is a matter of policy to maintain close contact between the Canadian government travel bureau and other departments of government whose functions have a bearing on the attraction of tourists to Canada. I think we have at the head of the Canadian government travel bureau a very competent director in Mr. Dolan. Every one of us admits the importance of this tourist traffic to Canada. It is one of the biggest industries we have and it has a great future ahead of it. I am thinking more of keeping in closest contact with government departments which are in a position to assist the work of the bureau in stimulating tourist traffic coming to this country. I may give an illustration. Last September I was in Nanaimo. Nanaimo formerly used to receive a generous share of the United States tourist trade; but latterly, because of neglect of the harbour, the businessmen of that city, speaking through the board of trade, were complaining strongly that they were losing part of the United States tourist traffic they had previously enjoyed. In a situation of that kind, is some attempt made to keep these government departments in contact with one another, so that these departments whose functions have a bearing on the attraction of tourists to Canada are doing their utmost to assist the work of Mr. Dolan and the staff of the Canadian travel bureau?

Mr. MacKINNON: The bureau does keep in close touch with other branches of government, such as national parks; and along the same line, we keep in very close touch with the operations of the provincial bureaux. Last fall we originated the idea of having a joint conference of provincial tourist organizations with us in Ottawa. It was very successful, and there has been a desire from all provinces to repeat it this year. We propose to call another conference in October.

Mr. FLEMING: That is all to the good. The matter of cooperation between the dominion bureau and the provincial departments is commendable, but I do not think the minister has my point. I am thinking about other federal departments. The responsibility for keeping harbours in proper condition belongs to the public works department. Is some attempt being made by these departments to keep in touch with the travel bureau and to accept suggestions which will enable the bureau to carry on the function of attracting more tourists?

Mr. MacKINNON: I am told that such an attempt is being made.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE

Customs and excise divisions—
244. General administration, $1,168,648.

Mr. FLEMING: There are two inquiries I wish to make on specific matters. They affect the administration of the Department of National Revenue in Toronto. One has to do with income tax and the other with customs. I will deal with income tax first. This has to do with salaries of staff.

Hon. J. J. McCANN (Minister of National Revenue): Customs and excise first.

Mr. FLEMING: My inquiry has to do with existing bonded warehouse facilities in Toronto. At the present time, I am informed, the bonded warehouse facilities there are quite inadequate. The business which the present facilities have been called upon to provide for has been growing very rapidly. In fact, I am told that in recent years it has practically doubled. In 1942 there were 800 entries a day and fourteen checkers. Today, I am informed, the number of daily entries is 1,500 and the number of checkers has not increased. In other words, the same staff is called upon to handle practically double the work. That is on the aspect of staff.

In addition, there is the question of accommodation. At the present time there is a C.N.R. bonded warehouse at Simcoe and Wellington, C.P.R. accommodation in the dominion public building on Front Street, and a C.N. express office in the same building. According to my information, the accommodation is quite inadequate and, by reason of the insufficiency of both accommodation and staff, there is a good deal of complaint about the slowness of the service. Sometimes, I understand, there are delays of three days to a week in obtaining delivery of goods after they have been cleared through the customs. That is a serious matter for a good many importers, and I would urge upon the minister that steps be taken to increase the staff and improve the accommodation.

We must bear in mind that this is a service which provides the country with revenue, and those who are paying the revenue through customs duties have a right to expect that

facilities shall be provided and that the bonded warehouses will give good and efficient service.

Mr. McCANN: The points that have been brought to my attention by the hon. member, we are quite aware of. The trouble has been due, in the main to the difficulty of securing facilities to meet the increased amount of business offering. That applies both to the tax division and to customs and excise. I cannot say that we have had any particular complaints as to delay or shortage of staff, but we will inquire into the matter.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Early in the session I said that I had been informed that large quantities of cigarettes and tobacco seized under the authority of the department were destroyed, and I asked the minister to consider having such cigarettes and tobacco distributed instead to veterans hospitals. I believe the minister replied on that occasion that the policy of destruction would continue. Later on, I placed on the order paper certain questions asking what goods had been destroyed, what goods had been sold and the various quantities and value. The reply showed that a considerable quantity of cigarettes and tobacco had been disposed of in this way.

I should like to find out why we are destroying cigarettes in this way when the Department of Veterans Affairs, from profits on canteens, is purchasing cigarettes and distributing them to patients. In addition to that, various organizations are canvassing for money for cigarettes and distributing these cigarettes free to hospitals and large numbers of individuals are also distributing cigarettes to veterans hospitals. If a patient undergoing treatment is not entitled to hospital allowances, the regulations provide for the payment to him of a monthly allowance of $5, which he may use to purchase cigarettes or any other articles he requires.

I should like to read a resolution passed at the 18th convention of the British Columbia command of the Canadian Legion held at Vernon, British Columbia, in May, 1947. This resolution reads:

Resolved that the government be requested to revert back to the system whereby cigarettes and tobaccos, etc., which become the property of the government of Canada by seizure, be handed over to an organization or organizations, for distribution to veterans who are receiving treatment in departmental institutions throughout the country.

I urge the minister to consider having seized cigarettes and tobacco handed over to the Department of Veterans Affairs for distribution throughout veterans affairs hospitals, instead of being destroyed, as at present.

Mr. McCANN: I believe the question was dealt with fairly well in the answer I gave. During the war years, cigarettes seized were turned over to the Red Cross for distribution. The experience of the department following the first great war in handing cigarettes over to other institutions did not work out very well, because the people for whom they were intended never got them, and the very fact that Canadian manufacturers pay an excise tax is another reason why we have not been distributing them. I will look further into the matter.

Mr. PROBE: It is my desire to voice a grievance with respect to the Department of National Revenue. The minister is familiar with the case I have to present at this time. Some months ago, in the city of Regina a war veteran, an air force officer who had been shot down over Germany and had spent twenty months in a prisoners of war camp, received a reestablishment credit or the blessing of the department to reestablish himself as a customs broker in that city. The business in Regina is quite ample to look after this young man's business if he had been able to receive a licence from the licensing advisory committee established for that purpose by the Department of National Revenue. There are only two customs brokers in that city and one operates exclusively for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The licensing advisory committee refused this young man's application for a licence to become a customs broker in my city, even though he was eminently qualified for that work. The reason given by the licensing advisory committee was that the father of the young air force officer was an employee of the customs branch at the city of Regina. That, of course, is correct.

The point I wish to make is this. By virtue of what the licensing advisory committee decided, in accordance with the regulations of the Department of National Revenue, they continued a monopoly in a very lucrative business in the city of Regina which could be advantageously used for the reestablishment of this young man. In view of the fact that the father is within a year or two of superannuation, it seems to me that the Department of National Revenue could make alternative arrangements for the employ of the father in order to permit the young man, who is married, to have an opportunity of reestablishing himself. I realize that there may be some confidential matters in the relationship

between an appraiser at a customs port and a customs broker. But surely the fact that father and son happened to be in lines of work which affect the same commodity should be no more reason for refusing to consider the case or make some reasonable adjustment of the claim than in the case of the Minister of National Revenue himself who, in my opinion, left himself wide open not so very long ago by occupying a post with a firm, the Guaranty Trust Company Limited of Canada, which has considerable business with his department. I feel that the minister should make some special arrangements—

Mr. McCANN: On a matter of privilege, that statement is not correct. The company I am identified with has no business whatever with the government.

Mr. PROBE: I am willing to withdraw what I said with respect to that, although to my mind it is inconceivable that a large financial institution will not have business dealings with the Department of National Revenue. But the point is that this young veterans' case is certainly as reasonable from the point of view of reestablishment as the statement which the minister has just made with respect to the relationship of a company, of whose board of directors he happens to be a member.

Mr. BENTLEY: I do not intend to introduce a debate. I just intend to offer in a few minutes, a few words of wisdom to the government. I believe they can use some occasionally. The first one is in connection with the question of bringing in some of the war assets from the United States. The United States War Assets Corporation made available to the public some of their 16-ply nylon tires from the big aeroplanes. These were discovered to be most useful as tractor tires, and some of our smaller business men in the west undertook to bring them over. I do not know whether or not there are any left, but if there are I believe it would be advisable for the government to consider bringing those in duty free for that purpose. A good deal of duty has been paid on those which have already come in.

The other matter I wish to speak about is the question of duty on egg crate fillers made from pulp. A great deal of our pulp is shipped to the United States, and I understand that a higher rate is paid for it than is paid by Canadian manufacturers. I am not sure of that, but it is what I have been told. Yet when their fillers come in, they are dutiable. It would appear that Canadian raw materials going over there for processing and then coming back here as an end product should be available to the Canadian people without duty. I hope the minister will consider that.

Item agreed to.

Customs and excise division—

248. To provide for payment of expenses, law costs, refunds and awards arising out of seizures and charges of contravention of customs or excise laws, $300,000.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I observe reference to payment of expenses, law costs and so on, in charges of contravention of customs or excise laws. I wanted to ask the minister whether there was no such expense for income tax and whether income tax, according to a statement I saw recently, is being enforced more rigidly; I mean, with more recourse to the courts?

Mr. McCANN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think it is fair to say that unhappily it is necessary to have recourse to the courts in certain cases in the income tax division. With reference to the customs and excise division, for the payment of expenses, costs, refunds and awards arising out of seizures and charges the appropriation is $300,000, and last year the expenditures were $209,000.

Item agreed to.

Taxation division—

249. General administration, including authority to create positions and make appointments, within the division, notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act and the said positions and staff so appointed are hereby wholly excluded from the operation of the said act, $1,192,159.

Mr. RINFRET: There is one question I should like to ask the minister in connection with the Montreal income tax office. I know of the considerable changes which have been taking place in the office in recent weeks. Can the minister make a statement as to the present set-up of the department and the steps he intends taking in the near future to increase the proportion of French-speaking personnel?

Mr. McCANN: As the hon. gentleman no doubt realizes, there has been a reclassification with reference to the Montreal office. I find now that of the occupants of the twenty-two key positions in the Montreal office, eleven are French. They are: Messrs. Bonin, Carlisle, Coté, Foisy-Foley, Fournier, Gauthier, Joubert, Miss Laberge, Mr. LeBourdais, Mr. Mondor and Mr. Paquin. There are ten English-speaking Canadians in the top positions. They are as follows: Messrs. Allen, Booth, Gilmour, McEntee, McMorrow, Nutt, Secord, Stewart, Leo Taylor, and L. R. Taylor.

Another one is of half English and half French descent. That is Mr. Pope. I may say to the hon. gentleman that there are two senior positions there which are being reserved for French Canadians and, as soon as suitable candidates can be found to fill those positions, they will be given to them. I am informed by the director general of the Montreal office—and he has been in the office for something over thirty years, I believe—that there have never before been as many French-Canadians in key positions as there are today, and that the reorganization we have made has already increased that representation. I appreciate the difficulties there are in that particular office in Montreal, the largest office we have in Canada. We do a bigger business there in the year than the Canadian Pacific does in the whole of Canada. It is important that efficiency must be the first consideration in regard to the personnel of that office. I recognize, too, that the efficiency will be improved if a holder of an office there is bilingual, whether he is descended from either French or English forebears. We are attempting in the reorganization plan to give a fair proportion to both French and English. But we must always keep in mind that efficiency is the first test. I think the men who have approached me on this particular subject will agree with me that it is difficult to get the type of people we want who are bilingual. However, every effort is being made to have a representative and fair proportion of bilingual officers in that office.

Mr. MacNICOL: Those eleven positions the minister referred to are not yet filled, are they?

Mr. McCANN: Yes, they are filled.

Mr. FLEMING: I should like to bring to the attention of the minister a situation involving the salaries which are paid to accountants in the income tax office at Toronto. I am informed that recently a number of accountants were brought in who had been formerly on the staff of the Department of Reconstruction and Supply. Their salaries in that department were $2,700 per annum, and when they were brought on the staff of the income tax office at Toronto they came in at the same salary. But they were placed under supervisors who proceeded to instruct them in their new duties, and the supervisors receive a salary of only $2,100 a year. I am told that situation is continuing. The supervising officials of the income tax office are receiving salaries of $2,100. These accountants brought in to work under their supervision are being paid $2,700. That is a most anomalous situation, and I submit that some corrective measures must be applied promptly. My information goes farther and indicates that there is a great deal of disaffection and unrest over this situation on the part of the members of the staff who were there before, particularly those engaged in supervisory capacities.

Mr. McCANN: A reclassification has been going on in the Toronto district office, as is the case with every district office throughout the country. We are taking on people who have been employed in war work with other departments. I may say that, during the war years, we lost a great many of our officials who went into private industry or into other departments of the government because the salaries in those departments and in industry were more remunerative than those being paid in our department. However, new classifications have been made. An assessor grade 1 now has a range from $2,280 to $2,580. They are graded from grade 1 to grade 6, and a grade 6 officer gets in the neighbourhood of $4,800. When the reclassification is completed I believe the employees of the Toronto office will be fairly dealt with and will be more satisfied with their position.

Mr. FLEMING: Then may I take it from the minister's statement that this situation will receive attention?

Mr. McCANN: It is being given the closest attention now.

Mr. GILLIS: Could the minister inform me as to the progress being made by the department with respect to the establishment of the sub-office at Sydney, Nova Scotia.

Mr. McCANN: We intend to proceed with the opening of a district office at Sydney. Our difficulty there has been the difficulty we have been experiencing throughout the whole country, that of getting competent personnel to fill these positions. As soon as we have the available people and the available space, we shall proceed to open the office at Sydney.

Item agreed to.

General—National film board, including the motion picture bureau—

***253.* General administration, $183,166.**

Mr. FLEMING: I do not wish to provoke a debate on the national film board at this hour of the night, but I desire to offer a suggestion which I think may be constructive.

The national film board is an important enterprise. There has been a great deal of criticism of it. No doubt there is a lack of understanding on the part of a good many

Canadians as to the functions the film board is intended to serve and the extent to which it is fulfilling the purpose for which it was intended. In the case of radio, which I think is a comparable government enterprise, we have a parliamentary committee appointed at most sessions to review the operations of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in all their aspects. I suggest that at another session we should have a committee appointed to conduct a similar review with respect to the affairs and operations of the national film board.

Item agreed to.

National film board, including the motion picture bureau—

255. Production of films, including authority to finance temporarily work performed for other public authorities or other agencies as the public interest requires, $766,000.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I wish to say a word on this, just following what my colleague the hon. member for Eglinton has said. First, let me say I believe in the film board. I think it performs a duty which the commercial people do not perform; but I am not at all convinced that the film board needs to do its own production. I notice it not only produces for itself but produces for other government departments. It is not immediately clear to me why a government should produce films any more than it should produce motor cars, but I am not going to labour that point tonight. I want to ask the minister this question. Does the film board ask for prices for the work it is having done from private producers, or does it go ahead and produce itself without any reference to comparative costs?

Mr. McCANN: The policy of the film board is both production and distribution, and, of course, administration. In some instances, in the matter of production competitive prices are asked from the private agencies, and I may say that, from a comparison of the costs, the film board can produce as cheaply as any agency in Canada. There has been a good deal in the newspapers lately to the effect that the film board should go out of the production field and be entirely a distributing agency. I cannot say I agree with that view, because our costs compare favourably with those of other agencies. At times we have given contracts to private agencies to produce films for us, and the costs are very much the same as our own.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Can the minister say whether any substantial amount of production has been farmed out to private agencies? Has it been done on the basis of asking competitive figures and wording the contracts accordingly?

Mr. McCANN: It has been done mainly when our own production facilities were not able to carry out a particular project because of the work in hand.

Mr. ADAMSON: Can the minister say what are the outlets in Toronto for the productions of the film board? Where can these films be procured in the Toronto area?

Mr. McCANN: I could not give the particular address, but the film board maintains a library of its own there.

Mr. ADAMSON: Where is that?

Mr. McCANN: I could not give the address.

Mr. ADAMSON: It used to be possible to obtain film board films only from the W.E.A. on St. George street. I wondered if that had been enlarged now.

Mr. MacNICOL: I want to say just a word in favour of the film board. During this session we have had shown in one of the main committee rooms in this building quite a number of productions of the film board, and they have been very educational. I cannot help but say to myself that an extension of their educational programme along the lines of the films we have seen here would be beneficial to the whole country.

Mr. POULIOT: The films were good and the lecturer exceptionally good.

Mr. FLEMING: Would the minister make any comment on my suggestion in regard to a parliamentary committee?

Mr. McCANN: I have been informed that, because of some criticism of the commissioner and the film board, they would welcome an investigation at any time into all their operations.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

751. To provide for expenses in connection with espionage prosecutions, $115,000.

Mr. FLEMING: What further expenses in connection with espionage prosecutions are involved in this item of $115,000? Which proceedings does it cover?

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice): The amount voted last year for prosecutions was $150,000, and about $75,000 of that was expended. So $75,000 of the

$115,000, in round figures, is a revote. This item, therefore, provides an additional $40,000 which will be required to take care of municipal and provincial out-of-pocket expenses in connection with these trials.

Mr. FLEMING: Is it expected this will be the last expense in connection with these prosecutions?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I should like to ask a question with respect to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. At the opening of the war, some members of the mounted police found that they could not get overseas because they were in that force. They resigned and went overseas, got married, returned to Canada and reengaged for service with the mounted police. Is it correct that these men are receiving only the pay of single men?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: A member of the mounted police force is not allowed to marry until after six years of service.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: They left the R.C.M.P. because they wanted to serve overseas. Returning from the armed services overseas, upon demobilization they reported to the mounted police. I understand that, under the mounted police regulations, they remain on single pay, although in the meantime they were married?

Mr. ILSLEY: I believe that is right. I thought the regulations were somewhat different from that, but I suspect the hon. member is correct in what he has said. If he is correct, the reason would be the one I gave when the main estimates were being considered, namely, that at the time of the war the direction in general orders was to the effect that members of the R.C.M.P. were to enlist only in a certain way, namely in the provost corps. Nevertheless some of them did otherwise, even after the whole force was circularized, or at least the headquarters detachment. Therefore I presume they are regarded as single men for the regular period.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: That would appear to be a severe penalty to inflict on a man who left the service because the only branch of the armed service open to him was the provost corps.

Mr. ILSLEY: I am not sure the hon. member is right, but if he is, that would be the reason for it.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: If that is true it seems to me the minister should consider the matter, because I know of young men from the west who left the force because of the way in which they were being treated. They were good men, with good records all the way through. This sort of treatment discourages men from entering the mounted police.

Item agreed to.

752. To provide for expenses incurred by the royal commission which investigated the disclosure of confidential information to agents of a foreign power, $60,000.

Mr. FLEMING: Would the minister explain this item.

Mr. ILSLEY: This is chiefly to cover the expenses of counsel. There are some expenses other than those of counsel, but it is mainly for the purpose I have mentioned. Their accounts are not yet submitted, and therefore have not yet been taxed.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

787. Departmental administration, further amount required, $71,650.

Mr. KNOWLES: Can the minister say anything further about the government's promised assistance to the Montreal Neurological Institute?

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I do not think I can, at this moment, except that the assistance is to be accorded to the institute.

Mr. KNOWLES: The Prime Minister said earlier it would either be through an item in the supplementary estimates or in some other manner.

Mr. MARTIN: It will be taken care of by action of the medical division of the national research council.

Mr. KNOWLES: Thank you.

Item agreed to.

LEGISLATION

Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons—
122. Allowance in lieu of apartments, $1,500.

Mr. LENNARD: Mr. Chairman, as the third session of this twentieth parliament is nearing its close, I should like to ask His Honour the Speaker, who is responsible for maintaining the dignity and traditions of this chamber why, in the performance of his duties, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in observing the dignity attached to his office, has never been properly dressed?

Mr. FAUTEUX: I would answer the hon. member by saying that, while some people believe that the uniform makes the man, some others do not believe that. However, so far as I am concerned, I believe my uniform has helped me a lot.

Mr. LENNARD: This is the first parliament in which a Deputy Speaker has not been gowned, so far as I know.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): Mr. Chairman, may I speak in my own defence by saying that when this parliament assembled it will be recalled there was considerable difficulty in obtaining materials. Hon. members will recall that the boys who had served in the armed forces were returning to civilian life. I felt it was only fair that they be given the first opportunity to get clothes.

However I am happy to be able to advise the committee that the tailor has received the material required for the official dress which the Deputy Speaker should wear. The suit has been made, and next session I hope I shall be able to appear properly dressed.

Item agreed to.

123. General administration, estimates of the Clerk, $645,350.

Mr. KNOWLES: This is an item on which some of us might have had a good deal to say, had we not reached this late stage of the session.

Mr. ADAMSON: You would have something to say at any stage.

Mr. KNOWLES: If there was a chance my hon. friend would make another speech on gold mining, but I am glad there is not. There is one group of people for whom I hope something will be done before another session. I refer to the stenographers who work for us, for whom I hope something in the way of a pension plan can be worked out very soon. I spoke to the Prime Minister about this matter earlier in the evening and placed in his hands certain material to which he promised to give consideration. With that assurance, I shall not speak further on the matter at this time.

Mr. MacNICOL: May I add one further word to what I said earlier in the evening? I think consideration should be given to stenographers who have been coming here for ten or perhaps fifteen years. The beginners who are just starting can work up to a service of ten, twelve or fifteen years, and that would be something to look forward to. Something more than ordinary pay should be given to these stenographers, something in the way of holidays or possibly their positions could be made permanent. The lady who takes my letters has been giving good faithful service for fifteen years.

Mr. FAUTEUX: Consideration has been given to all those working for the House of Commons, such as stenographers, messengers and so on. An extensive report has been prepared and was submitted to the house during the last days of the session. I have every reason to believe that, during the next session, something will be done to give satisfaction to every employee of the House of Commons.

Mr. BOUCHER: We have passed a lot of estimates and have looked upon the mercenary side of life. During the last two or three weeks we have been sitting long and arduous hours, and I should like to say a word on behalf of the page boys. Ordinarily they work about eight hours a day, but for the last two or three weeks they have been working eleven and eleven and a half hours. These boys have had experience in parliamentary life, but many of them have been deprived of their schooling. What they have seen here of our parliamentary institution will help to make them exemplary citizens. I think even at this late hour we should ask Mr. Speaker, or possibly empower him to give further consideration to these boys. I am sure every hon. member has appreciated the bright, willing and cooperative work of the page boys. I believe they stand apart from other members of the staff, such as stenographers and messengers. I believe they have done an excellent service which is worthy of every consideration.

Mr. MacNICOL: A short time ago the Prime Minister made what we all thought was a fitting suggestion with reference to the hon. gentleman who is now acting as chairman of this committee. At that time he did not want to accept anything, but I think he ought to accept what the house has graciously voted. He has worked hard and has proved himself an excellent chairman. We never had a better one.

Mr. LENNARD: Reference has been made to the members of the staff, but I should like to draw attention to those in the middle staff, the clerks of committees and the *Hansard* reporters. I believe their salaries are definitely out of line and they should be given special consideration next session.

Mr. BOUCHER: I wonder if Mr. Speaker could not give special consideration to the page boys at this time?

Mr. FAUTEUX: I should like to call the hon. member to order from this seat. He knows perfectly well that it is not the privilege of a private member to impose an expenditure upon the crown, and it is not the privilege of the Speaker, who is not a minister of the crown, to impose an expenditure upon the crown. I know it is the desire of every hon. member to help these young men who, in a few years, may be ready to replace us, and the hon. member for Carleton should be congratulated upon his suggestion. Every hon. member may be assured that the matter will be considered and, if it is possible—and I believe it is—something will be done in the way of a reward for these young boys.

Item agreed to.

124. Estimates of the sergeant at arms, $421,800.

Mr. PROBE: There are two items I wish to speak about. The first is the parliamentary restaurant, for which $48,000 is being appropriated this year. That is about $2,000 a week for the period we have been sitting. I should like to know whether there is an offsetting item of income or whether that is an over-all deficit. Then there is an item of $13,000 for tradesmen and others, plus $6,000 in supplementaries, a total of $19,000.

Mr. FAUTEUX: The hon. member probably knows, as do the hon. members who were on the restaurant committee, that we have a deficit in connection with the restaurant and the cafeteria. It is a service for the house, and we must keep a skeleton staff through the year so that they may open at any time to serve the members of the House of Commons.

Mr. PROBE: I should like a break-down of the $19,000 for tradesmen.

Mr. FAUTEUX: We have a deficit which is caused by the fact that we have to keep on a skeleton staff to be ready to open the restaurant and the cafeteria to give service when the session opens.

Item agreed to.

Library of parliament—

128. General administration, $100,471.

Mr. PROBE: We have had a torrid session and everyone is anxious to get through, but I think a word should be said about the administration of the library of parliament. If there is one branch of the Canadian government facilities in connection with which there is no overexpenditure or about which no criticism can be made, it is the library of parliament. Physically, the facilities which they have there to serve the members of parliament are not a credit to the Canadian people. Some consideration should be given to additional space. From what I know of technical personnel for library purposes, it seems to me that a reclassification of the staff of the library from the point of view of salary is long overdue. I wonder whether the Speaker could give some indication of what we are going to do about more library space.

Mr. FAUTEUX: As I told another hon. member a few minutes ago, the officers of different departments of the house have considered the case of each and every employee of the house, including the library. We have prepared a report which, I suppose, is actually being considered by the government, and we hope that next year all of these cases will be settled, including those persons who work in the library. Things have to be done one at a time. Last year there was some complaint about the lighting system of the library. That situation has been corrected, and the one to which the hon. member refers will also be corrected.

Mr. PROBE: And the building itself.

Item agreed to.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before I leave the Chair I again wish to take this opportunity of expressing my thanks and appreciation to all hon. members for their kindness to me while occupying this position. I sincerely hope they will forgive any mistakes I have made. I have tried to do my best.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. ABBOTT moved:

That the resolutions considered in committee of supply on June 3, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 25, 27, July 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16 and 17 and reported be read the second time and concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

Mr. ABBOTT 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, 1948, the sums of $761,256,101.04, $66,666.68 and $114,989,219.16, respectively, be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Abbott thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 457, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1948.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Golding in the chair.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Mr. BRACKEN: What is the total of the estimates, main and supplementary for the year?

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall have to speak offhand, Mr. Chairman. Speaking from memory, I think the main estimates were $1,196 million, supplementary estimates of $6 million, and the supplementary estimates I tabled the other day around $115 million. The total is something of the order of $2,150 million. I have not the exact figures before me at the moment.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There will be a few moments before word is received from the senate that the supply bill has passed the senate. I would suggest that the proceedings of the house be suspended until that word comes back from the senate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Mackenzie King moves, seconded by Mr. St. Laurent, that until word is received from the senate the proceedings of the house stand suspended.

Motion agreed to.

The house resumed at 12.25 a.m.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, 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, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the Senate chamber.

In the Senate chamber, His Honour the Deputy of his Excellency the Governor General was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

[Mr. Abbott.]

BILLS ASSENTED TO

An Act for the relief of Charles Gordon Nelson.

An Act for the relief of Pamela Mackay Alderice Johnstone.

An Act for the relief of Lilly Evans Auty.

An Act for the relief of Esther Lancit Weiss.

An Act for the relief of Bruce Montgomery Cooper.

An Act for the relief of Marion Naomi Gomery McGee.

An Act for the relief of Margaret Hazel Reid Koppel.

An Act for the relief of James Alexander King.

An Act for the relief of Proctor Clifford Neil.

An Act for the relief of Elizabeth Anne Eden Lindsay.

An Act for the relief of Ernest Edward Joslin.

An Act for the relief of Jessie Alberta Allan Derby.

An Act for the relief of Dorothy May Duff Hisey.

An Act for the relief of Elizabeth McIntosh Barber.

An Act for the relief of Muriel Lucy Brighten Burdon.

An Act for the relief of Constance Mae Ponman Newman.

An Act for the relief of Florence Alice Mapston Calcutt Doak.

An Act for the relief of Rose Housefield Blumstein.

An Act for the relief of Gertrude Loiseau Gaulin.

An Act for the relief of Marie Rose Alba Bernadette Lapointe dit Robin Ricard.

An Act for the relief of Thelma Genender Lefkowitz.

An Act for the relief of Mary Joyce Joly Clark.

An Act for the relief of Gertrude Helen Cayford Collins.

An Act for the relief of Francis George Isaac Fellows.

An Act for the relief of Elly Maria Charlotte Alden McBride.

An Act for the relief of Gladys Elizabeth Thompson Dorrance.

An Act for the relief of Una Kathleen Balmfirth Little.

An Act for the relief of William Walter Woodall.

An Act for the relief of Helen Lilian Jaques Bowen.

An Act for the relief of Doreen Jeanette Sibley Tirbutt.

An Act for the relief of Ida Norma Thompson Thornton.

An Act for the relief of Evangeline May Connelly Stervinou.

An Act for the relief of Olive Viola Olsson Ferguson.

An Act for the relief of Evelyn Ethel May Reich Macdonell.

An Act for the relief of Ernest Edward Lippiatt.

An Act for the relief of Elizabeth Butler Roberts Lambton.

An Act for the relief of Libby Margolese Smith.

An Act for the relief of Jean Elizabeth Hancock Thompson.

An Act for the relief of Isabella Hodgson McRae Edwards.

An Act for the relief of Marjorie Aileen Copping Ladouceur.

An Act for the relief of Annie Mildred Parnell Smellie.

An Act for the relief of Veronica Donnelly Hope Johnstone Shelley.

An Act for the relief of Irja Alina Agnes Vaisanen Shanahan.

An Act for the relief of Isabel Lindsay Mackay Dietz.

An Act for the relief of Edith Dean Michaels.

An Act for the relief of Maurice Michael.

An Act for the relief of Otto Hemlein.

An Act for the relief of Mary Josephine Jessop Croker.

An Act for the relief of Rose Lazar Nadigel

An Act for the relief of Frances Clare Lynch Layton.

An Act for the relief of Robert Alfred Nall.

An Act for the relief of Juliette Adrienne Labrosse Renaud.

An Act for the relief of Jean Isabel Dalton Ryan.

An Act for the relief of Rose Elkin Steinman.

An Act for the relief of Clinton Escott Vipond.

An Act for the relief of Alison McKinnon Palmer.

An Act for the relief of Ralph Wighton.

An Act for the relief of Claude Garcin Coffin.

An Act for the relief of Bea Helen Taffert Levin.

An Act for the relief of Elsie King Moorhouse.

An Act for the relief of William John Edgar McVetty.

An Act for the relief of Alfred John Holton.

An Act for the relief of William Howell MacDonald Brown.

An Act for the relief of Henrietta Elizabeth Forde Norrie.

An Act for the relief of Caston Cartier.

An Act for the relief of Margaret Lillian McCorkell Baldwin.

An Act for the relief of Hilda Wylie Bannister.

An Act for the relief of Sarah Goldberg Cohen.

An Act for the relief of Esther Mary Harding Breeze.

An Act for the relief of Jessie MacFarlane Boyle Smith.

An Act for the relief of Paul Jaeggin.

An Act for the relief of Muriel Agnes Martin Adams.

An Act for the relief of Edwin Theophilus Phillips.

An Act for the relief of Lillian May Alsop Mackenzie.

An Act for the relief of Robert Crawford Kirk.

An Act for the relief of Robert Thomas Jackson.

An Act for the relief of Ernest Wright.

An Act for the relief of Theresa Sherpitis Morganti.

An Act for the relief of Omer Montpetit, junior.

An Act for the relief of Harold Robinson.

An Act for the relief of Margaret Cote Truax.

An Act for the relief of Netta Cheyne Lee.

An Act for the relief of Bessie Letovsky Silverman.

An Act for the relief of Percy Coleman Stuart.

An Act for the relief of Pearl Vesta Fields Hollenbeck.

An Act for the relief of Adele Kuznetz Lesser.

An Act for the relief of Joseph Alexander Oswald Mercier.

An Act for the relief of Michael Maturjiw, otherwise known as Michal Matwijow.

An Act for the relief of Eugenie Beatrice Smith Ricketts.

An Act for the relief of Hilda Mary Charlotte Kelly Smith.

An Act for the relief of Eileen Louise Thomas Bleakney.

An Act for the relief of Eugenia Drake Armstrong Newell.

An Act for the relief of Muriel Aileen MacKeage Fewtrell.

An Act for the relief of Evelyn Marie Elliott McGrath.

An Act for the relief of Mary Nellie McGurk Stone.

An Act for the relief of Cipoire Segall Wurmbrand.

An Act for the relief of Violet Olive Magdalene Allchin Clark.

An Act for the relief of Victor Reid Murray.

An Act for the relief of Agnes Jane Irwin Everitt Dixon.

An Act for the relief of Peter Samuel Rosen.

An Act for the relief of Rose Waselevsky Balakirsky.

An Act for the relief of Sophie Wener Finestone.

An Act for the relief of Norma Mary Sharp Chapman.

An Act for the relief of Douglas Wilson Bradshaw.

An Act for the relief of Muriel Amelia Dufty Rochet.

An Act for the relief of Ethel Ornstein Pfeffer.

An Act for the relief of Hilda Katz Delnick.

An Act for the relief of Emilienne Grinsell Daoust.

An Act for the relief of Alice Hamilton Peck Stevenson.

An Act for the relief of Doris Victoria Bellisle Page.

An Act for the relief of Sydney Beaver.

An Act for the relief of Gladys Kathleen Wilkins Todd.

An Act for the relief of Norma Elizabeth Jane Murray Hanko.

An Act for the relief of Bernadette Mayford Roy.

An Act for the relief of Ellen Irene Gertrude Preston Hastie.

An Act for the relief of Marjorie Winnifred Bearman Smeall.

An Act for the relief of Mary Winifred Joyce Dick Dunford.

An Act for the relief of Eileen Ardis Locke Thompson.

An Act for the relief of Margaret Hamilton Wilson Bergeron.

An Act for the relief of Norma Marzitelli Rudzik.

An Act for the relief of Eileen Millar De Levi.

An Act for the relief of Hilda Constance Caroline Mosley Dwyer.

An Act for the relief of Louis Marcel Frigon.

An Act for the relief of Florence Nancy Maria Haworth Stewart.

An Act for the relief of John Bernth Jones, otherwise known as John Berth Jones.

An Act for the relief of Patricia Violet Puttock Bromby.

An Act for the relief of Dorothy Hawkins Myers.
An Act for the relief of Evelyn Deltoff Moore.
An Act for the relief of Eveline Hache Groulx.
An Act for the relief of Annie Lucy Hurteau.
An Act for the relief of Evelyn Alice Lancaster Chenoweth.
An Act for the relief of Robert Lussier.
An Act for the relief of Robert Rosaire Loiselle.
An Act for the relief of Marjorie Evelyn MacPherson Puley.
An Act for the relief of Sarah Rafferty Jackson.
An Act for the relief of Ida Berman Zatz.
An Act for the relief of Patricia Ellen Burt Williams.
An Act for the relief of Charles Alfred Michel Kelly.
An Act for the relief of Pearl Summers Slater.
An Act for the relief of Aime Jacques.
An Act for the relief of Grace Evelyn Smith Copeland.
An Act for the relief of Jessie Gertrude Noel Magee.
An Act for the relief of John Luchuck.
An Act for the relief of Rhondda Blanche Peace Hurford Smith.
An Act for the relief of Mabel Grace Mattinson.
An Act for the relief of Marcel Simonon.
An Act for the relief of Marian Susan Willson Roberts.
An Act for the relief of Jean Gainfort Grossman.
An Act for the relief of Evelyn Mildred Cook Stone.
An Act for the relief of Lily Elizabeth Harris Cunningham.
An Act for the relief of Mildred Merica Ruth Goodreau Snyder.
An Act for the relief of Harry Powell.
An Act for the relief of Margaret Patricia Fairhurst Richards.
An Act for the relief of Evelyn Florence Esson Pugh.
An Act for the relief of Katie Rhoda Brick McGrath.
An Act for the relief of Louise Guiol Ghetler.
An Act for the relief of George William Curtis Johnson.
An Act for the relief of Melville Mae Rundle Swinburne.
An Act for the relief of Ruby Weldrick Hunt.
An Act for the relief of Doris Shapiro Kolman.
An Act for the relief of Mary Margaret Rider Brown.
An Act for the relief of Fennie Nettie Adelstein Waldman.
An Act for the relief of Gustave Lucien Verhelle.
An Act for the relief of Ruby Campbell Matts.
An Act for the relief of Dorothy Kathleen Morrison Germain.
An Act for the relief of Sophie Radwolsky Closner.
An Act for the relief of Muriel Emma Wood Durrell.
An Act for the relief of William John Carmichael.
An Act for the relief of Guido Verdoni.
An Act for the relief of Ronald John Park.
An Act for the relief of Gloria Avon Roland.
An Act for the relief of Gilberto (Albert) Belmonte.
An Act for the relief of Mildred Lillian Flude.
An Act for the relief of Pauline Joan Hyde Murphy.
An Act for the relief of Alsye Mae Lissemore Lawrence.
An Act for the relief of Jessie Leonard Simpson Clunie.
An Act for the relief of Fern Catherine Kerr Ekins.
An Act for the relief of Lilly Elizabeth Ingborg Lindfors Crowhurst.
An Act for the relief of Romeo Richard.
An Act for the relief of Charles Augustus Dolling.
An Act for the relief of Charles Frederick McDowall.
An Act for the relief of Woolf (Robert) Cook.
An Act for the relief of Adele Brown Kerkofsky.
An Act for the relief of Ellen Heathcote Taschereau.
An Act for the relief of Molly Marcovitch Schwartz.
An Act for the relief of Betty Gertrude Bernstein Schreiber.
An Act for the relief of Margaret Joan Anstey Steven Hyslop.
An Act for the relief of Elly Zahn Kaminsky.
An Act for the relief of Naomi Joan Williamson Cantlie.
An Act for the relief of Matilda Jane Cumming.
An Act for the relief of Agnes Dowd Brown.
An Act for the relief of Ursula Catherine Tetreau Black.
An Act for the relief of Eleanor Edith McKechnie Martineau.
An Act for the relief of Jack Wallis.
An Act for the relief of Evelyn Margaret Morrison Cryer.
An Act for the relief of Frances Eileen Scribner Mackay.
An Act for the relief of Irene Laflamme Kattas.
An Act for the relief of Eileen Maude Gardner Richards.
An Act for the relief of Frances Audrey Gray Lacaille.
An Act for the relief of Aline Theoret Larose.
An Act for the relief of Margaret Betty Rollings Burman.
An Act for the relief of Beatrice Dorothy Pountney Alker.
An Act for the relief of Margaret Jean Duff Dorval.
An Act for the relief of George Somerville Blackie Begg.
An Act for the relief of Lillian Guerasio Galardo.
An Act for the relief of Stewart Davidson Myles.
An Act for the relief of Dorothy Bradford Hurley.
An Act for the relief of Elsie McCormick Albers.
An Act for the relief of George Wilson Dyce.
An Act for the relief of Rita Johnson Cherrier.
An Act for the relief of Esther Cole Zeesman.

An Act for the relief of Celia Yaffe Dubinsky.
An Act for the relief of Elsie Marlyn Garayt Johnston.
An Act for the relief of Leone Rhea Leduc Metcalf.
An Act for the relief of James Arthur Ablett.
An Act for the relief of Goldie Slovinsky Tkatch.
An Act for the relief of Harold Fassett Staniforth.
An Act for the relief of Claire Morgan Lockner Middleton-Hope.
An Act for the relief of Rose Nemerofsky Silverstein.
An Act for the relief of James Albert Carruthers, otherwise known as James Albert Fell.
An Act for the relief of Ronald Edwin George.
An Act for the relief of Margaret Lena Bertha Dasen Scheffer.
An Act for the relief of Ethel Mary McKenzie Cramp.
An Act for the relief of Evelyn Alice Howard Smart.
An Act for the relief of Mary Margaret Tibbins Gogo.
An Act for the relief of Alfred Nelson Nickle.
An Act for the relief of Arthur Haigh MacGill.
An Act for the relief of Clinton Leslie Dobson.
An Act for the relief of Bernard Stanley Bailey.
An Act for the relief of Archie William Young.
An Act for the relief of Olive Lever Sanborn Lead.
An Act for the relief of John Mackie.
An Act for the relief of Isabel Mercer Leboeuf.
An Act for the relief of Hilda Irene Gordon Lazarus.
An Act for the relief of Mary Margaret Bernice Walker Kennedy.
An Act for the relief of Gertie Rabin Bard.
An Act for the relief of Ruth Morrison Henderson Sidders.
An Act for the relief of Philip Berger.
An Act for the relief of Harold Swann.
An Act for the relief of Margaret Isabelle Curry.
An Act for the relief of Rosamond Edith Bean Crease.
An Act for the relief of Alma Mary Hanway Eccles.
An Act for the relief of Alberta Dorothy Olson Colby.
An Act for the relief of Clair Reginald McLaughlin.
An Act for the relief of Eugene Klein.
An Act for the relief of Daniel Hudson.
An Act for the relief of Eileen Edna Paget Bray Dundas.
An Act for the relief of Jessie Goodis Markis.
An Act for the relief of Julia Luella Audrey Cleroux Babbage.
An Act for the relief of Mile Kristo Yoja, otherwise known as Stanley Vadic.
An Act for the relief of Anthony Wavroch.
An Act for the relief of Mary Magee Glasheen.
An Act for the relief of Mary Ann Clorenda Archer Richardson.
An Act for the relief of Gladys May Kay Oliver.

An Act for the relief of Henry Thomas Matthews.
An Act for the relief of Ivy Stapleton Brown.
An Act for the relief of John William Sydney Jordan.
An Act for the relief of Pamela Mary Gottschalk Muckell.
An Act for the relief of Winnifred Doris Cleaver Wooley.
An Act for the relief of Eileen Francis Murphy Kerson.
An Act for the relief of Joyce Kathleen Reynolds Swards.
An Act for the relief of Anne Fishman Minsk.
An Act for the relief of Muriel Alice Goddard Perkins.
An Act for the relief of Irene Elizabeth Burke Robinson.
An Act for the relief of Gardiner Hinkley Prescott.
An Act for the relief of Joseph Amedee Alexis Cousineau.
An Act for the relief of Mildred Verna Ruth Schnaufer Case.
An Act for the relief of Robert Ralph Tripp.
An Act for the relief of Charles James Langevin.
An Act for the relief of Edward Frank Fulton.
An Act for the relief of Pauline Bertha Marwick Dallison.
An Act for the relief of Evelyn May McNaught Grandison.
An Act for the relief of Margaret Turner Shaw Ward.
An Act for the relief of Olivier Pierre Bernard Lagueux.
An Act for the relief of Hazel Mair Grant Rubin.
An Act for the relief of Doris Louise Dickson McMurray.
An Act for the relief of Ethel Florence Barr Shiells.
An Act for the relief of Gabrielle Augustine Gilberte Desmarais Creelman.
An Act for the relief of Christos C. Koukouvelis.
An Act for the relief of Aime Bibeau.
An Act for the relief of Henry Eaton.
An Act for the relief of Lodie Kadei Nakel.
An Act for the relief of Margaret Sophie Bolenski Dubeau.
An Act for the relief of Marion Mapes Harvey Allinson.
An Act for the relief of Frances Alice Egg Johnston, otherwise known as Frances Alice Egg Willey Johnston.
An Act for the relief of Selden Grant Stoddard.
An Act for the relief of Elmon Parker Law.
An Act for the relief of James Dewey, junior.
An Act for the relief of Peggy Alicia Stilwell Kneeland.
An Act for the relief of Alexander Monteith.
An Act for the relief of Evelyn Clara Woods Cross.
An Act for the relief of Minnie Braimaster Kazarensky.
An Act for the relief of Peter Moroz, otherwise known as Peter Morris.
An Act for the relief of Lorne Earl Barth.
An Act for the relief of Thomas Wynn Hayes, junior.
An Act for the relief of Claire Black Wolfe.
An Act for the relief of Anna Lovannah Theoret Wilson.
An Act for the relief of Norma Lorraine Desrosiers.

An Act for the relief of Rose Jacobson Greenberg.
An Act for the relief of Guido Corbo.
An Act for the relief of Harold Ashton Hugh Roberts.
An Act for the relief of Mary Kalichman Pulver.
An Act for the relief of Gaston Dorval Lachance.
An Act for the relief of Donat St. Jean.
An Act for the relief of Sheila Sydney Doner Gordon.
An Act for the relief of Thomas Walter John Moon.
An Act for the relief of Edward Charles Barron.
An Act for the relief of Violet Eileen Lepine Tickner.
An Act for the relief of Jean Lawrence Ritchie.
An Act for the relief of Livio Quintino Fantacci.
An Act for the relief of Bertha Bercovici Hamer.
An Act for the relief of Ann Bogdanof Millichamp.
An Act for the relief of Beatrice Elman Perlman.
An Act for the relief of Grace Emily Dawes Matheson.
An Act for the relief of Gabriel Burszan.
An Act for the relief of Doris Phoebe Potter Potts.
An Act for the relief of Richard Andrew Frame.
An Act for the relief of Louis Gertzman.
An Act for the relief of William Page.
An Act for the relief of Maud Mary Rose Denton.
An Act for the relief of Judith Bychowsky Sanders.
An Act for the relief of Marie Irene Joly Martineau.
An Act for the relief of Sam Pronman.
An Act for the relief of Eva Greenblatt Thow.
An Act for the relief of Edith Norma Isaac Davidson.
An Act for the relief of Ida Lottie Stubina Pollack.
An Act for the relief of Minnie Black Herman.
An Act for the relief of Clifford Gilbert Adams.
An Act for the relief of Dallas Sara Barnes Millington.
An Act for the relief of Madeleine Agnes Joly de Lotbiniere Doucet.
An Act for the relief of Adeline Charlotte Simone Desjardins Teakle.
An Act for the relief of Margaret Blane Bowen Adair.
An Act for the relief of Mary Hrab Navrotzki.
An Act for the relief of Pierre-Ben-Danais Warren.
An Act for the relief of Ethel Florence Rhodes Pompetti, otherwise known as Ethel Florence Crowdy Pompetti.
An Act for the relief of Elisa Jamoul Hull.
An Act for the relief of Ernest Stanley Rundell.
An Act for the relief of Thelma Lillian Dalton Hilger, otherwise known as Thelma Lillian Dalton Goernert.
An Act for the relief of Mary Alice Berrigan Hamelin.
An Act for the relief of Dorothy Mary Boyce Jackson.
An Act for the relief of Edith Oberfeld Mintz.
An Act for the relief of Roger Lebeau.
An Act for the relief of Sheila Marcus Issenman.
An Act for the relief of Zenobia Perrow Broadbent Emond.
An Act for the relief of Joseph Edmond Gerard Santoire.
An Act for the relief of Alderic Gemme.
An Act for the relief of Joseph Rosealphee Oderic Dussault.
An Act for the relief of Dan Alonzo Dwight Wright.
An Act to amend the Railway Act.
An Act to amend the Interpretation Act.
An Act to amend the Special War Revenue Act and to change its title to the Excise Tax Act.
An Act to amend The Fisheries Research Board Act.
An Act to amend the Income War Tax Act.
An Act to establish the Canadian Maritime Commission.
An Act to amend The Veterans Business and Professional Loans Act.
An Act to establish the Dominion Coal Board.
An Act respecting The Ottawa Electric Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate Commonwealth Insurance Company.
An Act to incorporate Progressive Insurance Company of Canada.
An Act to incorporate The Limitholders' Mutual Insurance Company.
An Act to incorporate Federation Insurance Company of Canada.
An Act to amend The Canadian Commercial Corporation Act.
An Act to amend the Old Age Pensions Act.
An Act respecting the Protection and Conservation of the Forests on the Eastern Slope of the Rocky Mountains.
An Act to provide Superannuation Benefits for Senior Appointees of the Department of External Affairs serving outside Canada.
An Act respecting certain National Parks and to amend The National Parks Act.
An Act to provide for Privileges and Immunities in respect of the United Nations and related International Organizations.
An Act respecting The Canada Permanent Trust Company.
An Act to amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act.
An Act to establish a Benevolent Fund from Army Canteen and other Service Funds.
An Act respecting the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co., Limited.
An Act to amend the Trust Companies Act.
An Act to amend the Civil Service Act.
An Act to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.
An Act respecting the Refunding and Adjustment of Indebtedness of the Four Western Provinces to the Government of Canada in respect of certain outstanding Loans for Relief and other purposes and Final Settlement of the Claims of the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan in respect of Natural Resources.
An Act respecting The Women's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.
An Act to incorporate the Yellowknife Telephone Company.
An Act to provide for the Alteration of His Majesty's Royal Style and Titles.

An Act to authorize the Government of Canada to enter into Agreements with the Governments of the Provinces pursuant to which, in return for compensation, the Provinces agree to refrain from levying certain taxes for a limited period.

An Act to amend The Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936.

An Act to amend the Militia Pension Act (Disablement Pension).

An Act to amend the Criminal Code.

An Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.

An Act to extend the term of office of a Transport Commissioner.

An Act to incorporate The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Labrador.

An Act to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1948.

To these bills the royal assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words:

In His Majesty's name the Honourable the Deputy Governor General doth assent to these bills.

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General as follows:

May it please Your Honour:

The Commons of Canada have voted supplies required to enable the government to defray certain expenses of the public services.

In the name of the Commons I present to Your Honour the following bill:

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1948.

To which bill I humbly request Your Honour's assent.

To this bill the Clerk of the Senate, by command of the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General did thereupon say:

In His Majesty's name, the Honourable the Deputy Governor General thanks his loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this bill.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

After which the Honourable the Deputy Governor General was pleased to close the third session of the twentieth parliament of the Dominion of Canada with the following speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

The restoration of peace and world recovery have not proceeded as speedily as had been hoped for. Failure to conclude peace settlements with Germany and Austria has complicated the political and economic situation, not only in Europe, but throughout the world. Several countries, including Canada, have approved treaties of peace with Italy, Roumania, Hungary and Finland.

In Europe, the delay in the re-establishment of industries has continued to affect adversely the balance of foreign trade and of international payments. The severe winter and the shortage of necessities, particularly of food, have added to human suffering, and aggravated the problems of relief and rehabilitation.

Unsettled world conditions have been reflected in many of the measures you have been called upon to consider at the session now being concluded.

On June 30, the united nations relief and rehabilitation administration came to an end. The need for relief, however, has not ended. In recognition of this need, parliament has made a substantial appropriation for the purchase of food and other essentials of life required by peoples of war-devastated lands. Parliament has also approved Canadian membership in the international refugee organization.

Canada is participating fully in the activities of the economic and social council, the atomic energy commission, and other agencies of the united nations. Our country is also effectively represented at the international conference on trade and employment at Geneva.

As a result of the deliberations of a special session of the general assembly of the united nations, a committee, on which Canada is represented, was created to prepare a report on Palestine.

An important feature of the session has been the removal, in an orderly manner, of the majority of controls and restrictions in force during and immediately after the war. To guard against sudden and excessive increases in the cost of living, and for other reasons, certain emergency orders and regulations have been continued for a further transitional period.

Another important development has been the action taken to encourage immigration. The Government's policy involves the careful selection of immigrants and adjustment of their numbers to the absorptive capacity of the country. Practical steps have also been taken to relieve the lot of many displaced persons and refugees.

Notwithstanding the unsettled conditions abroad, employment and national income at home have remained at high levels. The demand for the products of our primary industries has, in almost all cases, been sustained. Towards stabilizing the incomes of those engaged in agriculture, measures relating to the Canadian wheat board, and to the sale and export of certain other agricultural products have been enacted. The Fisheries Prices Support Act is being brought into operation. The maintenance of our prosperity will increasingly depend upon how conditions develop in other parts of the world.

In the past few months, in most industries, Canada has fortunately enjoyed a relatively wide measure of industrial peace. Preliminary consideration has been given in parliament to an important measure to provide more effective machinery for the settlement of industrial disputes and the adjustment of differences between employers and employees. A similar measure will be introduced at the next session.

The Government has continued to give constant attention to meeting the need for housing. To this end, substantial amendments have been made to the National Housing Act.

A further measure of social security has been provided by important amendments to the Old Age Pensions Act. Increases have been made in

the amount of pension, and also in the amount of other income permitted to pensioners. In addition, the pensionable age for blind persons has been lowered from forty to twenty-one years.

The Civil Service Superannuation Act has been amended to include additional categories of public servants, and to permit retirement at an earlier age than heretofore. Comprehensive changes have also been made to increase the security provided by the Act. Statutory provision has been made for the veteran's preference in appointments to the civil service, and to permit of annual increases in remuneration to temporary employees.

Steady progress has been made in placing the defence forces on a peace-time basis. The Department of National Defence Act has been amended to provide for the consolidation of the administration of the department, and for the establishment of a defence research board.

During the session, an important announcement of joint Canada-United States policy respecting cooperation in defence was made at Washington by the president and at Ottawa by the prime minister.

Other important measures enacted during the session include bills concerning a dominion coal board, a maritime commission, the canadian broadcasting corporation, conservation of natural resources, loan adjustments with certain of the provinces, the Patent Act, Penitentiaries and the Criminal Code. A benevolent fund from army canteen and other service funds has been established.

The representation of the people in the House of Commons has been readjusted on a basis which will more effectively maintain the historic principle of representation by population.

The question of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the manner in which those obligations, accepted by all members of the united nations, may best be implemented, has been given preliminary consideration by a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons. It is the intention of my ministers to recommend the reappointment of this committee at the next session of parliament.

Members of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the provision you have made for all essential services.

A most gratifying achievement of the session now concluding has been the substantial reduction in the level of taxation on personal incomes, which became effective on the first of July, and which was made possible by the drastic reduction of public expenditures. At the end of the year, the tax on excess profits will be removed.

Authority to conclude tax agreements with the provinces has been vested in the government. Seven of the nine provinces have signified their intention to conclude such agreements.

A bill to revise the income tax law was introduced in order to permit of study and consideration of its provisions between now and the next session.

Honourable Members of the Senate:
Members of the House of Commons:

The recent visit of the president of the United States to Ottawa was deeply appreciated by the citizens of Canada. The visit afforded renewed evidence of the close and cordial relations of our two countries.

My ministers have been pleased to welcome a delegation from the national convention of Newfoundland. Members of the delegation are exploring the possibility of finding a basis, which would be mutually acceptable, for the federal union of Newfoundland with Canada.

The people of Canada have learned with great pleasure of the betrothal of Her Royal Highness The Princess Elizabeth to Lieutenant Philip Mountbatten. As Her Royal Highness and Lieutenant Mountbatten continue to face the future with its duties and responsibilities, it will be the wish of all that health, happiness, and divine guidance may gladden their path through life.

Amid the uncertainties and perils of these troubled times, I pray that the guidance of Almighty God may be vouchsafed to our country and all the nations.

This concluded the third session of the twentieth parliament.

APPENDIX

AWARDS GRANTED TO PERSONNEL OF THE CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

From 10th September, 1939 to 31st March, 1947

ROYAL CANADIAN NAVY

HIS MAJESTY THE KING has been pleased to award the Victoria Cross (Posthumous) to Lieutenant Robert Hampton Gray, R.C.N.V.R. "for great bravery in leading an attack to within 50 feet of a Japanese destroyer in the face of intense anti-aircraft fire, thereby sinking the destroyer although he was hit and his aircraft on fire and, finally, himself killed. He was one of the gallant company of naval airmen who, from December, 1944, fought and beat the Japanese from Palembang to Tokyo.

The actual incident took place in the Onagawa Wan on 9th August, 1945. Gray was leader of the attack which he pressed home in the face of fire from shore batteries and at least 8 warships. With his aircraft in flames, he nevertheless obtained at least one direct hit which sank his objective."

THE CANADIAN ARMY

The KING has been graciously pleased to approve the award of the VICTORIA CROSS to:

Honorary Captain John Weir Foote,
Canadian Chaplain Services.

Honorary Captain Foote, Canadian Chaplain Services, was regimental chaplain with The Royal Hamilton Light Infantry at Dieppe on 19th August, 1942.

Upon landing on the beach under heavy fire, he attached himself to the regimental aid post which had been set up in a slight depression on the beach, but which was only sufficient to give cover to men lying down. During the subsequent period of approximately eight hours, while action continued, this officer not only assisted the regimental medical officer in ministering to the wounded in the regimental aid

post, but time and again left this shelter to inject morphine, give first aid and carry wounded personnel from the open beach to the regimental aid post. On these occasions, with utter disregard for his personal safety, Honorary Captain Foote exposed himself to an inferno of fire and saved many lives by his gallant efforts.

During the action, as the tide went out, the regimental aid post was moved to the shelter of a stranded landing craft. Honorary Captain Foote continued tirelessly and courageously to carry wounded men from the exposed beach to the cover of the landing craft. Also he removed wounded from inside the landing craft when ammunition had been set on fire by enemy shells. When landing craft appeared, he carried wounded from the regimental aid post to the landing craft through heavy fire with no consideration for his own safety.

On several occasions this officer had the opportunity to embark but returned to the beach as his chief concern was the care and evacuation of the wounded. He refused a final opportunity to leave the shore, choosing to suffer the fate of the men he had ministered to for over three years.

Honorary Captain Foote personally saved many lives by his efforts and his example inspired all around him. Those who observed him state that the calmness of this heroic man as he walked about, collecting the wounded on the fire swept beach will never be forgotten.

The KING has been graciously pleased to approve the award of the VICTORIA CROSS (posthumously) to:

H.6008 Warrant Officer Class II (Company Sergeant-Major) John Robert Osborn, 1 Battalion, The Winnipeg Grenadiers.

At Hong Kong on the morning of 19th December, 1941, a Company of the Winnipeg Grenadiers to which Company Sergeant-Major Osborn belonged became divided during an attack on Mount Butler, a hill rising steeply above sea level. A part of the Company led by Company Sergeant-Major Osborn captured the hill at the point of the bayonet and held it for three hours when, owing to the superior number of the enemy and to fire from an unprotected flank, the position became untenable. Company Sergeant-Major Osborn and a small group covered the withdrawal and when their turn came to fall back, Osborn single-handed engaged the enemy while the remainder successfully rejoined the Company. Company Sergeant-Major Osborn had to run the gauntlet of heavy rifle and machine gun fire. With no consideration for his own safety he assisted and directed stragglers to the new Company position exposing himself to heavy enemy fire to cover their retirement. Wherever danger threatened he was there to encourage his men.

During the afternoon the Company was cut off from the Battalion and completely surrounded by the enemy who were able to approach to within grenade throwing distance of the slight depression which the Company were holding. Several enemy grenades were thrown which Company Sergeant-Major Osborn picked up and threw back. The enemy threw a grenade which landed in a position where it was impossible to pick it up and return it in time. Shouting a warning to his comrades this gallant Warrant Officer threw himself on the grenade which exploded killing him instantly. His self sacrifice undoubtedly saved the lives of many others.

Company Sergeant-Major Osborn was an inspiring example to all throughout the defence which he assisted so magnificently in maintaining against an overwhelming enemy force for over eight and a half hours and in his death he displayed the highest quality of heroism and self-sacrifice.

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE

The KING has been graciously pleased to confer the following award in recognition of most conspicuous bravery:

VICTORIA CROSS

Pilot Officer Andrew Charles Mynarski (J87544) (deceased).

Home Address: 846 Manitoba Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

"Pilot Officer Mynarski was the mid-upper gunner of a Lancaster aircraft, detailed to attack a target at Cambrai in France, on the night of 12th June, 1944. The aircraft was attacked from below and astern by an enemy fighter and ultimately came down in flames.

As an immediate result of the attack, both port engines failed. Fire broke out between the mid-upper turret and the rear turret, as well as in the port wing. The flames soon became fierce and the captain ordered the crew to abandon the aircraft.

Pilot Officer Mynarski left his turret and went towards the escape hatch. He then saw that the rear gunner was still in his turret and apparently unable to leave it. The turret was, in fact, immovable, since the hydraulic gear had been put out of action when the port engines failed, and the manual gear had been broken by the gunner in his attempts to escape.

Without hesitation, Pilot Officer Mynarski made his way through the flames in an endeavour to reach the rear turret and release the gunner. Whilst so doing, his parachute and his clothing, up to the waist, were set on fire. All his efforts to move the turret and free the gunner were in vain. Eventually the rear gunner clearly indicated to him that there was nothing more he could do and that he should try to save his own life. Pilot Officer Mynarski reluctantly went back through the flames to the escape hatch. There, as a last gesture to the trapped gunner, he turned towards him, stood to attention in his flaming clothing and saluted, before he jumped out of the aircraft. Pilot Officer Mynarski's descent was seen by French people on the ground. Both his parachute and his clothing were on fire. He was found eventually by the French, but was so severely burnt that he died from his injuries.

The rear gunner had a miraculous escape when the aircraft crashed. He subsequently testified that, had Pilot Officer Mynarski not attempted to save his comrade's life, he could have left the aircraft in safety and would, doubtless, have escaped death.

Pilot Officer Mynarski must have been fully aware that in trying to free the rear gunner he was almost certain to lose his own life. Despite this, with outstanding courage and complete disregard for his own safety, he went to the rescue. Willingly accepting the danger, Pilot Officer Mynarski lost his life by a most conspicuous act of heroism which called for valour of the highest order."

AWARDS GRANTED TO PERSONNEL OF THE CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

From 10 September 1939 to 31 March 1947

British Awards

	Navy	Army	Air Force	Total
Victoria Cross (*VC*)	1	10	2	13
George Cross (*GC*)	..	3	4	7
The Order of the Companions of Honour (*CH*)	..	2	..	2
Companion of the Order of the Bath (*CB*)	6	33	23	62
Commander of the Order of the British Empire (*CBE*)	22	141	42	205
Distinguished Service Order (*DSO*)	8	352	72	432
Bar to Distinguished Service Order	..	17	6	23
Second Bar to Distinguished Service Order	..	2	..	2
Officer of the Order of the British Empire (*OBE*)	128	523	110	761
Member of the Order of the British Empire (*MBE*)	104	1,279	319	1,702
Royal Red Cross, 1st Class (*RRC*)	6	56	1	63
Distinguished Service Cross (*DSC*)	121	..	..	121
Bar to Distinguished Service Cross	21	..	..	21
Military Cross (*MC*)	..	671	5	676
Bar to the Military Cross	..	13	..	13
Second Bar to the Military Cross	..	1	..	1
Distinguished Flying Cross (*DFC*)	..	..	4,018	4,018
Bar to the Distinguished Flying Cross	..	..	214	214
Air Force Cross (*AFC*)	..	..	431	431
Bar to the Air Force Cross	..	..	1	1
Royal Red Cross, 2nd Class (*ARRC*)	16	134	20	170
Albert Medal (*AM*)	3	..	..	3
Medal for Distinguished Conduct in the Field (*DCM*)	..	161	1	162
Bar to Medal for Distinguished Conduct in the Field	..	1	..	1
Conspicuous Gallantry Medal (*CGM*)	2	..	12	14
George Medal (*GM*)	7	12	19	38
Bar to George Medal	4	..	..	4
Distinguished Service Medal	113	..	..	113
Bar to Distinguished Service Medal	2	..	..	2
Military Medal (*MM*)	..	1,234	1	1,235
Bar to Military Medal	..	10	..	10
Second Bar to Military Medal	..	1	..	1
Distinguished Flying Medal (*DFM*)	..	..	509	509
Air Force Medal (*AFM*)	..	..	43	43
British Empire Medal (*BEM*)	176	639	385	1,200
Mentioned in Despatches	937	6,527	2,200	9,664
King's Commendation	..	28	297	325
Cited in Orders	..	82	..	82
Total British Awards	1,677	11,932	8,735	22,344

Foreign Awards

Belgium	..	327	1	328
China	..	6	..	6
Czechoslovakia	4	23	22	29
France	15	352	65	432
Greece	1	..	..	1
Luxembourg	..	19	..	19
Netherlands	1	513	16	530
Norway	5	..	3	8
Poland	4	6	2	2
Russia	1	..	1	2
Tunis	..	1	..	1
United States of America	23	228	103	354
Total Foreign Awards	54	1,475	213	1,742
Grand Totals	1,731	13,407	8,948	24,086

ROYAL CANADIAN NAVY

Number—Rank—Name—Address

V.C. (1)

Gray, Robert Hampton, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R) (Posthumous), 815 Baker St., Nelson, B.C. 13 Nov., 1945.

O.B.E. (7)

Armit, George Gilmour, Commander (E), R.C.N. (R), 118 Bruce Ave., Mount Vernon, N.Y., U.S.A. 11 Dec., 1945.

Halliday, William Charles, Commander, R.C.N. (R), 743 W. 28th Ave., Vancouver, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Harries, James Leslie, Commander, R.C.N. (R), 11 Banastre Ave., c/o Mrs. W. Elliott, The Heath, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Eng. 30 Apr., 1946.

Hinchcliffe, Cecil Irving, Commander (E), R.C.N., 1252 Chapman St., Victoria, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Moreau, Cecil Henry, Chaplain, 1/c (RC) RCN (Temp), 380 Woodbine Ave., Toronto, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Wallace, Dickson Carlile, *DSC*, RD. Commander, R.C.N. (R), 4 Payzant Ave., Halifax, N.S. 11 Dec., 1945.

White, Richard Paul, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N. (R), 241 Range Rd., Ottawa, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

M.B.E. (4)

Carson, William James, Lieut. (SB), R.C.N. (R), 2126 Rose St., Regina, Sask. 1 Jan., 1946.

Codner, Eugene Augustus, Skr. Lieut., R.C.N. (R), 2 Oakdale Cres., Dartmouth, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Fisher, John William, Lieut. (E), R.C.N. (R), R.R. No. 1, Westboro, Ont. 11 Dec., 1945.

Wadsworth, James Bruce, Lieut. (L), R.C.N., 2485 LaFontaine St., St. Hyacinthe, P.Q., 11 Dec., 1945.

D.S.C. (8)

Brock, Jeffry Vanstone, Commander, R.C.N., 75 Harvard Ave., Winnipeg, Man. 4 June, 1946.

Butterworth, Charles Edgar, Lieut. (P), R.C.N. (R), c/o Bank of Montreal, St. John's, Nfld. 20 Nov., 1945.

Carnall, Herbert Bruce, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N. (R), 54 Braemar Ave., Toronto 12, Ont. 11 Dec., 1945.

Clayton, John Every, Lieut., R.C.N. (R), 2187 Guernsey St., Victoria, B.C. 4 June, 1946.

Fallis, Allen Thomas, Lieut., R.C.N. (R), Carberry, Man. 11 Dec., 1945.

Hatrick, Raymond Gardiner, Lieut., R.C.N. (R), Apt. D1, 3940 Cote de Neiges Rd., Montreal, P.Q. 1 Jan., 1946.

Meredith, Ralph Morton, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N. (R), 148 Pleasant St., Dartmouth, N.S. 11 Dec., 1945.

Moore, Arthur Walter, Skr. Liuet., R.C.N. (R), Barton, Digby Co., N.S. 11 Dec., 1945.

D.S.M. (9)

Brown, Robert William, Ldg. Stoker, R.C.N. (R) (A-1637), 43 Summerhill Ave., Toronto, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Leatham, Alexander, A/C.P.O. (DEMS) R.C.N. (R) (V-10339), 195 Olive St., Victoria, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Morrisey, Edmund Albert, A/C.P.O., R.C.N. (R) (V-12343), 12014-66 St., Edmonton, Alta. 11 Dec., 1945.

Poirier, Paul, A/P.O., R.C.N. (R) (V-959), Dalhousie, N.B. 11 Dec., 1945.

Shufelt, Stewart Keith, Signalman, R.C.N. (R) (V-23511), West Brome, P.Q. 11 Dec., 1945.

Sims, Patrick Joseph, A/C.P.O., R.C.N. (R) (V-15115), 1482 Broadway East, Vancouver, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Sinclair, Holden Alfred, A/C.P.O. (DEMS) R.C.N. (R) (V-30370), 610 Jarvis St., Ste. 30, Vancouver, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Taylor, Roy Thomas, E.R.A. 3/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-33993), 222 Michigan St., Victoria, B.C. 11 Dec., 1945.

Thomas, John Clement Dean, Ldg. Coder, R.C.N. (R) (V-11857), Bishop's Lake, Brandon, Man. 11 Dec., 1945.

B.E.M. (32)

Barker, Kenneth Raymond, C.P.O. (G.M.), R.C.N. (2700), 525 Paradise St., Esquimalt, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Boaler, Reginald George, A/Ldg. Smn. (DEMS), R.C.N. (R) (V-9716), 185 Berry St., St. Boniface, Man. 1 Jan., 1946.

Bonner, Albert Leo, Chief Yeo. of Sigs. R.C.N. (R) (V-2293), 108 Prince Edward St., Saint John, N.B. 1 Jan., 1946.

Bridgen, Kenneth Samuel, A/Ldg. Stoker R.C.N. (R) (A-5155), 406 Gore St., Amherstburg, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Brown, James Arthur, A/C.P.O., R.C.N. (R) (V-10239), 120 Creighton St., Halifax, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Childs, Robert Grenville, Ldg. Cook (S), R.C.N. (R) (V-8844), 57 Dome Ave., South Porcupine, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Clews, William Henry, Chief Yeo. of Sigs., R.C.N. (R) (V-7446), Palmers Lodge, Waverley, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Collins, Roy William, A/Chief Yeo. of Sigs., R.C.N. (R) (V-5322), 5814-2nd Ave., Rosemount, Montreal, P.Q. 1 Jan., 1946.

Dean, Cecil Scott, P.O. Telegraphist, R.C.N. (R) (V-308), 186 Brunswick St., Halifax, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Dickson, Adam Alexander, A/C.P.O. (DEMS), R.C.N. (R) (V-10361), 1146 Brault Ave., Verdun, Montreal, P.Q. 1 Jan., 1946.

Emmerson, Charles Frederick, A/Stoker P.O., (FF), R.C.N. (R) (V-69549), 2360 Grand Blvd., Montreal, P.Q. 1 Jan., 1946.

Ferguson, Arthur James John, C.P.O. (TGM), R.C.N. (R) (V-13174), 1517-10th Ave. West, Calgary, Alta. 1 Jan., 1946.

Foster, Frederick Charles, E.R.A. 2/c, R.C.N. (R) (A-2257), 217 Front St. East, Toronto, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Fyffe, George Millar, A/Ldg. Smn. (DEMS Gunlayer) R.C.N. (R) (V-6443) (Now Lieut., R.C.N. (R)), 130 McLeod St., Ottawa, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Goodman, Lloyd Frithor, Yeo. of Sigs., R.C.N. (R) (V-9918), 534 Arlington St., Winnipeg, Man. 1 Jan., 1946.

Hitchin, Edward, Ldg. Seaman, R.C.N. (R) (V-7800), 5 Ronald Ave., Toronto, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Holk, Frank Robert Moore, Convoy Yeo. of Sigs. R.C.N. (R) (V-8240), 3½ Barnesdale Ave., Hamilton, Ont., 1 Jan., 1946

Jones, George Herbert, Chief Motor Mechanic 3/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-49010), 1804 Crescent Road, Victoria, B.C. 11 Dec., 1945.

Kendrick, Victor, A/P.O., R.C.N. (R) (V-5256), 481-7th Ave., Lachine, Que. 1 Jan., 1946.

Lain, John Andrew, Stoker P.O., R.C.N. (R) (V-12707), Foothills, Alta. 1 Jan., 1946.

Lambert, Leopold Joseph, A/P.O., (D.E.M.S.) R.C.N. (R) (A-260), Charney, Que. 1 Jan., 1946.

McNeill, Ian Allister Gordon, Chief Stoker, R.C.N. (21559), 566 Grone Ave., Ladner, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Morrison, Gordon Murray, A/Ldg. Stoker (F.F.) R.C.N. (R) (V-11709), 2037 York St., Vancouver, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Newton, William Harold, Stoker P.O., R.C.N. (R) (A-4114), General Delivery, Almonte, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Noble, Robert Hunt, C.P.O. R.C.N. (R) (A-931), General Delivery, Canso, Guys Co., N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Palleck, Albert William, A/P.O., R.C.N. (R) (V-16035), 355 N. Brodie St., Fort William, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Robertson, James John Kenneth, A/C.E.R.A. (V-30634), R.R. No. 1, Atkins Road, Victoria, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Thompson, William Michael, A/P.O., R.C.N. (R) (V-22185), Huntsville, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Walberg, Walter Andrew, Convoy Ldg. Sig., R.C.N. (R) (V-9363), 264½ Creighton St., Halifax, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Walker, James Stephen, C.P.O. Telegraphist, R.C.N. (R) (V-1131), 272 Grafton St., Charlottetown, P.E.I. 11 Dec., 1945.

Wilkins, William, Chief Stoker, R.C.N. (21175), 504 Cecilia Rd., Victoria, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Williston, Archibald Weston Cameron, Ldg. S.A., R.C.N. (R) (V-12879), 4133-81 Ave., Edmonton, Alta. 11 Dec., 1945.

M. In D. (Officers)—(36)

Alcock, Ian Ernest, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R) Rockland Lodge, 1249 Rockland Ave., Victoria, B.C. 22 Jan., 1946.

Briggs, Thomas Robert, Warrant Engineer, R.C.N. (R), Kamloops, B.C. 11 Dec., 1945.

Cairns, Robert, Lt. Cdr. (E), R.C.N. (R), 69 B Park Ave., Quebec, P.Q. 1 Jan., 1946.

Carruthers, William Rhys, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 118 Inglewood Drive, Toronto, Ont. 1 Jan,. 1946.

Cock, Peter John Bligh, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 432 Daly Ave., Ottawa, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Cunningham, Frederick Alexander, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R) 88 Spadina Ave., Hamilton, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Davenport, Wilfred, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N. (R), 1174 Hewlett Place, Victoria, B.C. 9 Oct., 1945.

Dickinson, Neville Spencer Charles, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N. (R), Royal Bank of Canada, Oxford St. and Quinpool Rd., Halifax, N.S. 9 Oct., 1945.

Dobson, Thomas Smith, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 4 McMurray St., Dundas, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Gardner, Eric, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 188½ Quinpool Rd., Halifax, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Geddes, Edward John, Lieut. Cdr. (E), R.C.N. (R), 339 Arnot St., Victoria, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Gratton, Joseph John René George, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 154 Park St., Moncton, N.B. 1 Jan., 1946.

Harper, Arthur Morrell, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 1622 Avondale Ave., Vancouver, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Hindle, Hamilton Francis, Warrant Engineer, R.C.N., 824 Hutchinson Ave., Esquimalt, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Howard, Louis Henry, Sub-Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 180 Enfield Crescent, Norwood, Manitoba. 1 Jan., 1946.

Hutchison, Ralph Delamere, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 30 Walker Ave., Toronto, Ont. 11 Dec., 1945.

Jensen, Paul Hoeybye, Cd. Engineer, R.C.N. (R), Copenhagen, Denmark. 11 Dec., 1945.

Johnstone, Thompson Albert, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), c/o W. A. Hibbert, Box 44, Sioux Lookout, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Kingsmill, John Gault, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 5 Marliot Lane, Surrey, England. 11 Dec., 1945.

Kinsman, William Burnley, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 4631 Dunbar St., Vancouver, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Landymore, William Moss, A/Lieut. Cdr., 95 Reid Ave., Ottawa, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Leeming, John McWhannell, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 2888 Glenwood Ave., Victoria, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

McDonald, Kenneth Reginald, Sub Lieut. (E), R.C.N. (R), Box 394, Sioux Lookout, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Morrow, William George, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 11304-125th St., Edmonton, Alta. 1 Jan., 1946.

Outhet, Murray McLaren, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 3035 Cameron Ave., Montreal, P.Q. 9 Oct., 1945.

Patterson, James, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 152 Island Highway, Victoria, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Rayburn, Albert Dudley, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 1402 Centre A. St. N.E., Calgary, Alta. 1 Jan., 1946.

Ross, James Finlay, Lieutenant (P), R.C.N. (R) (Posthumous), 33 Willow St., Truro, N.S. 20 Nov., 1945.

Ross, Robert Ian, Lieutenant, R.C.N. (R), 5490 South Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A. 1 Jan., 1946.

Russel, Norman Gardner, Lieut., R.C.N. (R), 67 Cote de Liesse, St. Laurent, Montreal, P.Q. 1 Jan., 1946.

Simpson, Peter Marnock, Warrant Engineer, R.C.N. (R), 316-1st St., Medicine Hat, Alta. 1 Jan., 1946.

Smith, Brien Kemp, Lieut. (E), R.C.N. (R), 58 Duplex Ave., Toronto, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Tullidge, Geoffrey Huish, Commander (S), R.C.N. (R), 7288 Angus Dr., Vancouver, B.C. 11 Dec., 1945.

Turnbull, James Martin, Lieut., R.C.N. (R), c/o Clarkson, Gordon, Dillworth & Nash, 15 Wellington St. W., Toronto, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Wilkinson, William Arthur, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N. (R), 64 Heath St. East, Toronto, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Williams, Horace, Warrant Shipwright, R.C.N., Imperoyal, Halifax, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

M. in D. (Ratings) (83)

Aitkenhead, John Paterson, C.E.R.A., R.C.N. (R) (A-1607), 47 Tragine Ave., Hamilton, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Backus, Robert George, Petty Officer, R.C.N. (R) (V-12122), 414 Powell St., Victoria, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Baird, Allan Murray, Petty Officer, R.C.N. (X-2972), 719 Vaughan Rd., Toronto, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Balcome, Hugh Albert Louis, P.O. Writer, R.C.N. (R) (V-25750), Trenton, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Baldwin, Leslie Allison, A/Ldg. Smn. (DEMS), R.C.N. (R) (V-12705), 1346 Alberni St., Vancouver, B.C., 1 Jan., 1946.

Bernard, William Henry, Able Seaman, R.C.N. (R), (V-45209), 290 Albert St., Ottawa, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Brophy, James Ed., C.E.A., R.C.N. (R) (V-25017), 117 Main St., Reserve Mines, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Brydson, Jack Alexander, Petty Officer, R.C.N. (R) (V-14499), Victoria Ave., White Rock, B.C. 9 Oct., 1945.

Burbine, Robert Joseph, Steward, R.C.N. (R) (V-87399), Ribert Herbert, Cumberland, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Caldicott, Douglas Harold, A/C.P.O. (DEMS) R.C.N. (X-41098), Ste. 4, 2122 Cook St., Victoria, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Cameron, Donald Adair, Petty Officer, R.C.N. (R) (V-2281), 66 McLean Blvd., Toronto, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Campbell, Albert Bruce, *BEM*, Able Seaman, R.C.N. (R) (A-3836), General Delivery, Quesnel, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Conn, James Ralph, Ldg. Steward, R.C.N. (R) (V-67835) (Posthumous), 7 St. Joseph St., Montreal, P.Q. 1 Jan., 1946.

Corbett, Douglas, P.O. Tel., R.C.N. (R) (V-5816), 326 St. Pierre St., St. Hyacinthe, P.Q. 1 Jan., 1946.

Craig, Asa Vincent, Stoker, P.O., R.C.N. (21717), 1151 Balmoral St., Medicine Hat, Alta. 1 Jan., 1946.

Craig, Henry Raymond, Patrolman, R.C.N. (R) (V-63822) (Posthumous) R.R. No. 3, Harrow, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Dance, John Walter, Able Seaman, R.C.N. (R) (A-2411), 466 Napier St., Collingwood, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Deschenes, Roger Julien, Petty Officer, R.C.N. (R) (A-630), L'Islet Co., L'Islet, P.Q. 11 Dec., 1945.

Dillabough, Joseph Edward, C. Sto. P.O., R.C.N. (R) (V-11393), 435-5th Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask. 1 Jan., 1946.

Doary, Peter Wilfred, Petty Officer, R.C.N. (R) (A-978), Cannis, P.O., Richmond Co., Cape Breton, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Duncan, James Malcolm, C.M.M. 3/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-35527), 59 Prince Albert Rd., Dartmouth, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Dunphy, Harold Edward, Chief Stoker, R.C.N. (R) (A-2047), 105 Baiden St., Portsmouth, Ont. 9 Oct., 1945.

Excell, Douglas, E.R.A. 4/c, R.C.N. (R), (V-31576), 1412 Dublin St., New Westminster, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Forrest, William, E.A. 3/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-62170), 1416 Ash St., Trail, B.C. 11 Dec., 1945.

Gammon, Leonard, Able Seaman, R.C.N. (R) (V-72213), Essex, Ont. 11 Dec., 1945.

Garrett, Roy Percy, E.R.A. 3/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-21797), 9712-87th Ave., Edmonton, Alta. 1 Jan., 1946.

Goar, George, A/E.R.A. 4/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-24327), c/o Mr. George Goar, Port Elgin, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Green, Richard William, Leading Seaman, R.C.N. (R) (V-26090), Rencontre West, Nfld. 1 Jan., 1946.

Gurney, Strang Lamont Gower, P.O. (Radar), R.C.N. (3430), 360 St. Anne St., Apt. 4, St. Hyacinthe, P.Q. 1 Jan., 1946.

Hard, Arthur Andrew, C.P.O., R.C.N. (3267), 6th Ave. East, Swift Current, Sask. 1 Jan., 1946.

Holman, Harold, Ldg. Sig., R.C.N. (R) (V-17083), 208 Central Ave., Apt. 4, London, Ont. 11 Dec., 1945.

Howells, Alfred Ridler, C.E.R.A., R.C.N. (R) (V-22769), 2544 Cornwall St., Vancouver, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Ingham, John Goodrick, C.E.R.A., R.C.N. (21576), 817 Columbia, Kamloops, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Jacobs, George Frederick, Ldg. Colder, R.C.N. (R) (V-267), 300 Oxford St., Halifax, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Jacques, Carlton Joseph, Stoker P.O., R.C.N. (R) (V-19139) (Posthumous), Box 166, New Road, Pictou, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Jay, Clarence Franklin Wallace, A/P.O., R.C.N. (R) (A-2843) (Posthumous), Mount Stewart, Queen's Co., P.E.I. 9 Oct., 1945.

Jones, Evan, A/Ldg. Stoker, R.C.N. (R) (V-35210), Viking, Alta. 1 Jan., 1946.

Keeler, Morton Harry, C.P.O., R.C.N. (4308) Louisburg P.O., Cape Breton, N.S. 1 January, 1946.

King, Leslie Furrier, Stores P.O., R.C.N. (R) (V-31494), Box 164, Boissevain, Man. 1 Jan., 1946.

Knight, Herbert Russell, Ldg. Smn., R.C.N. (R) (V-19140) (Posthumous) Box 697, Leamington, Ontairo. 1 Jan., 1946.

Larter, Chester, P.O., R.C.N. (R) (V114490) 1136 E. 19 Ave., Vancouver, B.C.. 11 Dec., 1945.

Levesque, Enoch Adeodat, C.P.O. (T.C.) R.C.N. (R) (A-642), 97 St. John St., Quebec, P.Q. 1 Jan. 1946.

MacKinnon, Verdun, (A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N. (R) (V-46699), 347 Archibald St. N., Fort William, Ont. 1 January, 1946.

Malott, Hazen Fox, Able Seaman (L.T.O.) R.C.N. (R) (V-49019) c/o Mr. Bernie Malott, Kingsville, Ont. 1 January, 1946.

Manning, Robert Francis, E.R.A. 3/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-24981), Pointe du Bois, Manitoba. 11 Dec., 1945.

Martin, Donald Muir, S.B.A., R.C.N. (R) (V-34213), 85 Drummond St., Brantford, Ont. 1 January, 1946.

Masuk, Walter Martin, Able Seaman, R.C.N. (R) (V-11562), 908 Ave. "M" South, Saskatoon, Sask. 1 Jan., 1946.

McDonald, Morgan Howsan, Leading Coder, R.C.N. (R) (V-24991), Gunton, Man. 1 Jan., 1946.

McIntyre, Ross, C.P.O. Cook (O), R.C.N. (R) (V-30026), 1116 North Park St., Victoria, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Mead, John Francis, A/C.P.O. (DEMS) R.C.N. (R) (V-16039), 1016 Linden Ave., Victoria, B.C. 1 January, 1946.

Metcalf, Harold Edward, Ldg. Coder, R.C.N. (R) (V-27624), 683 Pape Ave., Toronto, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Milkins, Jask, Able Seaman, R.C.N. (R) (V-19146), 8 Foundry St., Leamington, Ont. 9 Oct., 1946.

Miller, Chris Wayne, R.A. 4/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-57134), 162 Brunswick St., Stratford, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Milligan, Ross Elwood, P.O., R.C.N. (R) (A-5358), 15 Richard St., Trenton, Ontario. 11 Dec., 1945.

Moilliet, Antony, R.A., 4/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-49831), 495 Beach Drive, Victoria, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Morrow, Roy Robert, C.P.O. (Stoker), R.C.N. (R) (V-2023), 43 Sewell St., Saint John, N.B. 1 Jan. 1946.

Murray, Lawrence James, Able Seaman, R.C.N. (R) (V-51071), 949 Salisbury Drive, Vancouver, B.C. 11 Dec., 1945.

Nation, Sidney George, A/P.O. (DEMS) R.C.N. (R) (V-12299), 505 Government St., Victoria, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Nelson, Terrence Dominic, Signalman, R.C.N. (R) (V-51108) (Posthumous) 764 King St., London Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

O'Connell, Leslie James, A/C.P.O., (T.C.) R.C.N. (R) (V-17598), 111 Dundas St., Brantford, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Patterson, Allan Lorne, P.Q. (Diver), R.C.N. (3029), Box 127, 4th Ave., West, Assiniboine, Sask. 1 January, 1946.

Perigo, George Mertha, A/P.O. (AA II) R.C.N. (3788), 81 Peter St. South, Orillia, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Rogers, Norville, Wilfrid, Petty Officer, R.C.N. (R) (V-14274), 1106 E. 60 Ave., Vancouver, B.C. 11 Dec., 1945.

Roscoe, Walter Ewart, Able Seaman, R.C.N. (R) (V-24089), 254 Dubic St., Norwood, Man. 1 Jan., 1946.

Sadler, Frank Emil, A/Ldg. Smn. (DEMS) R.C.N. (R) (A-450), 2837 Clarke Drive, Vancouver, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Semple, Robert, Chief Sto. P.O., R.C.N. (22202), Box 13, Atholville, N.B. 1 Jan., 1946.

Shedden James Alexander, R.A. 4/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-34351), 283 Royce Ave., Toronto, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Smith, William, Stoker P.O., R.C.N. (R) (A-4839) Tobin Road, Sydney Mines, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Smith, William Valentine, E.R.A. 2/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-33077), 1152 St. Paul St., Three Rivers, Que. 1 Jan., 1946.

Stones, H.A., Cook (S) R.C.N. (R) (V-27685), 227 Chambers Ave., Toronto 9, Ont. 11 Dec., 1945.

Tamblyn, Edwin Francis, Ldg. Cook (S), R.C.N. (R) (V-50299), 84 Glen Manor Drive, Toronto, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Thibodeau, Bernard Francis, A.B. (Radar III), R.C.N. (R) (V-2731), 10 Chester Ave., N. Woburn, Mass., U.S.A. 1 Jan., 1946.

Odling, Gosta William, Stoker 1/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-41103), Badum, Arnes, Sweden. 11 Dec., 1945.

Thornhill Claude Badham, A.B. (Radar II), R.C.N. (4515), 556 E. Broadway, Vancouver, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Ward, John Clement, E.R.A. 3/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-42344), 74 Salisbury Ave., Toronto 5, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Weiler, Herbert Eugene, Ldg. Steward, R.C.N. (R) (V-32534), 800 Elias St., London, Ont. 1 Jan., 1946.

Wellburn, Clifford Collinson, Ldg. Seaman, R.C.N. (R) (V-36029), 3135 West 11th Ave., Vancouver, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Whalen, John Cameron, Stores C.P.O., R.C.N. (R) (V-25266), 11 Sebastion Place, Halifax, N.S. 1 Jan., 1946.

Williams, David Anthony, *DSM*, Chief Stoker, R.C.N. (21256), 2943 Bridge St., Victoria, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

Williamson, Richard, Shipwright 3/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-45438), 393 Ferry Road, St. James, Man. 1 Jan., 1946.

Wilson, Roy Francis, Petty Officer, R.C.N. (R) (V-12222), 11332-95 A. St., Edmonton, Alta. 1 Jan., 1946.

Winterton, Ralph, E.R.A. 3/c, R.C.N. (R) (V-12726), Hub Hotel, Jasper Ave., Edmonton, Alta. 1 Jan. 1946.

Wright, Andrew James, A/Ldg. Smn. (DEMS.) R.C.N. (R) (A-3425), 1668 W 8th Ave., Vancouver, B.C. 1 Jan., 1946.

The Czechoslovakia Military Cross 1939

Shore, Sidore Basil, Lieut. Cdr. (SB), R.C.N. c/o British Embassy, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. 3 June, 1946.

Cravate de commandeur de la légion d'honneur with Military Cross and Palm (1) (France)

Murray, Leonard Warren, Rear Admiral, R.C.N., 507 Park West, Marble Arch, London W2, England. 7 Nov., 1945.

Legion of Honour (France) (4)

Brand, Eric S., Captain, R.C.N., 476 Wilbrod St., Ottawa, Ont. 27 Nov., 1946.

DeMarbois, J. M. B. P., Captain, R.C.N., c/o Upper Canada College, Lonsdale Road, Toronto 12, Ont 27 Nov., 1946.

Jones, George Clarence, Vice Admiral, R.C.N. (Posthumous), 1427 Laurier Ave., W., Vancouver. B.C. 27 Nov., 1946.

Nelles, Percy Walker, Admiral, R.C.N., 7 Rideau Gate, Ottawa, Ont. 27 Nov., 1946.

Knight (First Class) of the Order of St. Olav

(Norway) (1)

Boak, Eric Eversley Garratt, *DSC*, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N., 65 Laval Street, Apt. No. 3, Hull, P.Q. 30 May, 1946.

Legion of Merit, Degree of Commander

(U.S.A.) (7)

Beech, William James Robert, Commodore, R.C.N., 600 Linkleas Ave., Victoria, B.C. 27 June, 1946.

Brand, Eric S., Captain, R.C.N., 476 Wilbrod St., Ottawa, Ont. 30 Jan., 1946.

Brodeur, Victor Gabriel, Rear Admiral, R.C.N., 4414 West 4th Ave., Vancouver, B.C. 5 Aug., 1946.

Legion of Merit, Degree of Commander

Jones, George Clarence, *CB*, Vice Admiral, R.C.N. (Posthumous), 1427 Laurier Ave. West, Vancouver, B.C. 10 July, 1946.

Murray, Leonard Warren, *CB*, *CBE*, Rear Admiral, R.C.N., 507 Park West, Marble Arch, London W2, England. 6 May, 1946.

Nelles, Percy Walker, *CB*, Admiral, R.C.N., 7 Rideau Gate, Ottawa, Ont. 27 June, 1946.

Reid, Howard Emmerson, *CB*, Vice Admiral, R.C.N., 2222 "S" St. N.W., Washington, D.C., U.S.A. 6 March, 1946.

Legion of Merit, Degree of Officer (9) (U.S.A.)

Bidwell, Roger Edward Shelford, Captain, R.C.N., Director of Naval Air Division, Naval Service Headquarters, Ottawa, Ont. 6 May, 1946.

DeMarbois, Jean Maurice Barbe Pougnat, Captain, R.C.N., c/o Upper Canada College, Lonsdale Road, Toronto 12, Ont. 30 Jan., 1946.

De Wolf, Henry George, *CBE*, *DSO*, *DSC*, Commodore, R.C.N., Assistant Chief of the Naval Staff, Naval Service Headquarters, Ottawa, Ont. 6 May, 1946.

Godfrey, Valentine Stuart, Captain, R.C.N., Seaholm, H.M.C. Dockyard, Esquimalt, B.C. 30 Jan., 1946.

Harries, James Leslie, *OBE*, Commander, R.C.N. (R), c/o Mrs. W. Elliott, 11 Banastre Ave., The Heath Cardiff, Glamorgan, England. 18 April, 1946.

Holms, William Boyd Love, Captain, R.C.N., c/o Bank of Nova Scotia, Douglas St., Victoria, B.C. 30 Jan., 1946.

Mainguy, Edmond Rollo, *OBE*, Commodore, R.C.N., Heanitree Farm, Herd Rd., Duncan, B.C. 6 May, 1946.

Nares, H. G., Commander, R.C.N. (R), Okanagan Investments, Kelowna, B.C. 30 Jan., 1946.

Sherwood, Edson C., Captain, R.C.N., 290 Mariposa Rd., Rockcliffe, Ottawa, Ont. 10 Nov., 1945.

Medal of Freedom (U.S.A.) (1)

MacDonald, James Herbert, Stoker I, R.C.N. (22152), 36 Gammon Rd., Watford Herts, England.

ARMY

Victoria Cross

Rank and Name—Corps—Address

H/Capt. (A/H/Maj) J. W. Foote, Canadian Chaplain Services, Port Hope, Ont.

H.6008 WO II (CSM) J. R. Osborn, Canadian Infantry Corps, 87 Guay Ave., St. Vital, Man.

The Distinguished Service Order (DSO)

Major J. D. Learment, Canadian Infantry Corps, Truro, N.S.

Major F. S. Corbeau, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Penetanguishene, Ont.

Lt-Col. G. M. Churchill, *ED*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Wasagaming, Man.

Lt-Col. (A/Brig.) F. D. Lace, *OBE*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 64 St. Clair Ave. W., Toronto, Ont.

Lt-Col. C. A. Baerman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

Lt-Col. A. J. B. Bailey, *MBE*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Crofton, Vancouver Island, B.C.

Lt-Col A. G. Chubb, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1030 Hillcrest Ave., Calgary, Alta.

Lt-Col. J. W. Eaton, *OBE*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 104 Rosedale Heights Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Lt-Col. W. W. Halpenny, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 570 Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lt-Col. E. D. Nighswander, *OBE, ED*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 9 Swanwick Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt-Col. G. G. K. Peake, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Artilery, 121 North River Rd., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Lt-Col. R. H. E. Walker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3 Belvedere Rd., Westmount, P.Q.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) A. F. Coffin Canadian Infantry Corps, 1023-7th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) G. F. Eadie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 496 Clifton St., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) J. N. Gordon, Canadian Infanty Corps, 299 Forest Hill Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) C. M. McLean, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 210 Huron St., Stratford, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) G. E. B. Renison, Canadian Infantry Corps, Iroquois Falls, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) R. D. Telford, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 327 Beaverbrook St., Winnipeg, Man.

Major J. D. Baird, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2930 Qu'Appelle St., Victoria, B.C.

Major G. T. Baylay, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 243 Warren Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Major F. P. Boothe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 39 Rosedale Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Major L. H. Brown, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Mallorytown, Ont.

Major G. F. Charlebois, Canadian Infantry Corps, Placentia Bay, Nfld.

Major F. H. Clarke, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2419-28th St. W., Calgary, Alta.

Major M. G. Clennett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2 Oakland Rd., Halifax, N.S.

Maior C. R. Crocker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Millerton, N.B.

Major A. H. Crosbie, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, St. Johns, Nfld.

Major H. E. Dalton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 141 Lawton Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Major J. L. Dandy, Canadian Infantry Corps, Welland, Ont.

Major G. R. Flawn, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 65 Hawthorne St., Dartmouth, N.S.

Major J. A. Forman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 161 King St., Kingston, Ont.

Major E. L. Froggett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 19 Palmerston St., Brantford, Ont.

Major R. J. Graham, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Belleville, Ont.

Major W. D. Heyland, Canadian Infantry Corps, Claresholm, Alta.

Major E. M. Hodson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Halifax, N.S.

Major E. W. Hudson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1338 Clifton Ave., Moose Jaw, Sask.

Major W. G. James, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Bowmanvile, Ont.

Major E. F. Klugman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kitchener, Ont.

Major C. R. Lamoureux, Canadian Infantry Corps, Three Rivers, P.Q.

Major R. D. MacKenzie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 211 Patricia Rd., Windsor, Ont.

Major S. MacKinnon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 34 Duke St., New Glasgow, N.S.

Major C. W. MacLean, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4 Cedar Ave., Pointe Claire, P.Q.

Major W. A. Milroy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 11444-97th St., Edmonton, Alta.

Major T. B. Nash, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 12920 Stony Plain Rd., Edmonton, Alta.

Major R. J. Orr, Canadian Infantry Corps, 847 Outremont Ave., Outremont, P.Q.

Major R. W. Potts, Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 Ridge Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Major S. V. Radley-Walters, *MC*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 38-12th St., Limoilou, P.Q.

Major M. E. Reiner, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Wellesley, Ont.

Major F. de S. Robert, Canadian Infantry Corps, 220 Grand Allée, Quebec, P.Q.

Major F. B. Rolph, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. John, N.B.

Major J. A. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, Rimouski, P.Q.

Major E. J. H. Ryall, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

Major G. C. Savage, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 536 Pine Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Major W. J. E. Simmons, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 7 Springdale Blvd., East York, Ont.

Major F. A. Sparks, Canadian Infantry Corps, 600½ Grant St., Woodstock, Ont.

Major R. Styffe, Canadian Infantry Corps, 144 Duke St., St. John, N.B.

Major J. F. Swayze, Canadian Infantry Corps, 276 Queen St., Hamilton, Ont.

Major R. R. Taylor, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2137-17th St., S.W., Calgary, Alta.

Major H. Tellier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4392 Western Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Major M. L. Tucker, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 498 Lansdowne Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Major K. A. Williams, Canadian Infantry Corps, Weyburn, Sask.

Major J. E. W. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, 113 Lascelles Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Captain (A/Maj.) L. F. Kirkpatrick, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Parrsboro, N.S.

Captain (A/Maj.) J. G. Martin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 41 Allen St. E., Waterloo, Ont.

Major G. D. A. Bieler, *MBE*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5439 Earnscliffe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Brigadier W. W. Southam, *ED*, Canadian Army, 9 Ridge Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. D. E. Catto, *ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 14 Plymbridge Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. F. K. Jasperson, *ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 224 Sunset Ave., Windsor, Ont.

Lt.-Col. R. R. Labatt, *ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5 Beulah Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Major H. F. Lazier, *ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 266 Aberdeen Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Major D. C. Orme, Canadian Infantry Corps, Weyburn, Sask.

Major G. M. Rolfe, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 350 Northcliffe Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Major W. A. Bishop, *ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bury, P.Q.

Major E. Hodkinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 755 Spruce St., Winnipeg, Man.

Bar to the Distinguished Service Order

Lt.-Col. J. R. Stone, *DSO*, *MC*, Canadian Infantry Corps, Blueberry Mountain, Alta.

Lt.-Col. M. Young, *DSO*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hillier, Ont.

Second Bar to the Distinguished Service Order

Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) J. V. Allard, *DSO*, Canadian Army, 512, rue Bureau, Trois-Rivières, P.Q.

The Military Cross (M.C.)

Capt. (A/Maj.) D. F. W. Aitkens, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 604 Parkdale Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. S. F. Rook, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 485 Cranbrooke Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) H. B. Boates, Canadian Infantry Corps, Pictou, N.S.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. F. Davey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 780-17th St., West Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. S. Elder, Canadian Infantry Corps, 92 West Moira St., Belleville, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. A. Ferguson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 24 Lewrey Ave. N., Galt, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) P. F. Fisher, Canadian Infantry Corps, 581 Huron St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) C. S. MacLaren, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5406 Monkland Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. J. K. Pyne, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Coaticook, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. Schwob, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3015 Shebrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) H. E. Theobald, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 240 MacDonald Ave., Belleville, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) L. A. Watling, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chatham, N.B.

H/Capt. J. O. Anderson, Canadian Chaplain Services, 15 St. Mark's Place, St. Vital, Man.

Capt. B. L. P. Brosseau, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 190 Vimy St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Capt. W. M. Byers, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Metcalfe, Ont.

Capt. D. A. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 29 Catherine St., Glace Bay, N.S.

H/Capt. J. A. L. Clermont, Canadian Chaplain Services, 10228 St. Charles St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. D. M. Deacon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2 Elm Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. A. T. E. Fairweather, Canadian Infantry Corps, 72 Leinster St., Saint John, N.B.

H/Capt. J. W. Huard, Canadian Chaplain Services, Rimouski, P.Q.

Capt. J. T. Jenkinson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Main St., Grimsby, Ont.

Capt. J. V. Kerrigan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 500 Roslyn Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Capt. J. R. Koensgen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 258 Bertrand St., St. Boniface, Man.

H/Capt. C. L. Lewis, Canadian Chaplain Services, 1 Rolph Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. D. Little, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 128 Main St., Selkirk, Man.

H/Capt. R. E. Lowrey, Canadian Chaplain Services, 182 Pretoria Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. R. S. Lucas, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 499 George St., Cobourg, Ont.

H/Capt. E. C. MacDonald, Canadian Chaplain Services, 369 Metcalfe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. S. W. McDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. D. McGowan, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Kilmuir, P.E.I.

Capt. H. N. McLeod, Canadian Infantry Corps, 110 Orange St., Saint John, N.B.

Capt. M. A. McTague, Canadian Infantry Corps, 25 Bishop St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Capt. A. M. Matheson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 208-4th St., New Westminster, B.C.

Capt. W. J. A. May, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2354-A Yonge St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. M. W. Mowle, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Cookshire, P.Q.

Capt. A. G. Robinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lashburn, Sask.

Capt. L. G. Rupert, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1050 Yonge St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. A. Sharpe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 973 MacMillan Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. E. Spafford, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 14 Chelsea Pl., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. A. S. Todd, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 309 Indian Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. A. J. S. Turvey, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 101 Walmsley Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

H/Capt. W. Valentine, Canadian Chaplain Services, Dawson, Yukon.

Capt. D. H. Vermette, Canadian Infantry Corps, 656 Jarry St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. S. R. Wells, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1106-12th St. E., Saskatoon, Sask.

Capt. F. R. Wiggs, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2131 Commercial Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. F. G. Williams, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Fort Frances, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) R. Durand, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Loretteville, P.Q.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) G. A. Embury, Canadian Infantry Corps, Corydon Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) G. R. Fowler, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Baldur, Man.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) R. H. Goepel, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Kelowna, B.C.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) R. W. Johnston, Canadian Infantry Corps, 936 Cadero St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) H. L. Livingston, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 367 Carlton St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) D. C. Stewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 241 Fifth St. W., Cornwall, Ont.

Lieut. W. C. Alward, Canadian Infantry Corps, 364 Fourth St., New Aberdeen, N.S.

Lieut. L. Bergeron, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1647 Joliette St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. H. Bookbinder, Canadian Infantry Corps, 284 St. Johns Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. S. F. Bowick, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2028 Marlowe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. E. Cousineau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 55½ Baird St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. A. C. Davis, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 102 Fourth Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. P. Faribault, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4111 St. Hubert St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. W. W. Finlay, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, R.R. No. 7, Napanee, Ont.

Lieut. W. F. J. Gildersleeve, Canadian Infantry Corps, 912 Broughton St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. A. C. Gillespie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 28 Fernwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. J. F. Hargrave, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1079 Pape Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. H. J. Harkes, Canadian Infantry Corps, 209 First St., Port Credit, Ont.

Lieut. J. Harris, Canadian Infantry Corps, 537 Milton St., Nanaimo, B.C.

Lieut. H. R. Howitt, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 52 Lyon St., Guelph, Ont.

Lieut. J. Johnston, Canadian Infantry Corps, 458 Pembroke St., Pembroke, Ont.

Lieut. N. J. Kneeland, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5170 Verdun Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

Lieut. F. P. J. P. R. LaFlèche, Canadian Infantry Corps, 325 Daly Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. H. de M. Lamarre, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3902 Parc Lafontaine, Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. M. Lewicky, Canadian Infantry Corps, 105 Egerton Rd., St. Vital, Man.

Lieut. A. B. Megaw, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 122 Grenfell Blvd., Tuxedo, Man.

Lieut. S. K. Nickerson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Yarmouth, N.S.

Lieut. E. Norman, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 10232 Wadhurst Rd., Edmonton, Alta.

Lieut. J. Richardson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 219 McIntyre St. E., North Bay, Ont.

Lieut. D. L. Sarantos, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 68 Bedford Row, Halifax, N.S.

Lieut. J. H. Stone, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 278 Powell Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. J. L. Summers, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Wilkie, Sask.

Lieut. A. M. Sweeton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Exeter, Ont.

Lieut. W. B. Tobey, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 12310-108th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

K.47505 WO I (RSM) J. Clifford, Canadian Infantry Corps, Tribune, Sask.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) G. A. J. A. Bellavance, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1877 Sherbrooke E., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) V. L. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 159 Water St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Lieut. J. L. P. H. Boucher, The Corps of Royal Canadian Enginers, 225 Pine St., Sudbury, Ont.

Lieut. H. S. Crowe, Canadian Infantry Corps, 577 Lipton St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. J. R. Lemesurier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 419 Roslyn Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Capt. D. W. Clare, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Port Credit, Ont.

Capt. J. M. Currie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 9 Ravenscliffe Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. C. R. Eldred, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1922-23rd Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. R. J. H. Hainault, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1953 Bellechasse, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. A. C. Hill, Canadian Infantry Corps, 19-A Summerhill Gdns., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. G. Housser, Canadian Infantry Corps, 251 Warren Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. R. Huff, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5 Park Lane, Chatham, Ont.

Capt. T. M. Osten, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oxbow, Sask.

Capt. A. G. Vandelac, Canadian Infantry Corps, 120 Rache East, Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. E. Thompson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 61 Palmerston Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. V. H. Conn, Canadian Infantry Corps, Weyburn, Sask.

Lieut. W. G. Cunningham, Canadian Infantry Corps, Weyburn, Sask.

Lieut. J. E. R. Wood, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1551 Angus Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. F. T. Atkinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 31 Nanton Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H/Capt. U. Laite, Canadian Chaplain Services, 3650 W-19th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. R. W. Philip, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. T. A. Blackwood, Canadian Infantry Corps, Regina, Sask.

Lieut. C. A. Blaver, Canadian Infantry Corps, 115 Glendonwynne Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. W. F. Nugent, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lindsay, Ont.

Lieut. F. G. Power, Canadian Infantry Corps, 15 Daly Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

The Distinguished Conduct Medal (*DCM*)

H.100061 WO II (CSM) F. K. Breakey, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hartney, Man.

P.1579 WO. II (SSM) R. W. Deeming, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 31 Melbourne Ave., Toronto, Ont.

P.1062 WO. II (SSM) P. A. Forgrave, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 180 1st St., Iberville, P.Q.

F.55611 WO. II (CSM) J. H. MacQueen, Canadian Infantry Corps, Donkin, N.S.

E.19022 WO. II (CSM) G. Nadeau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 38 Rue Champlain, Lac Megantic, P.Q.

F.54818 WO. II (CSM) J. W. Olford, Canadian Infantry Corps, 38 Mansfield St., Glace Bay, N.S.

D.882922 WO. II (CSM) A. F. Turnbull, Canadian Infantry Corps, 986 Davaar Ave., Outremont, P.Q.

A.37403 Sgt. L. J. Bassett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 21 Nottingham St., Guelph, Ont.

F.76599 Sgt. A. Bennett, Canadian Infantry Corps 88 W. St. N., Sydney, N.S.

E.5634 Sgt. R. Chartrand, Canadian Infantry Corps, Laprairie, P.Q.

G.57535 Sgt. G. W. Eldridge, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. George, N.B.

H.16295 Sgt. J. T. King, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oxdrift, Ont.

H.40964 Sgt. J. I. McIvor, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sioux Lookout, Ont.

D.81699 Sgt. J. G. Tootle, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 955 Addington Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

K.38586 Cpl. M. J. Allison, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 304 St. Paul St., St. Catharines, Ont.

A.21463 WO. II (CSM) C. Stapleton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Windsor, Ont.

H.19744 Sgt. G. U. Renwick, Canadian Infantry Corps, Neepawa, Man.

D.62214 L/Sgt. P. Arseneau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 525A Lindsay St., Drummondville, P.Q.

B.66765 L/Sgt. E. F. Coles, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4 Emerson Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.10206 Cpl. H. C. Keys, Canadian Infantry Corps, 515 Rithet St., Victoria, B.C.

H.19299 Cpl. G. H. Meldrum, Canadian Infantry Corps, 258 Isabel St., Winnipeg, Man.

B.67589 Pte. G. G. Pelletier, Canadian Infantry Corps, Trinity Baie, P.Q.

E.29812 CQMS C. Standish, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cookshire, P.Q.

H.6235 Cpl. D. E. Rix, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

H.16444 Sgt. L. K. Pals, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 410 Spence St., Winnipeg, Man.

C.97586 S/Sgt. C. A. Clark, Canadian Postal Corps, 25 Neville Park Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

P.7541 Sgt. R. J. Routledge, Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 532-13th St., Brandon, Man.

The Military Medal (*M.M.*)

D.131241 Sgt. J. A. Bois, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 331 Marion St., Sudbury, Ont.

F.66339 L/Sgt. F. N. Whynot, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Mahone Bay, N.S.

B.118977 Tpr. W. B. Seymour, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 14 Elba Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D.26000 WO I (RSM) J. M. H. Cloutte, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3411 Northcliffe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

A.56018 WO I (RSM) J. D. A. Corrigan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Carling Terrace, Wingham, Ont.

A.11614 WO I (RSM) G. F. Curtis, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bellwood, Ont.

B.37247 WO I (RSM) R. M. Hibberd, Canadian Infantry Corps, Waterdown, Ont.

B.45741 WO I (RSM) P. C. McGinlay, Canadian Infantry Corps, 278½ King St. E., Hamilton, Ont.

B.24120 WO I (RSM) G. A. McKelvey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1368 Danforth Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D.61002 WO I (RSM) M. J. D. Nantel, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4219 Mentana, Montreal, P.Q.

F.50197 WO II (CSM) W. A. Baillie, Canadian Infantry Corps, River John, N.S.

B.40674 WO II (CSM) W. F. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1886 Prospect St., Niagara Falls, Ont.

G.17415 WO II (CSM) C. A. A. Cox, Canadian Infantry Corps, Beechwood, N.B.

K52664 WO II (SSM) W. G. B. Craig, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2442 E. 6th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

L.12032 WO II (CSM) J. E. Dean, Canadian Infantry Corps, Estevan, Sask.

P.1548 WO II (SSM) E. W. Douglass, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1505 Dundas St. E., Toronto, Ont.

B.15502 WO II (BSM) F. C. Hall, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 41 Princess St., Burlington, Ont.

H.35261 WO II (BSM) A. E. Haywood, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 80 Colony St., Winnipeg, Man.

C.21087 WO II (CSM) M. A. Martin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Halifax, N.S.

F.29861 WO II (SSM) C. L. Nicholson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 174½ South St., Halifax, N.S.

G.10007 WO II (BSM) F. G. Powell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 233 Pitt St., Saint John, N.B.

B.41341 WO II (CSM) G. Sim, Canadian Infantry Corps, 184 Hanson St., Toronto, Ont.

H.46145 WO II (CSM) H. W. Usher, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dryden, Ont.

M.11702 WO II (CSM) R. L. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Leo, Alta.

F.40350 CQMS M. G. McIsaac, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sydney Mines, N.S.

C.38722 BQMS G. F. Potter, The Royal Canadian Artillery, King St., Gananoque, Ont.

B.78912 CQMS S. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 759 Ossington Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.42179 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) A. M. M. Bell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 42 Purcell Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

B.51618 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) D. Bowman, Caandian Infantry Corps, St. Michael St., Georgetown, Ont.

B.5910 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) P. Willigen, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 24 Soudan Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D.81058 Sgt. (CQMS) R. W. Oxley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5017 LaSalle Blvd., Verdun, P.Q.

D.129 Sgt. J. L. Anfossi, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps. 5978 Hamilton St., Montreal, P.Q.

C.12488 Sgt. J. E. Aris, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 485 Laurier Ave. W., Ottawa, Ont.

E.21897 Sgt. G. S. Arkinson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 83 Fraser St., Quebec, P.Q.

H.38546 Sgt. G. H. Bird, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 272 Mountain Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

B.32004 Sgt. H. D. Black, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 100-A Admiral Rd., Toronto, Ont.

H.21027 Sgt. L. G. S. Blue, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fort Garry, Man.

A.49974 Sgt. W. F. B. Bunda, Canadian Infantry Corps, 39 Oak St., Wallaceburg, Ont.

B.40804 Sgt. G. E. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 351 Queenston Rd., St. Catharines, Ont.

D.150059 Sgt. A. R. Carriere, Canadian Infantry Corps, Magog, P.Q.

F.6171 Sgt. W. A. Cochrane, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hawthorne St., Windsor, N.S.

C.72756 Sgt. J. J. Crafton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 135 Queen St., Lindsay, Ont.

C.58014 Sgt. R. E. Dailey, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 810 Riverside Dr., St. Lambert, P.Q.

B.50069 Sgt. G. J. Eno, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 70 Helen St., Cobalt, Ont.

M.62367 Sgt. C. Fielding, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Hanna, Alta.

M.44865 Sgt. F. E. Freer, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Bear Flat, B.C.

D.91270 Sgt. J. C. Gillies, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 636 Hibernia Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

A.11178 Sgt. W. J. Hansford, Canadian Infantry Corps, 70 Argyle St., Stratford, Ont.

L.53546 Sgt. F. Harbor, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Hanley, Sask.

A.4515 Sgt. T. R. Hardingham, Canadian Infantry Corps, 237 Bernard Ave., London, Ont.

G.8022 Sgt. H. M. Heckbert, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Chatham, N.B.

D.9075 Sgt. A. A. Holmes, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 26 Devonshire Rd., Greenfield Park, P.Q.

A.37690 Sgt. T. A. E. Hopkins, Canadian Infantry Corps, Tobermory, Ont.

K.75179 Sgt. W. E. Hopper, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 45 W-10th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

L.22231 Sgt. I. R. Johns, The Royal Canadian Cirps of Signals, 1316 Walnut St., Vancouver, B.C.

B.69668 Sgt. W. A. Johnston, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1212 Cannon St. E., Hamilton, Ont.

K.47292 Sgt. J. D. Jones, Canadian Infantry Corps, Steelhead, B.C.

H.14798 Sgt. A. G. Kennedy, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

A.102884 Sgt. K. F. Larochelle, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Tilbury, Ont.

E.34806 Sgt. W. F. LeLachuer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Rosebridge, P.Q.

B.133323 Sgt. R. J. McKean, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4 Waters St., St. Catharines, Ont.

K.11 Sgt. J. C. McLeod, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vernon, B.C.

K.47265 Sgt. D. M. McNabb, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3734 Yale St., Vancouver, B.C.

B.129523 Sgt. H. H. K. MacPherson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 327 Queen St. S., Hamilton, Ont.

H.20370 Sgt. D. A. Middleton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 57 Pembroke St., Toronto, Ont.

B.61006 Sgt. J. H. Munro, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Uxbridge, Ont.

H.26482 Sgt. G. E. Murray, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 547 Selkirk Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

F.59651 Sgt. W. B. Peters, Canadian Infantry Corps, 54 Bayfield St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

B.155191 Sgt. J. Prokopchuk, Canadian Infantry Corps, 36 Lloyd St., Hamilton, Ont.

C.58035 Sgt. G. T. Prophet, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 27 McGill St., Toronto, Ont.

H.20017 Sgt. H. W. Reichert, Canadian Infantry Corps, Morden, Man.

H.41406 Sgt. A. F. Richardson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Atikokan, Ont.

L.53709 Sgt. W. E. Rosa, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Lancer, Sask.

G.5099 Sgt. J. C. Sansom, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Napadogan, N.B.

L.34018 Sgt. J. S. Scott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 427-6th Ave. E., Calgary, Alta.

L.19618 Sgt. H. C. Shaw, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 704 Dufferin Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.

L.6114 Sgt. E. Q. Smart, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 10817-79th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

K.47005 Sgt. G. E. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, New Westminster, B.C.

D.76121 Sgt. F. H. Sparrow, Canadian Infantry Corps, 223 Melville Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

D.9182 Sgt. K. F. Spracklin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 34 Carlton St., St. John, Nfld.

A.86860 Sgt. B. M. Stalker, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 1, Rodney, Ont.

D.62589 Sgt. M. Steben, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2051 Bleury St., Montreal, P.Q.

G.146 Sgt. A. Stevens, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Coles Island, N.B.

K.38151 Sgt. P. H. Stout, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Abbotsford, B.C.

B.11065 Sgt. T. W. Todd, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 33 Rose Ave., Brantford, Ont.

K.57813 Sgt. J. A. Tree, Canadian Infantry Corps, Glenboro, Man.

C.9333 Sgt. H. T. Trueman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Seelys Bay, Ont.

D.26451 Sgt. L. C. Wells, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5663-4th Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B.32235 Sgt. D. T. Whitfield, Canadian Infantry Corps, 22 Hilbernia St., Toronto, Ont.

B.63708 Sgt. R. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 159 Campbell Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.49001 Sgt. G. L. Woolf, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1209 11th St. W., Calgary, Alta.

D.138362 L/Sgt. J. F. Appleby, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Charles, P.Q.

F.2939 L/Sgt. C. M. Campbell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Bass River, N.S.

H.13120 L/Sgt. G. C. Finch, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 558 Arlington St., Winnipeg, Man.

K.75099 L/Sgt. A. Glover, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Pitt Meadows, B.C.

F.45191 L/Sgt. H. Kearley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Thorburn, N.S.

C.553 L/Sgt. J. H. Lewis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Napanee, Ont.

B.75914 L/Sgt. S. J. Maynard, Canadian Infantry Corps, 248 Fulton Ave., East York, Ont.

A.10126 L/Sgt. G. F. Percy, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 321 Ontario St., Toronto, Ont.

K.19019 L/Sgt. S. V. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 213-25th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

K.70861 L/Sgt. W. D. Wallace, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3281-26th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.

D.71516 L/Sgt. W. A. D. Williams, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3240 Maplewood Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

F.54944 L/Sgt. F. A. Wood, Canadian Infantry Corps, Glace Bay, N.S.

B.31513 Bdr. (A/Sgt.) F. J. Bolton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 17 Rosseau Rd., Hamilton, Ont.

A.102242 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) I. M. Deslippe, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1544 Pillett Rd., Windsor, Ont.

C.27771 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. N. Irwin, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 3, Harrowsmith, Ont.

K.62175 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) G. H. Jackson, Canadian Infantry Corps, East Wellington, V.I., B.C.

L.36084 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) F. H. Jesson, Canadian Provost Corps, 749 Market St., Victoria, B.C.

B.88011 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) F. M. Sexton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 113 George St., St. Catharines, Ont.

H.36804 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) R. Terhorst, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Harlington, Man.

L.65300 Cpl. T. E. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Pinkham, Sask.

D.123164 Cpl. C. A. Belanger, Canadian Infantry Corps, 274 Dorchester E., Montreal, P.Q.

D.91169 Cpl. G. A. Bennett, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 81-3rd Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

F.87799 Bdr. H. C. Brewer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 391 Alexandra St., Sydney, N.S.

K.66094 Cpl. J. D. Brown, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Rossland, B.C.

A.118190 Cpl. V. A. Carroll, Canadian Infantry Corps, Neidpath, Sask.

F.87216 Cpl. A. B. Cress, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bear River, N.S.

H.59648 Bdr. J. Fearnley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Rapid City, Man.

C.58766 Cpl. J. R. H. Fumerton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. #2, Carleton Place, Ont.

D.128754 Cpl. G. A. Gill, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 2184 Marcil Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

F.50377 Cpl. R. M. Harrison, Canadian Infantry Corps, 35 LaPlanche St., Amherst, N.S.

M.9070 Cpl. A. E. Kimball, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Rainier, Alta.

M.65556 Cpl. A. A. Lawrence, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Clandonald, Alta.

H.9027 Cpl. T. A. M. Leadbetter, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 632 Warsaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

H.400 Cpl. D. E. Lodwick, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Portage La Prairie, Man.

C.41265 Cpl. H. D. Moore, Canadian Infantry Corps, 25 Gifford St., Toronto, Ont.

F.45354 Cpl. A. G. Munroe, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Queensport, N.S.

A.2451 Cpl. J. M. Murray, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, West Broadway St., Orangeville, Ont.

D.81259 Cpl. A. T. Nicholls, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1497 Bourbonniere St., Montreal, P.Q.

D.62557 Cpl. R. Oullette, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

D.51325 Cpl. J. L. B. Poirier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 214 Bouthilier St., St. Jean d'Iberville, P.Q.

L.2506 Cpl. T. C. Riddell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Flat Valley, Sask.

H.103423 Cpl. I. Sangster, Canadian Infantry Corps, Deepdale, Man.

A.35503 Bdr. R. G. Smiley, The Royal Canadian, Artillery Rawdon, P.Q.

H.54630 Bdr. G. E. Smith, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 210 Devonshire Place, Ottawa, Ont.

K.76960 Cpl. J. N. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1906 Stephens St., Vancouver, B.C.

L.33095 L/Cpl. E. R. Boyce, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Swift Current, Sask.

B.11888 L/Bdr. R. A. C. Brown, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Scott St., St. Catharines, Ont.

K.30036 L/Cpl. J. A. Clifton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 10924-85th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

D.51362 L/Cpl. A. Dufour, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1072 Beaudry St., Montreal, P.Q.

L.27756 L/Cpl. D. G. Ekman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 658 Richmond St., Burnaby B.C.

M.53069 L/Cpl. G. C. Gustafson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, La Glace, Alta.

B.138388 L/Cpl. F. W. Hemingway, Canadian Infantry Corps, 133 Queen St. S., Hamilton, Ont.

F.29750 L/Cpl. J. R. MacGillivray, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 140 Brunswick St., Halifax, N.S.

H.38623 L/Cpl. C. H. McNeill, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Fullers, Man.

K.74112 L/Cpl. W. P. Marken, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Shoreacres, B.C.

B.85216 L/Bdr. D. A. Miller, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 147 Tolton Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

D.132506 L/Bdr. A. W. Mullan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hudson Heights, P.Q.

B.39777 L/Cpl. C. V. Reade, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, New Liskeard, Ont.

B.6014 L/Cpl. R. A. Wickens, Canadian Provost Corps, 520 St. Clements Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.86924 L/Cpl. J. J. M. Wighton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 38 Picton St. W., Hamilton, Ont.

L.20009 Sigmn. (A/Cpl.) S. Bowman, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1009 Ave. D, North, Saskatoon, Sask.

K.46106 Pte. (A/Cpl.) H. R. Chrishop, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1534 Balsam St., Vancouver, B.C.

B.132671 Pte. (A/Cpl.) D. C. Dorschner, Canadian Infantry Corps, 224 Ferguson St., North Bay, Ont.

L.64903 Pte. (A/Cpl.) V. C. Mahan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Arcola, Sask.

B.45244 Gnr. (A/Bdr.) E. A. Pearson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Noranda, P.Q.

D.57125 Pte. D. Arbour, Canadian Infantry Corps, 6581-24th Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

F.30544 Tpr. D. D. Bartlett, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Riverside, N.S.

E.1029 Gnr. J. Beaulieu, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 83 St. Louis St., Levis, P.Q.

B.8337 Sigmn. E. M. Bourke, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Kapuskasing, Ont.

D.94151 Pte. R. Champagne, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1154 Rue St. Thomas, Three Rivers, P.Q.

L.12736 Pte. A. K. Clark, Caandian Infantry Corps, Estevan, Sask.

F.59685 Pte. W. J. Cousins, Canadian Infantry Corps, 51 Cornwall St., Amherst, N.S.

G.8057 Gnr. W. A. Craik, The Royal Canadian Artillery, South Devon, N.B.

B.55247 Pte. F. A. Crawford, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 1, Powasson, Ont.

L.60776 Gnr. R. J. Fenske, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2220 Rae St., Regina, Sask.

E.10019 Pte. G. Goulet, Canadian Infantry Corps, 136 Aberdeen St., Quebec, P.Q.

D.76984 Tpr. C. Green, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1000 Papineau Ave., Montreal South, P.Q.

L.41851 Tpr. C. C. Hayward, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Unity, Sask.

C.52049 Pte. A. M. Hornbeek, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, R.R. No. 1, Kingston, Ont.

H.66845 Gnr. N. D. Hyndman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Rapid City, Man.

F.65848 Pte. L. E. Isenor, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Lantz Siding, N.S.

A.20128 Spr. G. James, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 182½ Cromwell St., Sarnia, Ont.

D.157927 Pte. A. Laramee, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5191 Drolet St., Montreal, P.Q.

B.77393 Gdsm. J. Levitt, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 135 Ulster St., Toronto, Ont.

M.3778 Gnr. J. T. McMullan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Gleichen, Alta.

P.3472 Tpr. A. L. McQuarrie, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 827-21st Ave. N.W., Calgary, Alta.

C.65196 Pte. C. A. Mason, Canadian Infantry Corps, Duke St., Bowmanville, Ont.

L.105485 Pte. R. G. Mason, Canadian Infantry Corps, Tessier, Sask.

C.1697 Gnr. D. J. Moncrieff, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Perth, Ont.

D.135856 Pte. C. Nesteruk, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Granada Rd., Rouyn, P.Q.

M.37070 Cfn. W. Olechowski, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Winnifred, Alta.

H.102190 Gnr. J. H. Phillips, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Monominto, Man.

K.7045 Gnr. A. E. Powell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 890 Bell Pl., Trail, B.C.

C.26327 Gnr. R. D. Russell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dorset, Ont.

M.66026 Gnr. L. K. Smith, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Vancouver, B.C.

M.34972 Gnr. J. Stepaniuk, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Caslan, Alta.

G.28727 Sigmn. D. Theriault, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Waugh Office, N.B.

K.75386 Pte. W. Thiesen, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chovlin, Man.

B.54715 Pte. N. L. Thompson, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 1, Durham, Ont.

M.44828 Spr. G. Velux, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 857-11th St., Medicine Hat, Alta.

M.3880 Gnr. R. Weiss, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Neilburg, Sask.

H.103619 Gnr. D. C. Wright, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dryden, Ont.

A.20114 L/Sgt. C. G. Towler, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 114 Dundas St., Sarnia, Ont.

A.21443 Cpl. G. Bruce, Canadian Infantry Corps, 874 Wellington Ave., Windsor, Ont.

B.66863 Sgt. G. A. Fletcher, Canadian Infantry Corps, 212 Monarch Pk. Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.13201 Cpl. J. J. Jeannotte, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lebret, Sask.

L.12451 Cpl. R. E. O. Upcott, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ogema, Sask.

B.37491 Cpl. R. V. West, Canadian Infantry Corps, 189 Murray St., Brantford, Ont.

D.61848 L/Cpl. A. Curtis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5801-B 2nd Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

M.27008 L/Cpl. G. L. Grennwell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Alexo, Alta.

M.27039 Tpr. A. F. Anderson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Calgary, Alta.

D.62894 Pte. L. Bernier, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sayabec, P.Q.

A.21937 Pte. W. E. Bradley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 722 Pelissier St., Windsor, Ont.

D.24011 Sigmn. J. F. Crosby, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2222 Harvard Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

H.19497 Pte. W. Hopkin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Arcola, Sask.

B.67348 Pte. J. G. McLean, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10 Westonia Ave., Humber Heights, Ont.

B.67674 Pte. T. McLean, Canadian Infantry Corps, 670 Lansdowne Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.20476 Pte. W. L. Newman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Virden, Man.

L.12240 Pte. B. M. O'Neill, Canadian Infantry Corps, Eel River Crossing, N.B.

B.67515 Pte. L. D. Pantaleo, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1022 Mount Pleasant Rd., Toronto, Ont.

H.19129 Pte. E. J. Ulrich, Canadian Infantry Corps, Gretna, Man.

E.30021 CQMS S. W. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, 36-11 Ave., Lachine, P.Q.

E.30269 Sgt. E. Bernard, Canadian Infantry Corps, East Angus, P.Q.

E.30144 Sgt. S. G. Stoddard, Canadian Infantry Corps, Waterloo, P.Q.

H.6048 Sgt. C. T. Whalen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 37 East 11th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

E.21892 L/Sgt. M. T. Goodenough, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cookshire, P.Q.

K.83926 Cpl. L. C. Speller, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 3905 Carey Rd., Victoria, B.C.

H.6905 L/Cpl. R. E. Atkinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 226 Hazel Dell, East Kildonan, Man.

H.20683 L/Cpl. M. Price, Canadian Infantry Corps, 250 Enfield Cres., Norwood, Man.

B.24237 L/Cpl. J. L. Varley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 33 Norway Ave., Toronto, Ont.

E.30245 Rfn. E. I. Bennett, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bishopton, P.Q.

H.6132 Pte. W. Morris, Canadian Infantry Corps, 69 Dagnear St., Winnipeg, Man.

H.6436 Pte. G. E. Williamson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 485 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.

C.92078 Pte. K. S. Cameron, Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Billings Bridge, Ont.

K.69908 Sgt. R. S. T. Chan, Royal Canadian Artillery, 1407 Government St., Victoria, B.C.

K.50207 Sgt. L. King, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4291 Main St., Vancouver, B.C.

K.49785 Sgt. N. M. Low, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Box 1733, Ashcroft, B.C.

K.69286 Sgt. J. Shiu, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1718-9th St., Berkeley 2, Cal., U.S.A.

B.67157 Sgt. A. Nicholls, Canadian Infantry Corps, 264 Garden Ave. Toronto 3, Ont.

Bar to the Military Medal

H.76021 Gnr. G. M. Humby, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 130 North Harold St., Fort William, Ont.

British Empire Medal (B.E.M.)

Operational Gallantry

B.111949 Gnr. J. T. Forsyth, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 99 Laughton Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.90872 Sgt. E. L. Jackson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 100 Main St., Humberston, Ont.

B.146597 Pte. L. A. Marsell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 117 Elizabeth St., Midland, Ont.

K.37376 S/Sgt. C. D. Woodcock, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4597 N.W. Marine Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

D.95674 Sgt. R. W. Clendenning, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3860 Claude St., Verdun, P.Q.

C.122600 Pte. J. W. Fiegenwald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 35 Ethel St., Eastview, Ont.

OPERATIONAL AWARDS

Mentions in Despatches

Maj.-Gen. (A/Lt-Gen.) C. Foulkes, *CB, CBE,* DSO, Canadian Army, 100 Lisgar Rd., Rockliffe, Ont.

Brig. (/Maj.-Gen.) R. H. Keefler, *CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 227 Kensington, Westmount,, P.Q.

Brig. J. P. E. Bernatchez, *DSO, OBE,* Canadian Army, c/o HQ, Eastern Quebec area, Quebec, P.Q.

Brig. J. F. Bingham, Canadian Army, Paris Bldg., Winnipeg, Man.

Brig. S. F. Clark, *CBE,* Canadian Army, 30 Cooper St., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. J. D. B. Smith, *CBE. DSO,* Canadian Army, 652 Talbot St., London, Ont.

Col. W. L. Coke, *OBE,* Canadian Army, 3092 W. 36th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Col. N. J. W. Smith, *DSO,* Canadian Army, 25 Rothnally Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) F. D. Lace, *OBE,* Canadian Army, 64 St. Clair Ave., W. Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Col.) H. W. Love, *OBE,* Canadian Army, 330 Cooper St., Ottawa, Ontario.

Lt.-Col. A. G. Chubb, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1030 Hillcrest Ave., Calgary, Alta.

Lt.-Col. K. D. Landell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 974 St. Antoine St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. M. F. Peiler, *ED,* Royal Canadian Armoured Corps 3441 Peel St., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) P. C. R. Black, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. 1, Cobble Hill, Vancouver Island, B.C.

Maj. G. T. Baylay, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 243 Warren Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. W. D. Brooks, *DSO, ED,* Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Tutela Heights, Brantford, Ont.

Maj. D. G. MacKenzie, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Oakville, Ont.

Maj. H. A. McKibbin, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Calgary, Alta.

Maj. R. E. M. Mason, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5 St. Andrews Ave., Centre Island, Toronto, Ont.

Maj. N. H. Welsh, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 117 London St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) M. L. M. Hogle, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 6051 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. A. McKechan, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 165 Humewood, Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) N. R. Rushforth, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 46 Balmoral Place, Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Maj.) The Lord Shaughnessy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4219 Western Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) H. E. Theobald, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Belleville, Ont.

Capt. W. G. Beatty, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 417 Campbell St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. V. B. Bjarnason, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 161 Sherbrooke St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. R. S. Forbes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 30 Walker Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. B. R. Hook, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5 Claxton Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. C. C. McLachlan, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 199 King St., E., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Capt. S. G. Patterson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Town of Mount Royal, P.Q.

Capt. E. Spafford, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 14 Chelsea Place, Simpson St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. B. M. Veilleux, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2 Patricia St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) G. C. Robinson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 80 Hillsdale Ave., W., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) C. W. Smith, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5567 McLynn Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. G. B. A. Bate, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 181 Fraser Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

Lieut. J. R. Billingsley, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 815 Main St., Saskatoon, Sask.

Lieut. S. F. Bowick, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2028 Marlowe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. G. M. Cempbell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 417 Grosvenor St., London, Ont.

Lieut. H. W. Chaplin, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Kelowna, B.C.

Lieut. J. S. Forrest, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5660 Olympic, Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. J. S. Garrett, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1737 Hampshire Rd., Victoria, B.C.

Lieut. D. I. Gilbert, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Port Coquitlam, B.C.

Lieut. R. A. Hastings, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 17 Purcell Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. B. K. Henders, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2398 Parkrow W., Notre Dame de Grace, P.Q.

Lieut. P. R. J. Page, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Knowlton, P.Q.

Lieut. E. G. Phillips, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 304 Richmond St., E., Oshawa, Ont.

Lieut. B. D. Richards, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 10811-126th St., Edmonton, Alta.

G.7248 WO I (RSM) C. T. Northrup, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Cody's, N.B.

H.26032 WO II (SSM) R. B. Akerstream, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 150 Talbot Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

M.27253 WO II (SSM) F. H. B. Bailey, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 329 4th Ave., N.E., Calgary, Alta.

A.429 WO II (SSM) L. Barratt, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 497 Atlas Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.37371 WO II (MQMS) J. F. E. Child, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2215-52nd E., Vancouver, B.C.

H.26470 WO II (SSM) E. H. Crabb, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Souris, Man.

K.1634 WO II (MQMS) H. J. Johnson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 102 Pine St., Nanaimo, B.C.

D.3401 WO II (MQMS) A. Lambert, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5324 Gavin, Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.

K.71509 WO II (SSM) H. C. Winterford, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4352 Atlin St., Vancouver, B.C.

D.36347 SQMS G. N. Anderson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2087 Union Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

D.71113 SQMS E. R. J. Fraser, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1172 MacKay St., Montreal, P.Q.

B.69812 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) R. F. Cairns, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Toronto, Ont.

D.36570 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) R. V. Parks, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

D.26230 Sgt. H. F. Atkinson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 11 Oldfield Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

H.77086 Sgt. R. K. Beach, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 434 Landsdowne Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

D.26169 Sgt. W. A. Boy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 509 Blvd. Du Haure, Valleyfield, P.Q.

A.43061 Sgt. A. J. Burke, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Listowel, Ont.

C.50543 Sgt. W. S. Cross, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. #2, Lansdowne, Ont.

D.77377 Sgt. C. Eason, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2383 Rushbrooke St., Montreal, P.Q.

B.38000 Sgt. T. R. Flack, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Paris, Ont.

M.102874 Sgt. H. W. Hart, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Botha, Alta.

K.1096 Sgt. H. J. A. Ives, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Comox, B.C.

B.144819 Sgt. J. G. Jones, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 157 Fairview Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.26537 Sgt. J. S. Lower, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 203 Oak St., Winnipeg, Man.

H.26269 Sgt. J. M. McCumber, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, West Selkirk, Man.

K.37615 Sgt. L. M. Murdoch, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1218 2nd Ave., Trail B.C.

H.51997 Sgt. A. S. Nunn, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Shoal Lake, Man.

C.58035 Sgt. G. T. Prophet, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Prescott, Ont.

B.19611 Sgt. T. W. Roberts, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 11 Cody Ave., Timmins, Ont.

H.214 Sgt. G. H. Stewart, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 479 Spencer St., Winnipeg, Man.

D.130 Sgt. J. A. Woodward, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 9 Burton Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

H.26613 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) McMillan, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Emerson, Man.

A.723 Cpl. G. H. Doescher, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1823 Broad St., Schenectady, N.Y., U.S.A.

B.4888 Cpl. J. F. Malek, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 80 Case St., Hamilton, Ont.

M.10610 Cpl. T. E. Samuel, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Duck Lake, Sask.

A.44035 Cpl. A. C. Scott, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Dutton, Ont.

D.46279 L/Cpl. A. Cornish, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Lennoxville, P.Q.

M.103802 L/Cpl. B. Tangen, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Poplar Hill, Alta.

K.51705 Tpr. (A/Cpl.) W. E. Adam, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 895 E. 51st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

L.107048 Tpr. J. P. Bremner, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Pasqua, Sask.

B.62474 Tpr. V. C. Eaton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Angus, Ont.

H.77611 Tpr. K. A. Engen, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 356 Laura St., Winnipeg, Man.

H.77106 Tpr. E. Green, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 340 Simcoe St., Winnipeg, Man.

H.17394 Tpr. J. R. Halliday, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 464 Fischer Ave., The Pas, Man.

C.41354 Tpr. L. S. Maley, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Smith Falls, Ont.

M.45606 Tpr. E. P. Nichols, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Clyde, Alta.

A.11984 Tpr. G. Wilkinson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Queen St. E. Kincardine, Ont.

Lt.-Col. W. F. McMullen, Royal Canadian Artillery, 45 A Claxton Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. R. P. Rothschild, *MBE*, Royal Canadian Artillery, 69 St. Johns, Quebec, P.Q.

Maj. B. F. Gossage, *MC*, Royal Canadian Artillery, 11 Shorncliffe Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. C. F. Harrington, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3510 Redpath St., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. L. E. Kenyon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Beamsville, Ont.

Maj. J. T. Lambert, The Royal Canadian Artillery, MacLeod, Alta.

Maj. T. O'Shea, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 22 Chestnut St., Kingston, Ont.

Maj. R. W. Reville, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1 Church St., Brantford, Ont.

Maj. R. Walkem, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1159 Seymour Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. J. E. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Colony St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Maj.) T. E. D. Kidd, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kingston, Ont.

Capt. F. R. P. Arsenault, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 78 School St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Capt. M. E. Comfort, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Grimsby Beach, Ont.

Capt. T. E. Dack, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 549 William St., London, Ont.

Capt. J. G. Davidson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 290 Inkster Blvd., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. D. M. Deacon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2 Elm Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. P. J. Dupuis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 7057 rue St. Denis, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. W. L. Hutcheon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sardis, B.C.

Capt. H. B. Hutchison, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 485 Duplex Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. C. C. Locke, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6092 Sperling St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. J. L. McNiven, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 360 Notre Dame St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt, W. K. Moyle, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 88 Cutting St., Coaticook, P.Q.

Capt. F. C. Nelson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. #1, Smithville, Ont.

Capt. P. L. Partington, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Halifax, N.S.

Capt. R. A. Patch, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3156 Westmount Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. E. B. Phair, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 177 Rosedale Heights Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. A. K. Pousette, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 827 Grosvenor Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. D. J. Teek, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2919-W-29th, Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. W. R. Tippett, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. #1, Loch Lomond, Saint John, N.B.

Capt. A. P. Whelan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 610 Querbes Ave., Outremont, P.Q.

Capt. S. B. Williams, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 89 Court St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. S. Boyce, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Moose Jaw, Sask.

Lt. (A/Capt.) H. A. Hope, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 447 Ash St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. A. L. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4026 Cartier St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. A. L. M. Fleming, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 63 Rosedale Heights, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. E. H. A. Heeney, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1216 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. A. C. Kiteley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5th St., Brandon, Man.

Lieut. V. C. Nelms, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2346 Winnipeg St., Regina, Sask.

Lieut. M. R. Rohne, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Rosetown, Sask.

Lieut. J. H. Stone, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 278 Powell Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. J. J. Trottier, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1139 Belanger St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. G. E. Whitaker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 615 Strathcona St., Winnipeg, Man.

H.54854 WO I (SM) M. E. Crawford, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kenora, Ont.

M.56 WO I (SM) A. Gray, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 412 19th St. N., Lethbridge, Alta.

D.250 WO II (BSM) L. A. Archambault, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4919 Notre Dame St. E., Montreal, P.Q.

A.35439 WO II (BSM) J. Gormall, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 362 York Rd., Guelph, Ont.

B.22096 WO II (BSM) H. F. Guenther, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 193 Soudan Ave., Toronto, Ont.

E.22853 WO II (BSM) H. Laporte, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Marchand de Bois, Charlesbourg, P.Q.

E.34808 WO II (BSM) H. LeBlanc, The Royal Canadian Artillery, York Centre, P.Q.

C.50503 WO II (BSM) W. J. Nalon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 117 William St., Gananoque, Ont.

D.8192 WO II (BSM) A. Watt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 691-4th Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

K.98241 S/Sgt. P. D. Bundun, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 157 8th Ave., W., Vancouver, B.C.

G.3844 BQMS. D. S. L. Crawford, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Campbellton, N.B.

P.4610 S/Sgt. W. J. Crone, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. # 1, Simcoe, Ont.

C.50805 S/Sgt. N. C. Dimmell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 94 Dundas St., Deseronto, Ont.

L.60794 S/Sgt. M. G. Hall, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Lampman, Sask.

H.92369 BQMS. L. McKinnon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Minto, Man.

K.54035 Sgt. L. M. Androlia, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Elwood City, Penn., U.S.A.

F.6171 Sgt. W. A. Cochrane, The Royal Canadion Artillery, Falmouth, N.S.

B.11276 Sgt. K. B. Creed, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Rousseau Rd. S., Bartonville, Ont.

B.20761 Sgt. E. B. Dickson, The Royal Canadion Artillery, 1667 Highland Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.

D.26620 Sgt. D. Eaton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2654 Moreau St., Montreal, P.Q.

H.35359 Sgt. A. T. Flexman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1235 Atkinson St., Regina, Sask.

L.60709 Sgt. E. A. Gilchrist, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 206 Ave. S., North Saskatoon, Sask.

G.54556 Sgt. L. A. Hanson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Swan River, Man.

B.18674 Sgt. C. I. James, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Bradford, Ont.

C.9404 Sgt. H. J. James, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 743 Brunswick Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.22906 Sgt. D. F. Johnston, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 9906 79th Ave., South Edmonton, Alta.

F.15321 Sgt. T. P. McManaman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Pleasant St., Springhill, N.S.

M.40598 Sgt. S. G. McWalters, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 512 2nd Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

D.10828 Sgt. W. G. Mulroney, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2010 Melrose Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

P.7534 Sgt. W. E. Osler, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2209 Stephens St., Vancouver, B.C.

B.17570 Sgt. F. R. Peer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 38 Torrens Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.92309 Sgt. W. H. Sherritt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Portage La Prairie, Man.

L.6114 Sgt. E. Q. Smart, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 10817 79th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

D.119573 Sgt. A. J. Sullivan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5984 Louie Hemon St., Montreal, P.Q.

C.63518 Sgt. A. E. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 359 Victoria St., Cobourg, Ont.

B.85366 Sgt. H. L. Tillinghaste, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 79 Murray St. E., Hamilton, Ont.

B.53886 Sgt. F. H. Walsh, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6 Wishman St., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

K.92172 Sgt. P. A. G. Walsh, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Pinawa, Man.

C.33813 L/Sgt E. R. Barber, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Haley Station, Ont.

H.59684 L/Sgt. G. A. Hall, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Cromer, Man.

D.3164 L/Sgt. D. S. Hough, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 13C Chilton Rd., Toronto, Ont.

A.33164 L/Sgt. A. J. Webster, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kincardine, Ont.

H.76079 Bdr. C. L. Ames, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dubuc Blk., St. Boniface, Man.

M.43951 Bdr. R. Cartwright, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Glen Valley, B.C.

F.86080 Bdr. M. D. Drake, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Belleoram, Fortune Bay, Nfld.

H.59648 Bdr. J. Fearnley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Rapid City, Man.

C.39560 Bdr. J. McRoberts, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Ivanhoe Ave., Britannia Heights, Ont.

B.9880 Bdr. L. R. Marshall, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Cooksville, Ont.

A.32166 Bdr. L. C. Ranger, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 42 Bell St., Ingersoll, Ont.

B.15691 Bdr. C. N. Ryan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Gallant Setllement, Shediac, N.B.

B.15177 Bdr. H. F. O. Wright, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 31 Mintern Ave., Brantford, Ont.

D.132506 L/Bdr. A. W. Mullan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hudson Heights, P.Q.

M.3800 L/Bdr. E. Zeer, The Royal Candian Artillery, Wardlow, Alta.

F.10161 Gnr. (A/Bdr.) C. J. O'Connell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 376 Warren St., New Waterford, N.S.

B.146484 Gnr. J. T. Algeo, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 336 Gamma St., Alderwood, Ont.

M.36537 Gnr. J. M. Beckett, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 911-6th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

H.101804 Gnr. C. S. Benedictson, The Royal Canadian Artilery, 244 Flora Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

A.104454 Gnr. F. A. Brohman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. #2, Kitchener, Ont.

D.10166 Gnr. W. O. Cooper, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3749 Gertrude St., Verdun, P.Q.

L.64155 Gnr. J. W. C. Davis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Crescent, B.C.

A.33156 Gnr. C. C. Frizzell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 47 Perth St., Guelph, Ont.

D.6697 Gnr. B. E. Hughes, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. #1, Rothesay, N.B.

D.118537 Gnr. C. W. A. Kelly, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 441 Victoria Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

G.63052 Gnr. R. Lang, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Lac Baker, N.B.

G.23856 Gnr. L. A. Loggie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Chaplin Rd., Newcastle, N.B.

M.104615 Gnr. G. R. Lowe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Chin, Alta.

F.77371 Gnr. H. E. MacLeod, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. #6, Truro, N.S.

B.9569 Gnr. D. B. Maxwell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. #1, Midland, Ont.

C.39570 Gnr. J. D. Millar, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 697 Bank St., Ottawa, Ont.

M.36527 Gnr. K. R. Myers, The Royal Canadian Artilery, Calgary, Alta.

H.75169 Gnr. G. W. Myhill, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Shoal Lake, Man.

H.102190 Gnr. J. H. Phillips, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Monominto, Man.

H.59504 Gnr. A. O. Summer, The Royal Canadian Artilelry, Deroche, B.C.

F.86956 Gnr. W. A. Vacon, The Royal Canadion Artillery, East Quinan, N.S.

M.60771 Gnr. O. O. Volker, The Royal Canadion Artillery, Nevis, Alta.

K.15420 Gnr. T. M. Weymer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hillers, Vancouver Island, B.C.

B.95138 Gnr. F. C. Wiltshire, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 9 Beal St., Woodstock, Ont.

Lt.-Col. A. S. Rutherford, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4355 Montrose Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lt. Col. E. H. Webb, *DSO*, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2 Harcroft Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) R. E. Hendershot, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1034 McMillan Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. D. K. Burke, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 105 Madison Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. D. J. Hayes, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 5828 Durocher Ave., Outremont, P.Q.

Maj. T. M. Kingsbury, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 55 Strathallan Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. A. D. Langmuir, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Oakville, Ont.

Maj. C. M. Wrenshall, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 81 High Park Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. T. Miller, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 101 Flora St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. J. W. Bailey, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 10089 Jasper Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. R. M. Black, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Sussex, N.B.

Capt. L. P. Kenyon, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4926 Mira Rd, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. J. C. H. Porter, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4515 W. 12th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. G. E. G. Webber, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 504 Anderson Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lt. (A/apt.) G. K. Brown, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3411 Northcliffe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. Jure, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1240-12th Ave. E., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. A. T. Anderson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4238 Angus Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. B. J. F. Hamilton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 153 S. Woodrow Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. N. A. Lawrence, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Pincher Creek, Alta.

Lieut. A. M. McLachlin, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 35 Deloraine Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. C. G. Murray, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 10 Whitehall Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. E. Norman, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 10232 Wadhurst Rd., Edmonton, Alta.

Lieut. N. J. Paithouski, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 589 Vidal St. S., Sarnia, Ont.

Lieut. I. H. Sloane, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 219 College St., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. A. G. Vance, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 499-9th St. W., Owen Sound, Ont.

Lieut. L. W. Young, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 21 Eastbourne Cres., Mimico, Ont.

C.25720 WO I (RSM) R. A. Richardson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Osgoode, Ont.

B.23163 WO II (CSM) F. N. Bidgood, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 82 Eglinton Ave. E., Toronto, Ont.

C.64023 WO II (CSM) C. Brindle, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Fergus, Ont.

M.41678 WO II (CSM) D. J. Irons, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Nanton, Alta.

A.34934 WO II (SSM) I. Sargent, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Fergus, Ont.

M.43927 WO II (CSM) J. F. Sininger, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 819A-5th St., Medicine Hat, Alta.

B.68802 S/Sgt. A. T. Aikins, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 238 Allington Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.54294 S/Sgt. R. J. Barkley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1206 2nd Ave. S., Lethbridge, Alta.

B.26157 S/Sgt. N. A. Frame, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 49 Laughton Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D.17088 S/Sgt. F. H. Sherring, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 6299 Beaulieu St., Montreal, P.Q.

H.25090 CQMS W. W. Wilwand, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 156 Berry St., Norwood, Man.

D.23328 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) K. Disher, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 6068 Jean Mance, Montreal, P.Q.

B.28862 Sgt. R. W. Aseltine, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Kimberley, B.C.

H.13224 Sgt. R. Buchholz, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Grahamdale, Man.

B.92897 Sgt. R. G. Peitzsche, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Dauphin, Man.

L.19052 Sgt. M. Sokoloski, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Wynyard, Sask.

B.25923 Sgt. R. E. Walker, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1835-3rd Ave. W., Owen Sound, Ont.

L.56836 Sgt. A. N. Wark, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 910 15th St. W., Prince Albert, Sask.

B.28435 Sgt. W. E. B Yates, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 409 Markham St., Toronto, Ont.

M.54348 S/Sgt. W. E. G. Mates, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Huallen, Alta.

A.19295 L/Sgt. R. B. Milne, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 374 Oxford St., London, Ont.

B.26549 L/Sgt. G. A. McCloy, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1861 Danforth Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C.25809 L/Sgt. W. J. O'Brien, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 304 Sussex St., Pembroke, Ont.

B.26424 L/Sgt. K. V. Woods, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 64 Wood St., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

B.11293 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) G. E. Bright, The Corps of the Royal Canadian Engineers, 39 Normanhurst Ave.

K.71071 Cpl. D. Mercier, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Fort San, Sask.

B.130780 L/Cpl. B. Mitchell, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 82 Dome Ave., South Porcupine, Ont.

L.17049 Spr. W. Desormeaux, The Corps of Royal Caandian Engineers, 7046 St. Laurent St., Montreal, P.Q.

B.29912 Spr. M. Goretsky, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 180 Hillside Ave., Mimico, Ont.

B.23351 Spr. B. Knutson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 33 Lebel Ave., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

A.20734 Spr. L. M. McBeth, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Aylmer, Ont.

B.94824 Spr. J. M. MacLaren, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 8 Alexandria Ave., Belleville, Ont.

H.195090 Spr. E. Mosiondz, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 41 Leys St., Port Arthur, Ont.

G.18632 Spr. W. C. Price, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 34 Seventh St., Moncton, N.B.

F.86792 Spr. H. E. Weeks, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 43 Connolly St., Halifax, N.S.

K.16312 Spr. J. E. Wilkinson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 320 Walker Ave., Victoria, B.C.

L.104268 Spr. J. R. Wurtz, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 1, Asquith, Sask.

Lt-Col. B. W. G. Grover, *OBE, ED,* The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 217 Bernard Ave., London, Ont.

Lt-Col. W. W. Lockhart, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Roblin, Ont.

Lt-Col. J. T. North, *OBE,* The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1056 Matthews Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Maj. J. B. Clement, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 5 Tullis Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. N. Chisholm, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Caledonia, N.S.

Capt. W. D. Egan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 199 Bayswater Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. R. S. Grant, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Sackville, N.B.

Capt. J. K. Hall, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1336 W. 11th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. V. G. Jamieson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 10557 Sask. Dr., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. C. G. O'Brien, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 122 Byron St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. O. J. F. Rankin, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 101 College St., Kingston, Ont.

Capt. J. D. Smythe, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Como, P.Q.

Capt. F. R. Wiggs, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2131 Commercial Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. J. A. Davidson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 64 St. Clair Ave. W., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. H. D. Heavysege, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 67B-34th Ave., Lachine, P.Q.

Lieut. W. C. Long, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Clear Water, B.C.

Lieut. W. Worwood, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 78 Poirier St., Levis, P.Q.

B.33081 WO II (QMS) D. W. Cooper, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Chesley, Ont.

D.21223 WO II (QMS) D. F. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Rosemount, P.Q.

A.2141 WO II (RQMS) G. Sturman, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, London, Ont.

P.40084 WO II (CSM) C. J. Taillon, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 226 Earl St. Kingston, Ont.

B.32588 Sgt. E. M. Jewell, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 516 Wellington St. E., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

C.29568 Sgt. J. T. Munroe, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Grafton, Ont.

A.2212 Sgt. H. B. Murdock, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 285 Admiral St., Woodstock, Ont.

B32899 Sgt. E. J. Williams, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 641 The Queensway, Etobicoke, Ont.

B.39191 Cpl. M. J. H. Buck, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, R.R. #2, Paris, Ont.

M.35258 Cpl. L. Everts, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Pincher Creek, Alta.

B.62731 Cpl. G. T. Fox, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Bridge View Survey, Hamilton, Ont.

B.58804 Cpl. J. Higgins, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 39 Hocken Ave, Toronto, Ont.

B.32073 Cpl. K. Ingard, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Shelbourne, Ont.

B.58773 Cpl. W. G. Jones, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 477 Beresford Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.9070 Cpl. A. E. Kimball, The Royal Canadian Corp of Signals, Rainier, Alta.

M.102194 pl. R. A. Lyon, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, High River, Alta.

K.36015 Cpl. J. E. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 720 Wilson St., Victoria, B.C.

B.33023 Cpl. J. Marachini, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 327 Roehampton Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.55253 Cpl. H. Roberts, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Stettler, Alta.

K.37225 Cpl. H. Strong, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1221 Barnaby St., Vancouver, B.C.

G.53254 Cpl. E. R. Taylor, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, The Willows, N.B.

D.24200 Cpl. W. I. Thomson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 10776 de Poncheville Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B.111744 L/Cpl. A. Galinsky, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 523 Euclid Ave., Toronto, Ont.

F.26368 L/Cpl. L. J. Howatt, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 18 Haviland St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

B.136325 Sgmn. J. B. Cooley, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 46 Pape Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.38759 Sgmn. E. S. Desson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 11 Walter St., Toronto, Ont.

B.31696 Sgmn. M. J. McClelland, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 168 Foster Ave., Belleville, Ont.

B.31979 Sgmn. K. F. C. Merlin, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Wakopa, Man.

B.108544 Sgmn. W. H. Norgrove, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 133 Glendonwynne Rd., Toronto, Ont.

K.8008 Sgmn. E. V. Ramsden, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 90 Linden Ave., Victoria, B.C.

M.56749 Sgmn. A. Rebus, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 991-82nd Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

D.135734 Sgmn. G. Robinson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 676 Cadillac St., Montreal, P.Q.

M.3387 Sgmn. T. Tarry, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Royalties, Alta.

D.116297 Sgmn. V. C. Thomas, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 759 Walker Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. H. E. T. Doucet, *OBE*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 183 Wilbrod St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. W. S. Murdoch, *MBE*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1535 W 13th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt.-Col. F. E. D. Wallace, *OBE, ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 55 Chestnut Ave., Brantford, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt. Col.) L. H. C. Payne, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1237 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. R. G. Armstrong, Canadian Infantry Corps, 333 MacLaren St., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. J. W. F. Battershill, Canadian Infantry Corps, 201 Girton Blvd., Tuxedo, Man.

Maj. J. T. Bell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 32 Mountain Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Maj. M. G. Clennett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2 Oakland Rd., Halifax, N.S.

Maj. E. W. Cutbill, *DSO*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 225 James St. S., Hamilton, Ont.

Maj. H. E. Dalton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 141 Lawton Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. J. M. Delamere, *ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 92 Madison Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. E. D. Fulton, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. #1, Kamloops, B.C.

Maj. E. J. O. Gravelle, Canadian Infantry Corps, 478 North Cumberland St., Port Arthur, Ont.

Maj. G. Grossman, *ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 150 McDonald Rd., Chilliwack, B.C.

Maj. H. J. Kennedy, *MC*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1100 Ouellette Ave., Windsor, Ont.

Maj. P. E. Lambert, Candian Infantry Corps, 141 King St. E., Kingston, Ont.

Maj. C. R. Lamoureux, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1230 Jean Talon St. E., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. J. R. H. Morgan, *MBE*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 184 King St., Weston, Ont.

Maj. S. O. Robinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Innisfail, Alta.

Maj. V. Schubert, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4th Ave. S., Weyburn, Sask.

Maj. F. A. Sparks, Canadian Infantry Corps, 600½ Grant St., Woodstock, Ont.

Maj. G. H. Stevens, Canadian Infantry Corps, 315 Union St., Saint John, N.B.

Maj. K. A. Williams, Canadian Infantry Corps, Weyburn, Sask.

Maj. L. H. Young, Canadian Infantry Corps, 211 Elm St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Maj.) A. L. Finlayson, *MM*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 420 Sherbrooke St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Maj.) B. G. Fox, Canadian Infantry Corps, Colborne, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) H. E. Gaskin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 35 Oak St., Galt, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) D. Hogarth, Canadian Infantry Corps, 122 Tamarack St., Timmins, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) F. Klenavic, Canadian Infantry Corps, 22 Bain Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) H. K. MacIntosh, Canadian Infantry Corps, 420 Russell Hill Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. R. Martin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 35 Dunloe Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) A. Muise, Canadian Infantry Corps, 18 Centre St., Allandale, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) L. M. K. Reed, Canadian Infantry Corps, 313 36th Ave. S.W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. I. H. Ashbury, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dundas St., Oakville, Ont.

Capt. K. S. D. Corsan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 866 Newport Ave., Victoria, B.C.

Capt. W. E. Fess, Canadian Infantry Corps, 12 Relmar Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. E. M. Fraser, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3930 West 11th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. W. G. A. Lane, Canadian Infantry Corps, Weyburn, Sask.

Capt. J. A. Lukasffy, Canadian Infantry Corps, Calgary, Alta.

Capt. E. C. Luxton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chilliwack, B.C.

Capt A. H. Stephenson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 623 Young St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. B. A. Upjohn, Canadian Infantry Corps, 42 Cluny Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. A. Virtue, Canadian Infantry Corps, 79 Park St., Brockville, Ont.

Capt. A. P. W. Watkinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3594 King Edward Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. G. E. Wilshire, Canadian Infantry Corps, Stoney Creek, Ont.

Capt. R. A. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, 153 Egerton St., London, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) S. F. Day, Canadian Infantry Corps, 163 Downsview Ave., Weston, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.)D. W. Dymond, Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 Dover St., Chatham, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) V. E. Fleming, Canadian Infantry Corps, 46 Prince St. W., Saint John, N.B.

Lt. (A/Capt.) D. A. Hobkirk, Canadian Infantry Corps, 165 Park Hill Rd., Peterboro, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) W. H. Laughlin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Nashwaaksis, N.B.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. C. P. McCullagh, Canadian Infantry Corps, 72 Dixon Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) C. Milton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 302 Moss St., Victoria, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) E. S. White, Canadian Infantry Corps, King George Highway, Newcastle, N.B.

Lieut. D. S. Dove, Canadian Infantry Corps, 96 Runnymede Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. G. W. Grant, Canadian Infantry Corps, 52 Harriet St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. C. Grenier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 202 Rue St. Joseph, Lauzon, P.Q.

Lieut. H. J. Harkes, Canadian Infantry Corps, 209 First St., Port Credit, Ont.

Lieut. P. M. Hedley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sherbrooke, N.S.

Lieut. J. G. Lafontaine, Canadian Infantry Corps, 7840 De Gaspe St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. K. D. F. McKenzie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 324 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. D. A. McNutt, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.

Lieut. K. A. Rintoul, Canadian Infantry Corps, 213 Park St., Brockville, Ont.

C.20504 WO I (RSM) L. D. Brunet, Canadian Infantry Corps, 123 Eccles St., Ottawa, Ont.

D.81307 WO I (RSM) R. N. C. Diplock, *MBE*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 557 Osborne Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

L.27140 WO I (RSM) W. A. Edwards, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1371 Donald St., North Battleford, Sask.

M.10693 WO I (RSM) H. W. McArthur, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1035-15th Ave. E., Calgary, Alta.

F.50197 WO II (CSM) W. A. Baillie, Canadian Infantry Corps, River John, N.S.

M.11330 WO II (CSM) H. Baker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 511B Maple Ave., Medicine Hat, Alta.

F.49874 WO II (CSM) V. H. Bartlett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 225 Queen St., Truro, N.S.

F.34912 WO II (CSM) L. A. Horne, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8 Leaman St., Halifax, N.S.

G.22595 WO II (CSM) B. J. McMillan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Douglasfield, N.B.

E.19022 WO II (CSM) G. Nadeau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 38 Champlain St., Lac Megantic, P.Q.

L.24017 WO II (QMS) N. Pete, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1022 7th St. E., Prince Albert, Sask.

D.77158 WO II (CSM) G. H. Quinn, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5838 Louis Hebert St., Montreal, P.Q.

B.55600 CQMS. W. S. Steele, Canadian Infantry Corps, 17 Main St., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

B.64463 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) G. Jackson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Scugog St., Bowmanville, Ont.

E.5414 Sgt. J. Anglioillo, Canadian Infantry Corps, 803 De Castelneau, Montreal, P.Q.

L.28236 Sgt. V. J. Bellegarde, Canadian Infantry Corps, Balcarres, Sask.

B.54536 Sgt. R. Boultbee, Canadian Infantry Corps, 115 Melrose Ave., Toronto, Ont.

A.22953 Sgt. R. E. G. Boyd, Canadian Infantry Corp, 229 Worthington Ave., St. Vital, Man.

C.6349 Sgt. C. Crawford, Canadian Infantry Corps, 328 Fraser St., Kingston, Ont.

B.72920 Sgt. D. Cummings, Canadian Infantry Corps, 120 Vaughan Rd., Toronto, Ont.

B.63799 Sgt. C. E. Dade, Canadian Infantry Corps, 823 Woodbine Ave., Toronto, Ont.

G.57535 Sgt. G. W. Eldridge, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. George, N. B.

M.10606 Sgt. G. F. Guise, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2338 York St., Vancouver, B.C.

B.77277 Sgt. R. D. Lawrence, Canadian Infantry Corps, South Maitland, N.S.

H.19467 Sgt. K. E. McRae, Canadian Infantry Corps, 220 William Rd., Stebeston, B.C.

D.56835 Sgt. D. Paquin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 89 St. Charles St., St. Therese de Blainville, P.Q.

M.35324 Sgt. P. A. Rylaarsdam, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vega, Alta.

B.77230 Sgt. J. B. Stone, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

K.85383 Sgt. V. P. Weber, Canadian Infantry Corps, Shawnigan Lake, B.C.

M.29183 Sgt. J. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Athabaska, Alta.

B.63708 Sgt. R. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 159 Campbell Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.4036 L/Sgt. P. G. Alcock, Canadian Infantry Corps, 214-8th Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

B.37259 L/Sgt. H. Prince, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 1 Mount Pleasant, Ont.

D.81038 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. L. Bell, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 1, Calumet, P.Q.

H.19605 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) C. H. Bennington, Canadian Infantry Corps, 248 Highland Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

K.57868 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) W. M. Kelly, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 1, Milner, B.C.

H.41085 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) C. L. Minaker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 809-13th St., Brandon, Man.

G.28017 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) H. J. Newman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 260 Duke St., West Saint John, N.B.

B.46740 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. Tenute, Canadian Infantry Corps, 724 Cookman Cres., Niagara Falls, Ont.

D.127478 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) K. L. J. White, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4851 Lasalle Rd., Verdun, P.Q.

G.50902 Cpl. J. L. Chambers, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sackville, N.B.

K.47030 Cpl. R. A. Denomy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 442 Devoy St., New Westminster, B.C.

H.20117 Cpl. J. A. Elliott, Canadian Infantry Corps, Swan River, Man.

B.37867 Cpl. W. G. Lamb, Canadian Infantry Corps, 134 Waterloo St., Brantford, Ont.

H.20449 Cpl. C. A. J. Lemieux, Canadian Infantry Corps, Somerset, Man.

H.42354 Cpl. N. Munn, Canadian Infantry Corps, Clyde, Alta.

M.37554 Cpl. A. Naffin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Drumheller, Alta.

B.101551 Cpl. G. Scott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 26 Goodwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.56682 Cpl. G. M. Smithson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 123 Bold St., Hamilton, Ont.

D.63232 L/Cpl. M. G. Goudreau, Canadian Infantry Corps, Malartic, P.Q.

A.37993 L/Cpl. A. D. Kennedy, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 1, Fordwich, Ont.

B.111541 L/Cpl. G. White, Canadian Infantry Corps, 60 Jones Ave., Toronto, Ont.

A.116480 L/Cpl. M. M. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, Harrow, Ont.

H.46424 Pte. (A/Cpl.) D. J. Bliss, Canadian Infantry Corps, 130 Balsam St., Port Arthur, Ont.

D.59169 Pte. (A/Cpl.) A. Corneau, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hearst, Ont.

A105222 Pte. (A/Cpl.) A. E. Kain, Canadian Infantry Corps, Walkerton, Ont.

H.43076 Pte. (A/Cpl.) L. E. Lehman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Marchand, Man.

B.116918 Pte. R. D. Amaolo, Canadian Infantry Corps, 48 Imperial St., Hamilton, Ont.

B.131668 Pte. W. A. R. Amos, Canadian Infantry Corps, 41 Mount Royal Ave., Toronto, Ont.

A.37397 Pte. A. Berrington, Canadian Infantry Corps, Edward St., Hespeler, Ont.

D.144398 Pte. A. P. Berthiaume, Canadian Infantry Corps, Verdun, P.Q.

A.58714 Pte. G. C. Deschaine, Canadian Infantry Corps, 219 Wellesley Blvd., Windsor, Ont.

B.63969 Rfn. T. G. Gold, Canadian Infantry Corps, 186 Northcliffe Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

B.132884 Pte. W. J. G. Hardy, Canadian Infantry Corps, Muskoka Falls, Ont.

L.56014 Pte. E. F. Jones, Canadian Infantry Corps, Rabbit Lake, Sask.

B.135703 Pte. J. J. Koropchuk, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 1, Millgrove, Ont.

D.166292 Pte. P. H. Montreuil, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5211 Blvd. St. Laurent, Montreal, P.Q.

F.60440 Pte. J. F. Mossey, Canadian Infantry Corps, Souris, P.E.I.

B.158477 Pte. W. J. Mulvihill, Canadian Infantry Corps, 39 Comfort St., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

G.50944 Pte. R. E. Newman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Wilson's Beach, N.B.

B.134982 Pte. T. Stewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 141 Cayuga St., Brantford, Ont.

B.156199 Pte. J. L. Thompson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Greensville, Ont.

L.104907 Pte. G. Van Caeseele, Canadian Infantry Corps, Langenburg, Sask.

B.87260 Pte. B. LaB. Watters, Canadian Infantry Corps, 253 Emerson St., Hamilton, Ont.

H/Maj. G. R. Addie, Canadian Chaplain Services, 321 Main St., Cowansville, P.Q.

H/Maj. A. B. J. O'Neill, Canadian Chaplain Services, 15 LeBreton St., Ottawa, Ont.

H/Capt. F. G. Stewart, Canadian Chaplain Services, 22 Maynard Ave., Kitchener, Ont.

H/Capt. J. A. Sweeney, Canadian Chaplain Services, 257 Havelock St., Toronto, Ont.

Lt-Col. J. M. Pocock, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 281 Oxford St., London, Ont.

Maj. J. S. Richards, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, MacMillan Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. P. A. White, *MBE*, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 99 Lansdale Ave., North Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. A. R. Rochefort, *MBE*, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 887 Somerset St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. D. R. Brodie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 213 Paling Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. J. G. M. Clark, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 20 Strathearn Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. H. N. Cleworth, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 5143 Westbury Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. J. V. Cook, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 708-14th St., Brandon, Man.

Capt. A. D. Cossaboom, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 99 Abercrombie Rd., New Glasgow, N.S.

Capt. L. V. Earle, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Gananoque, Ont.

Capt. C. D. Glover, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Watrous, Sask.

Capt. J. N. Gordon, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Benson, B.C.

Capt. R. A. D. Kelly, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1637 Arlington St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. E. F. Manning, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 924 Dorchester Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. B. A. Martin, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 502 3rd St. W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. M. A. MacPherson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2164 Hamilton St., Regina, Sask.

Capt. J. J. G. O'Brien, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 6168 Hutchison St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. K. M. Pack, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 313 Bay St. W., Midland, Ont.

Capt. G. A. Poirier, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 322A Victoria Ave., Lachine, P.Q.

Capt. T. G. Watt, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 9-10th Ave., St. Eustache sur le Lac, P.Q.

Capt. F. G. Wellard, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 3622 Lorne Cres., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. O. Evans, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 203 Main St. W., North Bay, Ont.

Lieut. H. G. F. Ashby, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 144 Byron St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. F. G. Bussell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Wakefield, P.Q.

Lieut. A. R. A. Cane, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2 Lyall Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. W. R. Corner, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. H. J. Horne, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1049 Nelson St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. M. A. North, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Canning, N.S.

L.7115 WO I (MSM) A. W. Haysom, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1455 Elphinstone St., Regina, Sask.

B.83947 WO I (MSM) O. J. Thomas, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 76 Mill St., Welland, Ont.

B.88430 WO II (SQMS) (A/WO I, SM) M. D. Brown, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 125 Vaughan Rd., Toronto, Ont.

B.85959 WO II (CSM) T. Burgess, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1435 Barton St. E., Hamilton, Ont.

B.81576 WO II (CSM) R. J. Donn, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1206 Wilson Ave., Downsview, Ont.

B.85831 WO II (CSM) A. Mace, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 116 Locke St. N., Hamilton, Ont.

D.91159 WO II (CSM) T. J. Norcott, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 37 Christie St., Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.

K.79091 WO II (SQMS) H. R. Shewring, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 693 W. 21st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

A.2308 S/Sgt. (A/WO II, QMS) W. J. MacGregor, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 16 Arthur St., London, Ont.

P.27919 Sgt. (A/WO I, Mech. SM) A. E. Shoebridge, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Morrison Ave., Sussex, N.B.

B.84361 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) L. H. Birmingham, 89 Amelia St., Toronto, Ont.

B.84089 S/Sgt. P. E. Sheehan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 270 Poplar Plains Rd., Toronto, Ont.

H.37615 Sgt. (A/CQMS) J. Uprichard, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

D.105593 Sgt. C. E. Adams, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Sillarsville, P.Q.

L.9521 Sgt. D. L. Crosbie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

M.104516 Sgt. A. N. Dick, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1408 Joliet Ave., Calgary, Alta.

H.37241 Sgt. D. A. Douglas, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 785 Dorchester Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

L.7151 Sgt. J. C. Focht, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 1, Abbotsford, B.C.

K.75959 Sgt. W. J. Golley, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Salmon Arm, B.C.

D.106972 Sgt. R. Lucas, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2209 Harvard Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B.54005 Sgt. T. Marsh, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 149 McAnulty Blvd., Hamilton, Ont.

E.14293 Sgt. P. Morency, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Neuville, P.Q.

H.37618 Sgt. O. R. Otto, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Gladstone, Man.

D.115517 Sgt. R. Pendleton, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1396 St. Antoine St., Montreal, P.Q.

E.14329 Sgt. G. Savoy, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Dalhousie, N.B.

B.80297 Sgt. W. K. Shier, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 165 Laclie St., Orillia, Ont.

D.114544 Sgt. L. F. Smith, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Rock Forest, P.Q.

B.89424 Sgt. A. F. Stacey, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 170 Curzon St., Toronto, Ont.

B.80411 Sgt. J. E. Taylor, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 34 Woodmount Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.5575 Sgt. R. K. Taylor, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Michel, B.C.

C.30470 Sgt. G. C. Walker, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1334 Dorchester St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

M.31333 L/Sgt. V. E. Bjork, The Canadian Army Service Corps, Lloydminster, Sask.

G.42662 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) K. C. Wyman, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Gondola Point, N.B.

B.3669 Cpl. A. G. Bennett, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 22 Cambridge St., Toronto, Ont.

F.79897 Cpl. G. C. Gill, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, James St., Pictou, N.S.

M.55800 Cpl. L. M. Green, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Sundre, Alta.

B.37913 Cpl. T. R. Jarvis, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 335 Gladstone Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C.30280 Cpl. J. M. McClelland, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 107 Preston St., Ottawa, Ont.

H.99172 Cpl. G. A. McLean, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Elgin, Man.

B.75480 Cpl. J. McNicol, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 21 Beck Ave., Toronto, Ont.

G.59501 L/Cpl. E. J. Drisdale, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 42 Norwood Ave., Moncton, N.B.

D.121472 L/Cpl. A. T. Gosselin, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Tomfobia, P.Q.

H.88162 L/Cpl. P. J. Leonard, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Armstrong, Ont.

B.98529 L/Cpl. W. T. McBeath, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 48 St. Clarens Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C.100717 L/Cpl. W. Neville, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Douglas, Ont.

C.92255 L/Cpl. M. J. Shields, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 1, Osgoode, Ont.

B.87735 L/Cpl. J. Yates, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 161 Fairlawn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

F.32187 Pte. (A/Cpl.) F. G. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 349 Central Ave., Glace Bay, N.S.

B.3700 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. C. Christie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 58 The Maples, Bain Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.24200 Pte. (A/Cpl.) R. Stansfield, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Cadomin, Alta.

D.166911 Pte. G. G. Carter, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 5354 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

B.88979 Pte. J. S. Cheatley, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Sandford, Ont.

C.37462 Pte. N. R. Currie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 418 Bronson Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

D.155511 Pte. M. Dumont, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Ponteix, Sask.

B.49257 Pte. L. Ferguson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 60 Clapperton St., Barrie, Ont.

C.75080 Pte. H. Hall, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Prescott, Ont.

D.91066 Pte. L. Lambert, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2522 Frontenac St., Montreal, P.Q.

K.11215 Pte. M. C. Lester, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 469 Gertrude St., Winnipeg, Man.

D.127923 Pte. G. Leveille, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 115 4th Ave., Lachine, P.Q.

A.63282 Pte. A. I. Lynch, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 91 Foster St., Guelph, Ont.

M.63032 Pte. S. A. McDonald, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2105 2nd St. W., Calgary, Alta.

K.50268 Pte. L. H. Morgan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 177 King Hiram St., Ingersoll, Ont.

D.13654 Pte. G. E. Powers, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 23 Main St., Magog, P.Q.

K.78994 Pte. L. Walmsley, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2469 Oxford St., Vancouver, B.C.

A.108060 Pte. R. J. Willis, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 644 Mercer St., Windsor, Ont.

Lt-Col. H. A. Ansley, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 14605 Summit Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Lt-Col. G. A. Copping, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 504 Lansdowne Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lt-Col. F. G. Kergin, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Prince Rupert, B.C.

Lt-Col. F. W. Schroeder, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3022 College Ave., Regina, Sask.

Maj. C. W. Dales, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 150 Main St., Newmarket, Ont.

Maj. F. J. McLean, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. J. H. Shaw, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 172 Weymouth St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Maj. J. E. Williams, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Water St., St. Mary's, Ont.

Capt. R. E. Bell, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 13417 102 Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. A. E. Conley, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 166 South Mitton St., Sarnia, Ont.

Capt. N. C. Delarue, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 29 Hambly Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. A. C. Derby, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3650 Northcliffe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. C. M. Leighton, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 64 Alma St., Moncton, N.B.

Capt. A. H. MacLennan, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 10118 125th St., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. (QM) F. J. Pattison, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 703 Pine St., Victoria, B.C.

Capt. R. E. G. Place, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 4131 Cote Des Neiges Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. J. C. G. Young, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 283 MacLaren St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) R. G. Austin, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 28 Butternut St., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) G. Bernadin, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 10876 Clarke St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. (N/S) P. J. Bonnor, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Carnduff, Sask.

Lieut. (N/S) E. L. Bowen, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, R.R. No. 5, Napanee, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) H. L. Bradley, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Chatsworth, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) G. L. Canning, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Pitt Meadows, B.C.

Lieut. (N/S) I. M. Chipman, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Hollis St., Halifax, N.S.

Lieut. (N/S) O. M. Clancy, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Newton, B.C.

Lieut. (N/S) M. J. Coutts, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 71 Wellington Ave., Victoria, B.C.

Lieut. (N/S) A. M. Cran, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1284 Wellington Cres., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. (N/S) A. E. Crothers, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 11 Sydenham St., Kingston, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) M. A. Dean, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 319 Lonsdale Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) A. F. Dearden, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 55 Montreal St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Lieut. (N/S) D. J. Dunbar, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Rennies Bridge, St. Johns, Nfld.

Lieut. (N/S) A. Elliot, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, St. Francois, Orleans Isle, P.Q.

Lieut. (N/S) M. E. Farmer, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 30 Maple Ave., St. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.

Lieut. (N/S) R. M. Fulton, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Upper Stewiacke, N.S.

Lieut. (N/S) M. E. Gleadow, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Dauphin, Man.

Lieut. (N/S) N. C. Hall, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 304 Tulac St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. (N/S) E. B. Hayes, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Apohoqui, N.B.

Lieut. (N/S) E. Holfield, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Dafoe, Sask.

Lieut. (N/S) R. S. O. Hooper, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Olds, Alta.

Lieut. (N/S) G. Labonte, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 4653 De Lanaudiere, Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. (N/S) E. A. E. Loree, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Lloydtown, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) M. J. McDermid, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Apple Hill, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) D. J. MacKay, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Garson, Man.

Lieut. (N/S) J. G. MacKay, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, LaFleche, Sask.

Lieut. (N/S) E. C. McKinnon, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 114 Intercolonial St., Sydney, N.S.

Lieut. (N/S) E. I. Millar, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 221 Enfield Cres., Norwood, Man.

Lieut. (N/S) E. M. Murray, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Stellarton, N.S.

Lieut. (N/S) A. D. Potts, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 179 Queen St., Kingston, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) E. M. Robinson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, R.R. 6, Parkhill, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) R. Smith, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 15 Carmelite Rd., Grand Falls, Nfld.

Lieut. (N/S) M. P. Styffe, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 163 Wexford Ave. S., Hamilton, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) H. Wells, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 336 Vaughn Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. (N/S) M. C. Younge, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Western Rd., R.R. #3, London, Ont.

2/Lt. (Diet.) N. M. Attree, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Gordon, Man.

2/Lt. (H/S) M. Jamieson, The Royal Canadian Medical Corps, 2830 Hemlock St., Vancouver, B.C.

E.20608 WO I (RSM) R. S. Bayliss, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 400 Laurier Ave. E., Ottawa, Ont.

C.52001 WO I (RSM) A. Bending, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 293 Conrad St., Sarnia, Ont.

M.24013 WO I (RSM) E. Marsden, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 834 Northwest Blvd., Calgary, Alta.

L.102140 WO II (QMS) J. Crawford, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1078 Rae St., Regina, Sask.

G.44942 WO II (QMS) D. D. Hall, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 35 Charlotte St., Saint John, N.B.

B.91075 WO II (RQMS) T. S. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1559 Queen St. E., Toronto, Ont.

B.3566 WO II (QMS) N. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 247 Eglington Ave. W., Toronto, Ont.

M.40768 S/Sgt. L. J. Bisson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 202 3rd Ave. E., Calgary, Alta.

C.27212 S/Sgt. R. M. Drouin, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 119 Fourth E., Cornwall, Ont.

G.43035 S/Sgt. F. F. Freeze, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, R.R. #1 Coldbrook, Saint John, N.B.

A.27213 S/Sgt. H. W. H. Howells, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 55 Hincks St., Woodstock, Ont.

M.41895 S/Sgt. C. M. Kyler, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Ponoka, Alta.

G.47116 S/Sgt. A. T. McKim, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Belleisle Creek, N.B.

H.1692 S/Sgt. A. T. Martin, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 26 Lipton St., Winnipeg, Man.

L.21119 S/Sgt. L. C. Smallwood, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Moose Jaw, Sask.

B.95953 S/Sgt. G. K. O. Waghorn, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 631-10th St. W., Owen Sound, Ont.

L.17037 S/Sgt. R. F. Walmsley, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 99 King Edward Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.92606 S/Sgt. G. L. T. West, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 930 Retallack St., Regina, Sask.

K.80054 S/Sgt. G. Whittaker, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1008 Denman St., Vancouver, B.C.

P.10396 S/Sgt. E. Yeadon, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Brookside Prospect Rd., Halifax, N.S.

L.17195 Sgt. R. Herron, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Moosomin, Sask.

F.66622 Sgt. J. F. McCarville, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 63 Victoria Ave., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

B.90767 Sgt. E. R. White, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 73 Taunton Rd., Toronto. Ont.

K.70420 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. W. Cameron, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1436 Pendrell St., Vancouver, B.C.

G.44010 Cpl. O. T. Duncan, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, R.R. No. 1, Anagance, N.B.

B.80782 Cpl. W. H. Gray, The Royal Canadian Medical Corps, 98 Mayfield Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.95917 Cpl. L. Hoad, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 127 Maitland St., Port Whitby, Ont.

K.74016 Cpl. W. J. Millar, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Kelowna, B.C.

K.78960 Cpl. C. Sams, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2215 West 1st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

B.91072 Pte. H. E. Cooper, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 741 Palmerston Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.81988 Pte. W. Flood, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 155-12th St. W., Owen Sound, Ont.

F.867 Pte. W. MacKay, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Stanley Bridge, P.E.I.

B.83356 Pte. L. H. Renaud, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Sturgeon Falls, Ont.

Lt.-Col. R. T. Bennett, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 80 Belmont Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) M. Mirsky, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 150 Argyle Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) H. Denis-Nathan, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 18 Allen St. E., Waterloo, Ont.

Capt. R. E. Boykowich, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 635 44th Ave. E., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. D. J. Casey, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 116 Main St., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

Capt. H. F. Dixon, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 1050 Southgate St., Victoria, B.C.

Capt. W. J. Finney, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 15 Letchworth Rd., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. C. R. Harris, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 477 Wellington St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. I. C. Heggie, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 82 Elizabeth St., Brampton, Ont.

Capt. L. C. Luke, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 328 Kingsdale Ave., Oshawa, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. G. Howard, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 157 Evelyn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) S. N. MacLean, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 40 Outram St., Truro, N.S.

L.51297 WO I (Condr.) G. A. Candler, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Ernfold, Sask.

P.35059 WO I (S/Condr) E. H. Casselman, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 202 Clarence St., Ottawa, Ont.

C.94190 WO II (SQMS) (A/WO I, S/Condr) F. B. Raby, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 383 Nepean St., Ottawa, Ont.

L.9175 WO II (QMS) R. H. Calder, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, White Fox, Sask.

B.8537 WO II (SQMS) D. L. Harris, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 55 Fairview Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.74753 S/Sgt. M. A. Carruthers, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Lashburn, Sask.

B.4572 S/Sgt. R. H. Hagan, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 70 Toronto St., Barrie, Ont.

G.44976 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) W. F. Kydd, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 23 Theresa St., Barrie, Ont.

C.42293 Sgt. N. J. Burak, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 826 Memorial Dr., Calgary, Alta.

H.36797 Sgt. I. Jonatanson, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 27 Kingswood Ave, St. Vital Man.

B.77545 Sgt. L. Martin, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 45 Bond St., N., Hamilton, Ont.

C.15809 Sgt. J. V. Sloan, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 262 Lisgar St., Ottawa, Ont.

H.37237 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) R. McEvoy, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 222 Kennedy St., Winnipeg, Man.

B.57041 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) A. McNeely, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 53 Arlington Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.9227 Cpl. N. D. Stewart, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Delaware, Ont.

B.39891 L/Cpl. O. H. Dufresne, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 165-1st Ave. W., North Bay, Ont.

B.2086 Pte. (A/Cpl.) H. L. Griffiths, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 616 Cataract Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.

M.4085 Pte. C. D. Adams, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 224 3rd St. W., Drumheller, Alta.

G.49718 Pte. R. W. Crossman, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Dorchester, N.B.

B.52798 Pte. C. Ewing, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 396 Woodfield Rd., Toronto, Ont.

L.2560 Pte. F. W. Harris, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, McElhanney, Sask.

Lt.-Col. H. B. McAdam, *MBE*, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 57 Barclay St., Hamilton, Ont.

Maj. L-A. Bourbonnais, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 478 rue Galt, Verdun P.Q.

Maj. R. A. Mitchell, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Gorge Rd., Victoria, B.C.

Maj. F. A. Rose, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 9 Kingsway, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) G. W. Thompson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Udney, Ont.

Capt. V. J. Battram, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1321 Logan St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. S. L. Erwin, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1506 Chicago Blvd., Detroit, Mich., U.S.A.

Capt. G. F. Grainger, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 409 Boyd Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. E. W. Johnson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 4123 Trinity St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. R. R. Seely, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 172 Bridge St., Saint John, N.B.

Capt. M. K. Strang, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 25 King St. W., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. A. Edwards, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 68 Scollard St., Toronto, Ont.

P.35153, WO I (S/Condr), J. R. Boon, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 24 Division St., Kingston, Ont.

F.93446, WO I (Armt. SM), E. P. Flinn, Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 6½ Victoria Rd., Dartmouth, N.S.

P.35410, WO I (Armt. SM), G. M. Hagan, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 58 Kent Rd., Toronto, Ont.

B.4415, WO I (Armt. SM), H. D. McMullen, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Alliston, Ont.

P.35274, WO I (Armt. SM), W. H. Norton, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 186 Hinton Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

M.28066, WO I (Armt. SM), W. R. Varcoe, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1063 Sandwich St. E., Windsor, Ont.

G.45046, WO II (Armt. QMS) (A/WO I, Armt. SM), G. B. Dakin, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Westport, N.S.

D.96052, WO II (Armt. QMS) (A/WO I, Armt. SM), C. McCrudden, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 4728 Messier St., Montreal, P.Q.

L.7304, WO II (Armt. QMS), A. Lukiwiski, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Esterhazy, Sask.

A.99715, WO II (Armt. QMS), E. F. Wright, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers,134 Railway Ave., Stratford, Ont.

C.42230, S/Sgt. H. A. Murray, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 9 Succo St., Copper Cliff, Ont.

K.53919, S/Sgt. J. A. Pfoh, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 526 Boulevard N.W., Calgary, Alta.

M.29148, Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.), Stimson, J. F., Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Redcliffe, Alta.

K.52262, Sgt. R. A. Baillie, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Kelowna, B.C.

E.5295, Sgt. A. Charbonneau, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 635 South Marks, Fort William, Ont.

D.109185, Sgt. A. M. Hamilton, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1220 Crescent St., Montreal, P.Q.

B.75959, Sgt. C. R. Wakefield, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 3256 Third Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.

B.9284, Cpl. (A/S/Sgt.) T. B. MacPherson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1486 Queen St. W., Toronto, Ont.

F.1269, L/Cpl. D. B. Dougherty, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Vernon, P.E.I.

A.29302, L/Cpl. F. J. Puckett, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, St. John St. E., Waterloo, Ont.

F.87085, L/Cpl. H. W. Weldon, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Cambridge, N.S.

M.60763, Cfn. M. J. Garrett, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Carbon, Alta.

D.109700, Cfn. G. W. Jarvis, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 4653 Lafontaine St., Montreal, P.Q.

M.37070, Cfn. W. Oleochowski, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Winnifred, Alta.

B.1628, Cfn. W. G. Woodward, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Minett, Ont.

Maj. F. O. Hambrook, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 26 Division St., Kingston, Ont.

Maj. J. P. Labrambroise, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 5567 Dunmore Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. M. P. Reilley, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 562 Claremont Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

B.76562, Sgt. R. W. Fosbury, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Mount Forrest, Ont.

Maj. T. J. S. Cooke, Canadian Dental Corps, Wolseley, Sask.

Capt. H. M. Jolley, Canadian Dental Corps, 40 Grange Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. T. H. C. Robb, Canadian Dental Corps, 2323 Smith St., Regina, Sask.

C.41782, WO II (QMS), W. R. Pelow, Canadian Dental Corps, 175 Clergy St. E., Kingston, Ont.

L.25823, L/Cpl. N. R. Jarvis, Canadian Dental Corps, Hudson Bay Junction, Sask.

D.124616, Pte. A. H. Ley, Canadian Dental Corps, 568 Notre Dame St., Lachine, P.Q.

P.38153, WO I (SSM), G. A. Johnston, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 173 Wychwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.70650, S/Sgt. J. W. Davie, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 1225 Barclay St., Vancouver, B.C.

H.2842, Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.), Jasper, K. W., Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 646 Kingsway Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

B.83661 Sgt. F. W. Burch, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Temple Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

D.121092, Sgt. E. K. Giles, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 5736 Jeanne Mance St., Montreal, P.Q.

D.106941, Sgt. G. K. Smith, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 1006 Melrose Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

A.472 Sgt. W. E. Watson, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 470 York St., London, Ont.

D.127206, Sgt. R. D. Whyte, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 320 Third Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

B.55991, Cpl. F. D. Flood, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 1328 4th Ave. E., Owen Sound, Ont.

L.198 L/Cpl. W. J. Whitfield, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Regina, Sask.

B.103003, Pte. (A/Cpl.) M. A. Hindle, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 46 Canal St., Merritton, Ont.

A.11710, Pte. (A/Cpl.) T. A. Sutcliffe, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 477 Ontario St., Stratford, Ont.

A.105607, Pte. G. W. Howell, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Hespeler, Ont.

A.105527, Pte. R. A. Masson, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 25 Green St., Guelph, Ont.

Maj. R. G. Smith, Canadian Postal Corps, 261 Garfield St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. H. B. Horn, Canadian Postal Corps, Wabamun, Alta.

C.97616, WO II (QMS), R. E. Trimble, Canadian Postal Corps, R.R. No. 8, St. Thomas, Ont.

C.97447, S/Sgt. P. H. Steadman, Canadian Postal Corps, Bridgewater, N.S.

C.97656, Sgt. H. W. H. Ashberry, Canadian Postal Corps, Okanagan Mission, B.C.

Maj. J. R. Stewart, Canadian Provost Corps, 120 Cumberland St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Capt. (A/Maj.) G. H. Kerr, Canadian Provost Corps, 28 Norfolk St. S., Simcoe, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. J. Platt, Canadian Provost Corps, 5395 Bourret St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. J. R. Campbell, Canadian Provost Corps, Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Capt. C. B. Newman, Canadian Provost Corps, Colquitz, Victoria, B.C.

M.24212, Cpl. (A/Sgt.) S. W. Gouldie, Canadian Provost Corps, Carbon, Alta.

C.38363, Cpl. (A/Sgt.) H. E. Popkey, Canadian Provost Corps, Combermere, Ont.

B.97806, Cpl. N. A. Amell, Canadian Provost Corps, 23B Arthur St., Cornwall, Ont.

K.18059 Cpl. D. Routledge, Canadian Provost Corps, 3176 W. 32nd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

B.50844 Cpl. R. J. Tunnah, Canadian Provost Corps, Nobel, Ont.

C.42054 L/Cpl. J. H. Bumphrey, Canadian Provost Corps, 2058 Elphinstone St., Regina, Sask.

C.27291 L/Cpl J. J. David, Canadian Provost Corps, 344 Lisgar St., Ottawa, Ont.

C.75816 L/Cpl. W. A. Dwyer, Canadian Provost Corps, Vermillion, Alta.

P.17117 L/Cpl. W. A. Gynes, Canadian Provost Corps, 80 Richelieu St., St. John's, P.Q.

Maj. G. D. Baxter, Canadian Forestry Corps, 615 Mercille Ave., St. Cambert, P.Q.

Maj. O. V. Maude-Roxby, *MC*, Canadian Forestry Corps, Kelowna, B.C.

Capt J. C. MacLeod, Canadian Forestry Corps 61 Nelson St., Montreal West, P.Q.

Capt. P. M. Morley, Canadian Forestry Corps, Ottawa, Ont.

B.17149 Sgt. W. J. Achilles, Canadian Forestry Corps, Hearst, Ont.

K.57409 Sgt. J. R. Craig, Canadian Forestry Corps, Saskatoon, Sask.

K.66216 Sgt. J. E. Smith, Canadian Forestry Corps, 2111 E. 30th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

W.15009 Cpl. M. Freedman, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 3548 Grey Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

W.15059 L/Cpl. N. K. Slade, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 2950 Mahon Ave., North Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. H. P. Grauer, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Revelstoke, B.C.

Capt. P. Stratton, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 602 W. Hastings St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. C. J. Webster, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 200 Rosslyn Ave., S., Hamilton, Ont.

M.60873 WO II (CSM) W. J. McVea, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 9724 89th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Lt-Col. H. M. Cathcart, *OBE, ED*, General List 5468 Isabella Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt-Col. O. L. McCullough, *MBE, ED*, General List, 52 Delaware Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) G. L. W. White, General List, 3441 Peel St., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) H. Williamson, *OBE*, 325

Maj. W. F. Bates, General List, 20 Paradise Ave., "E" South, Saskatoon, Sask.

Rd. N., Hamilton, Ont.

Maj. C. S. Fraser, General List, 2583 Thompson Ave., Victoria, B.C.

Maj. T. H. Kirkpatrick, General List, R.R. No. 4, London, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) H. L. Boyd, General List, 27 Sussex St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. (A-Maj.)) D. G. Dean, General List, 112 Lake Shore Rd., Haileybury, Ont.

Capt. J.-P. Duhaime, General List, 1954 Masson St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. R. H. Moffatt, General List, 419 St. Charles St., Mine Centre, Ont.

Capt. P. A. Gallagher, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 731 Warsaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. J. E. R. Montpetit, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 5835 St. Urbain St., Montreal, P.Q.

F.24470 Sgt. L. Lighter, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 31 Marconi St., Glace Bay, N.S.

H.19744 Sgt. G. U. Renwick, Canadian Infantry Corps, Neepawa, Man.

H.19797 Pte. W. Sutherland, Canadian Infantry Corps, 181 Rose Berry St., St. James, Man.

B.8392 Pte. M. H. Wallace, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 2928 Yonge St., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. J. A. Hildes, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 560 Manning Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Brig. I. S. Johnston, *DSO, ED*, Canadian Army, 81 Binscarth Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. W. J. E. Simmons, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 7 Springdale Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) C. F. Baker, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 9 Castle Frank Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. M. F. Barnes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vernon, B.C.

Capt. J. E. Beswick, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 410 Giles Blvd. W., Windsor, Ont.

Capt. R. V. B. Caldwell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 38 Crescent Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. D. S. Clapperton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3432—6th St. W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. J. S. Hunter, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Meyronne, Sask.

Capt. J. C. Letcher, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Fernie, B.C.

Capt. E. F. Neale, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1 Bellevue Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Capt. J. E. Wilkin, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5533 Queen Mary Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt. (A-Capt.) D. A. Gass, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Sackville, N.B.

D.36472 Sgt. C. Gibb, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Richard, Sask.

M.37436 Sgt. R. J. Montney, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Provost, Alta.

M.26986 Cpl. H. M. Parlby, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Alix, Alta.

Maj. D. J. Halfhide, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 722 Broadway St., Saskatoon, Sask.

Capt. S. J. Matthews, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 19 7th St. N.E., Portage La Prairie, Man.

Capt. G. H. W. McKee, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Bridgewater, N.S.

Capt. G. H. Southam, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Lindenelm, Rockcliffe, Ont.

Lt. (A-Capt.) J. A. Bourne, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 55 Glen Rd., Toronto, Ont.

M.2008 WO I (RSM) W. M. Cuthbertson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 10716 78th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

A.47117 WO II (BSM) O. R. Burr, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 520 Victoria St., Point Edward, Ont.

H.76022 Sgt. D. M. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 230 Robertson St., Fort William, Ont.

H.29101 Sgt. J. E. Wright, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Alexander, Man.

D.6583 L-Sgt. L. Taylor, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5905 Beaulieu St., Montreal, P.Q.

D.118219 L-Bdr. G. A. Montgomery, The Royal Canadian Artillery, New Richmond Station, P.Q.

B.44013 Gnr. R. Burman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 295 Park Ave., Brantford, Ont.

M.100379 Gnr. H. F. Dunham, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Tofield, Alta.

H.75069 Gnr. W. S. Majcher, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 48 5th St., Brandon, Man.

B.43721 Gnr. A. J. A. Neller, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 45 Sutherland Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.7045 Gnr. A. E. Powell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 890 Bell Place, Trail, B.C.

K.66015 Gnr. H. S. Wade, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Crescent Beach, B.C.

Lieut. D. Giannini, *MBE*, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Kirkland Lake, Ont.

C.53823 WO II (QMS) C. W. Wilson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 88 Havelock St., Brockville, Ont.

L.19017 Sgt. T. Barton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Estevan, Sask.

M.54233 Sgt. D. C. Eckardt, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Kinuso, Alta.

M.5370 Sgt. K. Madsen, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Calgary, Alta.

B.28142 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) W. E. Smith, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 44 Coxwell Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.92869 L/Sgt. J. McPherson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Collingwood, Ont.

B.28831 Cpl. A. A. Grenier, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Sioux Lookout, Ont.

B.29300 Cpl. H. B. Jackson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 658 Ontario St., Toronto, Ont.

K.31601 Spr. A. F. Lewis, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2936 Silver Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

A.2318 WO I (RSM) H. T. Harwood, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 66 Delaware Ave., Chatham, Ont.

B.31835 L/Sgt. R. H. Easby, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 38 Pearson Ave., Toronto, Ont.

U.1718 L/Sgt. D. W. J. McMullin, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 115 Earlscourt Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.34504 Cpl. D. L. G. Simcox, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Hornepayne, Ont.

A.103717 L/Cpl. F. B. Barr, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Mossley, Ont.

K.70614 L/Cpl. E. C. Herod, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 8208 French St., Vancouver, B.C.

K.35420 L/Cpl. M. A. Kerslake, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 348 Hillside Ave., Victoria, B.C.

Mentions in Despatches

Lt.-Col. H. P. Bell-Irving, *DSO*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2810 S.W. Marine Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt.-Col. J. R. Stone, *DSO*, *MC*, Canadian Infantry Corps, Blueberry Mountain, Alta.

Maj. C. D. Chisholm, Canadian Infantry Corps, 62 Dundas St., Oakville, Ont.

Maj. D. M. Clark, Canadian Infantry Corps, 475 House St., Vancouver, B.C.

Maj. G. R. Duncan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 155 Silverbirch Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. P. Hart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4849 Hutchison St., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. S. C. Heyes, Canadian Infantry Corps, 469 Spadina Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. J. A. Nesbitt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5012 Roslyn Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. H. Tellier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4392 Western Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. H. Wharton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 223 Lonsdale Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. N. Anderson, *ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1210 1st Ave. N.W., Moose Jawk Sask.

Capt. C. Armstrong, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oakville ,Ont.

Capt. M. E. George, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3010 Queen St. E., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. Stein, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) D. H. Kennedy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8510 Foucher St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. E. Nicholson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3270 Douglas St., Victoria, B.C.

K.47432 WO II (CSM) S. L. Salsbury, Canadian Infantry Corps, Mission City, B.C.

B.24054 WO II (CSM) E. G. Stock, Canadian Infantry Corps, Milford Bay, Muskoka, Ont.

K.70481 Sgt. F. W. Bradstreet, Canadian Infantry Corps, 236 Silverthorne Ave., Toronto, Ont.

F.34897 Sgt. D. A. Corkum, Canadian Infantry Corps, 14 Albert St., Dartmouth, N.S.

F.42610 Sgt. F. W. Kelly, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bridgetown, N.S.

G.17049 Sgt. N. Ruff, Canadian Infantry Corps, Plaster Rock, N.B.

B.112472 L/Cpl. R. J. Welsh, Canadian Infantry Corps, Queen St., Bowmanville, Ont.

L.154216 Pte. L. F. Long, Canadian Infantry Corps, Naicam, Sask.

F.40627 Pte. E. Quinlan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Stoney Island, N.S.

H/Capt. (A/H/Maj.) E. W. MacQuarrie, Canadian Chaplain Services, 390 First Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

H/Capt. G. E. Hooper, Canadian Chaplain Services, Dartmouth, N.S.

Lt.-Col. J. H. Ziegler, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Wingham, Ont.

Maj. W. H. Morgan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1718 5A St., Calgary Alta.

Capt. R. M. Moran, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, London, Ont.

Capt. J. L. Morrison, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 311 Ridout St. S., London, Ont.

Lieut. G. A. Smith, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Millgrove, Ont.

B.88384 S/Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM, C. B. Green, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 424 Main St., Toronto, Ont.

K.75668 CQMS J. J. Waddell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2623 W-5th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

B.77318 Sgt. T. W. Coveyduck, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Thornhill, Ont.

E.20229 Sgt. H. J. Tupper, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 21½ Madeleine St., Quebec, P.Q.

P.40297 Cpl. C. R. Briggs, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps. 43 Ashland Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.7681 Pte. (A/Cpl.) W. S. Watson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 862 Robinson St., Regina, Sask.

B.81434 L/Cpl. G. E. Gagnon, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Dugwal, Ont.

L.7536 L/Cpl. E. W. Greenwood, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Qu'Appelle, Sask.

B.85639 Pte. A. E. Almond, R.R. No. 4, Waterford, Ont.

M.101580 Pte. J. Bahry, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 7203-118 Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

A.42087 Pte. W. W. Fulsom, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 3, Princetown, Ont.

L.65693 Pte. E. H. Heier, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, O'Malley, Sask.

B.54238 Pte. G. F. Jarman, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1061 Valliquette St., Verdun, P.Q.

C.11761 Pte. J. W. MacAtee, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 47 Havelock Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

B.146084 Pte. G. E. Platten, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 193 Nassau St., Oshawa, Ont.

H.37631 Pte. J. D. Richardson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Thomasburg, Ont.

Col. G. R. Forbes, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 13 Bloomingdale Terrace, Halifax, N.S.

Lt.-Col. W. K. Bice, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1501 7th St. W., Calgary, Alta.

Lt.-Col. L. E. R. Luckey, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 14 Prince Rupert Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. H. S. Mitchell, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 232 Portland Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. D. K. Grant, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Listowel, Ont.

Maj. I. S. MacLean, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 95 Niagara St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. W. M. Byers, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Metcalfe, Ont.

Capt. J. G. W. Swanson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 287 Beverly St., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. (P/M) S. Miles, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Rothesay, N.B.

Maj. (P/M) M. A. Rutherford, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Mount Forest, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) (A/Capt. (Matron)) J. L. Clemens, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1304 Church St., Windsor, Ont.

Lt. (Diet.) B. C. M. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 674 University Dr., Saskatoon, Sask.

Lieut. (N/S) A. P. Gibson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 190 Ann St., Belleville, Ont.

Lieut. (P/A) M. M. Harrington, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Regina, Sask.

2/Lt. (H/S) E. R. Webster, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 45 Glen Elm Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D.61471 WO II (QMS) R. Boissy, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Longueil Annex, P.Q.

D.95153 WO II (RQMS) U. Fortin, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 201 Wilbrod Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

D.95811 WO II (RQMS) S. Meyers, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2202 Hampton Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

D.98645 WO II (QMS) D. Thatcher, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 4777 Notre Dame St. E., Montreal, P.Q.

L.17258 Sgt. H. Crone, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1120-7th Ave. N.W., Moose Jaw, Sask.

B.67165 L/Sgt. A. R. Mackie, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Toronto St., Colborne, Ont.

B.93603 Pte. M. E. Cleary, Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 46 Rhodes Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D.98670 Pte. H. F. Lohnes, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 14 Hess St., Hamilton, Ont.

Maj. P. M. Irwin, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 51 Albert St., Waterloo, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. L. Yarwood, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 823 Ashburn St., Winnipeg, Man.

K.73211 WO I (S/Condr) L. G. Archibald, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Quesnel, B.C.

H.3917 WO II (QMS) R. E. Coppell, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Dauphin, Man.

L.9127 Cpl. S. E. Hillier, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Southey, Sask.

A.64163 Sgt. F. R. McCarthy, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, St. Marys, Ont.

Capt. B. F. G. Brimmelt, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Winnipegosis, Man.

Capt. L. K. Shrum, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Smithville, Ont.

Capt. L. Wardman, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1723 Lee Ave., Victoria, B.C.

A.34400 WO II (SQMS) E. A. Holyer, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 451 Sherman Ave. S., Hamilton, Ont.

M.62378 WO II (Armt QMS) E. A. Taylor, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Drumheller, Alta.

M.41913 Armt S/Sgt. S. J. Smith, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 6605 18A St. S., Calgary, Alta.

M.7087 Armt S/Sgt. S. G. Wilson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 12148-96th St., Edmonton, Alta.

M.16868 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) O'Donnell, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 9604-103 A. Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

M.10869 Sgt. F. J. Kovach, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Madison, Sask.

B.53034 Sgt. G. I. McGrath, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, R.R. No. 1, Thessalon, Ont.

U.1832 Sgt. T. A. Read, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 142 St., Edmonton, Alta.

A.3028 Sgt. O. Sweeney, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, London, Ont.

D.96184 Sgt. F. V. Whynott, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 710 Galt Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

D.122765 Cfn. A. Najovits, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 3872 De Bullion St., Montreal, P.Q.

A.29534 Cfn. H. C. Walker, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 299 Simcoe St., London, Ont.

Lt.-Col. K. F. Wintemute, *OBE*, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 103 Wilmot Place, Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. A. D. Crawford, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 2350 Park Row W., Montreal, P.Q.

C.95033 Sgt. J. K. Gibson, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 9 Thornton Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

L.26005 Sgt. A. C. Shattuck, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Mossbank, Sask.

Lt.-Col. C. B. H. Climo, *DCM, ED* Canadian Dental Corps, 3847 Draper Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. R. C. Cullington, *ED*, Canadian Dental Corps, 341 Springdale Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

M.63311 Cpl. C. J. E. Gebert, Canadian Dental Corps, Ponoka, Alta.

P.38222 WO I (SM) H. E. Thomas, The Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 80 Waverley St., Ottawa, Ont.

H.16657 WO II (QMS) N. B. Houghton, The Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 124 Spence St., Winnipeg, Man.

C.96324 Sgt. G. M. Dunfield, The Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Almonte, Ont.

W.11003 Sgt. J. F. Allan, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 32 McAdman Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

W.11142 Cpl. H. M. Booker, Canadian Women's Army Corps, Sandwick, Vancouver Island, B.C.

W.1018 Cpl. K. S. Torrance, Canadian Women's Army Corps, Mossley, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) P. N. Cotton, Canadian Intelligence Corps, R.R. No. 1, Stevenson Rd., White Rock, B.C.

Lt.-Col. C. W. Gilchrist, General List, 184 Princess St., Saint John, N.B.

Maj. E. O. Delorme, General List, 1535 Le Caron St., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. G. M. G. Johnstone, General List, 1525 Closse St., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. E. McIntyre, General List, 22 Blenheim Rd., Galt, Ont.

Maj. W. McLaws, General List, 816 Royal Ave., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. A. H. McCallum, General List, 1543 Preston St., Windsor, Ont.

Capt. G. F. Clynick, General List, 175 Westmoreland St., Fredericton N.B.

Capt. L. A. Moore, General List, 405 Lake Promenade, Long Branch, Ont.

Capt. W. E. Patterson, *ED*, General List, 61 Astley, Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Spvr. G. M. Singleton, Auxiliary Services, 4155 Venaliles St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. A. R. Stewart, General List, 2503 E. Pender St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. P. E. Thibeault, General List, 6656 Louis Hemon, Montreal, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) F. H. D. Pickersgill, General List, Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. J. F. Rodney, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Fort Saskatchewan, Alta.

B.66716 Cpl. H. Archibald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 41 Pape Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.37377 Pte. C. N. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 781 Main St. E., Hamilton, Ont.

Lt.-Col. C. C. I. Merritt, *VC*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3830-12th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. A. Beauregard, General List, Hamel, P.Q.

Lieut. D. M. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5 Dalhousie St., Halifax, N.S.

Lieut. (N/S) R. P. Smith, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 13 Hawthorn St., Dartmouth, N.S.

K.67378 Cpl. C. L. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1019 Bute St., Vancouver, B.C.

Maj. T. E. Hayhurst, *ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1922 Wyandotte St., Windsor, Ont.

Maj. J. R. Painchaud, Canadian Infantry Corps, 124 Ave. Des Braves, Quebec, P.Q.

Maj. N. A. Waldron, Canadian Infantry Corps, 174 George St., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. R. C. W. Bowery, Canadian Infantry Corps, 164 Dundas St., Brantford, Ont.

Capt. W. L. McGregor, Canadian Infantry Corps, 810 Devonshire Rd., Walkerville, Ont.

Capt. J. R. Prefontaine, Candian Infantry Corps, 3737 Hutchison St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. G. G. Sinclair, Canadian Infantry Corps, 54 Braemar Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. A. Turner, Canadian Infantry Corps, 310 Horace St., Norwood Grove, Man.

Capt. A. H. Turney, Canadian Infantry Corps, Calgary, Alta.

Capt. J. F. S. Walmsley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 7 Beulah Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) W. H. Scott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1338 Ouelette Ave., Windsor, Ont.

Lieut. E. Bennett, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 543 Henry St., Woodstock, Ont.

Lieut. J. D. Colson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5353 Queen Mary Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. J. H. Dunlap, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 105 Kenwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. J. A. Foster, Canadian Infantry Corps, 100 Bedford Rd., Toronto, Ont.

83166—379½

Lieut. A. D. Green, Canadian Infantry Corps, 810 Argyle Ave., Windsor, Ont.
Lieut. L. G. Kempton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Weyburn, Sask.
Lieut. J. R. Kent, Canadian Infantry Corps, 728 Victoria Ave., Windsor, Ont.
Lieut. W. C. Patterson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 53 Vernon St., Toronto, Ont.
Lieut. J. A. Prince, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4523 Riverside Drive, Windsor, Ont.
Lieut R. S. Stewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 925 St. Clair Ave. W., Toronto, Ont.
Lieut N. M. Watson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 339½ North Christena St., Sarnia, Ont.
Lieut. W. G. R. Wedd, Canadian Infantry Corps, 174 Fairlawn Ave., Toronto, Ont.
Lieut. R. A. Wise, Canadian Infantry Corps, 158 Ruby St., Winnipeg, Man.
H.19777 Pte. S. Skromeda, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1806 Pacific Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
H.19638 Sgt. W. L. Rankine, Canadian Infantry Corps, 806 McDermot Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
H.20143 Pte. S. F. Sutton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kenora, Ont.
L.12416 WO I (RSM) R. H. Strumm, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1040 13 St. E., Saskatoon, Sask.
B.66658 WO II (CSM) W. S. M. Jacobs, Canadian Infantry Corps, 136 Shaw St., Toronto, Ont.
B.25103 Sgt. S. J. Cleasby, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 808 Gladstone Ave., Toronto, Ont.
B.66543 Sgt. D. B. L. Hassell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.
B.66541 Sgt. E. Peaks, Canadian Infantry Corps, 334 Bain Ave., Toronto, Ont.
L.12574 Sgt. S. N. J. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, Silver Park, Sask.
D.61148 L/Sgt. J. P. Beauvais, Canadian Infantry Corps, 6628 De Gaspe St., Montreal, P.Q.
A.19162 L/Sgt. W. W. McMurray, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Denfield, Ont.
L.12767 Cpl. F. Clowes, Canadian Infantry Corps, Regina, Sask.
B.36710 Cpl. G. Duckworth, Canadian Infantry Corps, 27 Highland Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
L.12030 Cpl. E. R. Kercher, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cassidy, V.I., B.C.
A.21479 Cpl. C. E. Wendover, Canadian Infantry Corps, 592 Crawford Ave., Windsor, Ont.
C.15830 Cpl. J. J. Zahab, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 240 Bell St., Ottawa, Ont.
L.12633 L/Cpl. C. L. Keast, Canadian Infantry Corps, Coronach, Sask.
L.13131 L/Cpl. W. J. Knight, Canadian Infantry Corps, Estevan, Sask.
A.19235 L/Cpl. J. R. Nicholls, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 31 Norwood Terrace, Toronto, Ont.
M.26903 L/Cpl. D. E. Welch, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Erskine, Alta.
K.34791 L/Cpl. A. G. Wills, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 990 Bute St. Vancouver, B.C.
H.19155 L/Cpl. A. H. Graham, Canadian Infantry Corps, 505 Victor St., Winnipeg, Man.
B.67396 Pte. G. P. Bloomfield, Canadian Infantry Corps, 113 Niagara St., Toronto, Ont.
L.22286 Pte. W. D. Chymko, Canadian Infantry Corps, Semans, Sask.
D.24058 Sgmn. W. Hunter, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Montreal, P.Q.
A.18274 Spr. C. T. Knowles, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1070 Florence St., London, Ont.
D.61217 Pte. H. Lacelle, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1871 Montcalm St., Montreal, P.Q.
B.37360 Pte. H. F. McCourt, Canadian Infantry Corps, Douglas, Ont.
A.19114 Spr. G. W. Million, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 93 Adelaide St., London, Ont.
H.19122 Pte. W. J. Morris, Canadian Infantry Corps, Qu'Appelle Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
B.66669 Pte. A. H. Timleck, Canadian Infantry Corps, 58 Close Ave, Toronto, Ont.
D.61874 Pte. R. Trudel, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1950 St. Helen, Montreal, P.Q.
Gen. H. D. G. Crerar, *CH, CB, DSO,* Canadian Army, 477 Manor Rd., Rockliffe, Ont.
Lt.-Gen. G. G. Simonds, *CB, CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
Maj.-Gen. (A/Lt.-Gen.) C. Foulkes, *CB, CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, 100 Lisgar Rd, Rockliffe, Ont.
Maj.-Gen. E. L. M. Burns, *DSO, OBE, MC,* Canadian Army, 541 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.
Maj.-Gen. B. M. Hoffmeister, *CB, CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 4749 Belmont Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
Maj.-Gen. R. F. L. Keller, *CBE,* Canadian Army, 2480 Cardigan Rd., Victoria, B.C.
Maj.-Gen. Vokes, *CB, CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, 433 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.
Brig. (A/Maj.-Gen.) H. W. Foster, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, Wolfville, N.S.
Brig. (A/Maj.-Gen.) R. H. Keefler, *CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 227 Kensington, Westmount, P.Q.
Brig. (A/Maj.-Gen.) A. B. Matthews, *CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 3 Clarendon Cres., Toronto, Ont.
Brig. (A/Maj.-Gen.) D. C. Spry, *DSO,* Canadian Army, Kingsmere, Ont.
Brig. (A/Maj.-Gen.) E. G. Weeks, *CBE, MC, MM,* Canadian Army, 11 Belvedere Crescent, Rockliffe, Ont.
Brig. (A/Maj.-Gen.) H. A. Young, *DSO,* Canadian Army, 1702-17th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
Brig. D. K. Black, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, 418 Mount Stephen Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
Brig. K. G. Blackader, *DSO, MC, ED,* Canadian Army, Montreal, P.Q.
Brig. E. L. Booth, *DSO,* Canadian Army, Penetanguishene, Ont.
Brig. G. R. Bradbrooke, *MC,* Canadian Army, "The Beaches" Grand Ave., London, Ont.
Brig. I. H. Cumberland, *DSO, OBE, ED,* Canadian Army, 12 Millbank Rd., Toronto, Ont.
Brig. D. G. Cunningham, *DSO,* Canadian Army, 270 Albert St., Kingston, Ont.
Brig. G. R. D. Farmer, *CBE, ED,* Canadian Army, 120 Herkimer St., Hamilton, Ont.
Brig. J. G. Gauvreau, *DSO,* Canadian Army, 2739 Maplewood Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
Brig. J. E. Genet, *CBE, MC,* Canadian Army, 260 King St., E., Kingston, Ont.
Brig. J. R. R. Gough, *CBE,* Canadian Army. Sherbrooke St., Westmount, P.Q.
Brig. H. D. Graham, *DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 44 Kingsview Driveway, Ottawa, Ont.
Brig. W. E. Huckvale, *ED,* Canadian Army, 709 Sifton Blvd., Calgary, Alta.
Brig. J. C. Jefferson, *CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 10470-83rd Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
Brig. J. N. Lane, *DSO,* Canadian Army, Kingston, Ont.

Brig. R. J. Leach, *MC*, Canadian Army, Sparks St., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. J. S. H. Lind, *DSO, ED*, Canadian Army, St. Marys, Ont.

Brig. G. A. McCarter, *CBE*, Canadian Army, Sparks St., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. C. C. Mann, *CBE, DSO*, Canadian Army, 494 Lansdowne Rd., Rockfiffe, Ont.

Brig. W. J. McGill, *DSO*, Canadian Army, 121 Powell Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. M. H. S. Penhale, *CBE*, Canadian Army, Kingston, Ont.

Brig. E. C. Plow, *CBE, DSO*, Canadian Army, Montreal, P.Q.

Brig. W. G. H. Roaf, Canadian Army, 47 Goulbourn Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. J. M. Rockingham, *DSO*, Canadian Army, 825 Foul Bay Rd., Victoria, B.C.

Brig. E. R. Suttie, *DSO, ED*, Canadian Army, Yarmouth, N.S.

Brig. G. Walsh, *CBE, DSO*, Canadian Army, Oakville, Ont.

Brig. A. E. Wrinch, *CBE*, Canadian Army, 349 Somerset St. W., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. R. A. Wyman, *CBE, DSO, ED*, Canadian Army, Saanich Road, Victoria, B.C.

Col. (A/Brig.) H. M. Elder, *DSO, ED*, Canadian Army, 18 de Casson Rd., Westmount, P.Q.

Col. O. H. Barrett, *OBE*, Canadian Army, 544 King Edward Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Col. J. J. Hurley, *OBE*, Canadian Army, 104 William St., Brantford, Ont.

Col. C. J. Laurin, *OBE*, Canadian Army, 165 St. George St., Toronto, Ont.

Col. M. C. G. Meighen, *OBE*, Canadian Army, 57 Castle Frank Cres., Toronto, Ont.

H/Col. K. E. Taylor, *OBE. ED*, Canadian Army 347 Piccadilly St., London, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) L. G. Clarke, *OBE*, Canadian Army, 591 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Big.) C. M. Drury, *DSO, MBE*, Canadian Army, 57 Cluny Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) J. E. Ganong, *ED*, Canadian Army, 201 Rosemary Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) J. A. Roberts, *DSO*, Canadian Army, 150 Balmoral Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) J. S. Ross, *DSO*, Canadian Army, 32 Elmsthorpe Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) J. G. Spragge, *DSO, OBE, ED*, Canadian Army, 4 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Col.) J. C. H. Anderson, *MC*, Canadian Army, 65 Burnaby Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Col.) J. P. Carriere, Canadian Army, 429 Huron Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Col.) P. C. Klaehn, *OBE*, Canadian Army, 2nd Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.

Lt.-Col. (A/Col.) R. E. A. Morton, *DSO*, Canadian Army, Rothesay, N.B.

Lt.-Col. F. L. Caron, *DSO*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 7985 St. Denis St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. F. T. Jenner, *MBE*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Sylvan Lake, Alta.

Lt.-Col. R. L. Purves, *DSO*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, St. Joseph De Sorel, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. C. A. Richardson, *DSO*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 10126-122nd St., Edmonton, Alta.

Lt.-Col. M. J. Scott, *ED*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5550 Cote St. Luc Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. E. M. Smith, *DSO*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 190 Carling Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. G. D. deS. Wotherspoon, *DSO, ED*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 8 Edgewood Cres., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. H. W. F. Appleton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 223 Grenadier Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. O. L. G. Atkey, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 127 Elmwood Ave., London, Ont.

Maj. A. C. Beckingham, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 354 Princess St., Kingston, Ont.

Maj. D. F. Cameron, *MBE*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 10511 Saskatchewan Dr., Edmonton, Alta.

Maj. D. L. de Volpi, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 5048 Victoria Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. J. E. Domville, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 304 Monmouth Rd., Town of Mount Royal, P.Q.

Maj. G. H. T. Duguid, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 227 First Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. K. P. Farmer, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 30 Maple Ave., Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.

Maj. C. A. Greenleaf, *MC*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4345 Draper Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. J. D. Hannen, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 157 Briar Hill Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. A. J. Lavoie, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 511A-6th Ave., Medicine Hat, Alta.

Maj. L. L. Morell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Prescott, Ont.

Maj. A. A. Pirie, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2 Ardmay Cres., Guelph, Ont.

Maj. F. N. Ritchie, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Montebello, P.Q.

Maj. G. R. H. Ross, *ED*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Wolfville, N.S.

Maj. L. M. Sebert, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 30 Jackson Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. J. G. Turnley, Royal Canadian Armoured Corsps, 2429-20th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

Maj. C. A. West, *ED*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 46 Albert St., Dundas, Ont.

Maj. N. F. Wilkins, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 82 Delatre St., Woodstock, Ont.

Maj. P. R. R. Williamson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3495 Walker Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. H. D. Gentles, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1015 Second Ave. N.E., Moose Jaw, Sask.

Capt. ((A/Maj.) R. D. Grant, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 52 Castle Frank Cres., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) D. M. Irwin, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Whitby, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) H. W. MacEwing, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 300 Balfour Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Maj.) T. A. Popplewell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 95 Main St., Saint John, N.B.

Capt. D. A. Ames, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3190 St. George's Ave., North Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. L. E. Callaghan, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 11 Parkman Place, Westmount, P.Q.

Capt. F. J. Cornish, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 107 Bedford Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. D. Dolan, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Stradbrooke Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. F. W. Hill, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4455 Coolbrook Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. R. S. Inkster, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 18 Rideau Terrace, Rockcliffe, Ont.

Capt. A. R. Jessup, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 16 Kilbarry Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. E. H. Kates, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 16 Edgar Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. F. R. Lalor, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Dunnville, Ont.

Capt. D'A. T. Lynch, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 190 Vimy St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Capt. D. M. McDonald, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3775 S.W. Marine, Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. D. F. McLachlin, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 211 College St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. G. V. Newsam, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4335 Girouard Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. C. F. Oerton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 571 George St., Woodstock, Ont.

Capt. J. W. Quinn, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 613 Lorne Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.

Capt. W. S-J. Radford, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. J. W. Rainey, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. W. M. Reade, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 310 Centennial St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. A. C. M. Ross, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 826 Main St. E., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. A. F. Shaw, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Pennant, Sask.

Capt. A. E. Shepherd, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Lake Shore, North Bay, Ont.

Capt. J. E. Slinger, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 93 Arthur St., Guelph, Ont.

Capt. O. G. Stoner, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 314 Wharncliffe Rd. S., London, Ont.

Capt. A. B. Sturdy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 298 Dufferin Ave., London, Ont.

Capt. R. B. Tackaberry, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. D. Taylor, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Meaford, Ont.

Capt. M. M. Thom, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 488 Roselawn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. C. L. Tomlinson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3940 Cote de Neiges Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. R. B. Verner, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 728 Downie St., Stratford, Ont.

Capt. J. Leo Whitton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 20 Ward St., Port Hope, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. W. Combe, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2393 Queen St. E., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) T. F. Howard, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Elmira, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. MacIver, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 91 Follis Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) W. G. L. Murphy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4523 Harvard Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) C. H. Wilkins, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 37 Maclean Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) S. W. Wood, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 333 Second Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. R. L. Austad, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1896 Main St., Niagara Falls, Ont.

Lieut. D. R. Colombo, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 492 14th St. W., Owen Sound, Ont.

Lieut. C. W. Doulton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 672 1st Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

Lieut. S. L. Dunn, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 85 Scugog St., Bomanville. Ont.

Lieut. K. C. Liddell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4250 Marcil Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. D. L. Magee, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 110 St. Clair Ave. W., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. C. A. Middleton-Hope, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 167 Radisson St., Three Rivers, P.Q.

Lieut. G. S. Murray, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 518 Merton Ave., St. Lambert, P.Q.

Lieut. J. M. O'Dell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 110 Forest Ave., St. Thomas, Ont.

Lieut. A. E. Pettigrew, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 354 Esther St., Pembroke, Ont.

Lieut. V. W. Stannard, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1316 West 10th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. H. Sweetland, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 171 Vaughan St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. C. S. Thompson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Lieut. G. D. Turpin, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, King St. W., Cobourg, Ont.

Lieut. M. A. Vernon, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 405 Elgin St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. W. B. Walker, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3 Hogarth Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. J. M. Wickett, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 73 Pearson Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. R. H. Willis, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 432 Hochelaga St. W., Moose Jaw, Sask.

A.37341 WO I (RSM) R. W. Croley, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 564 Ontario St., London, Ont.

C.70458 WO II (SSM) (A/WO I, RSM) W. H. Barnes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, West St., Prescott, Ont.

A.67909 WO II (SSM) J. J. Boomer, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 280 Park St. W., Windsor, Ont.

B.102019 WO II (QMS) J. H. Cocks, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 379 Aberdeen St., Medicine Hat, Alta.

H.77412 WO II (RQMS) B. G. Conroy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Virden, Man.

D.71030 WO II (SSM) J. H. Davy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2090 Claremont Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

K.53778 WO II (Mech QMS) T. H. Dawson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Merritt, B.C.

D.3162 WO II (SSM) A. E. Feltus, Roval Canadian Armoured Corps, 5157 Gatinea St., Montreal, P.Q.

A.44577 WO II (SSM) G. R. Harnett, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 1, Muirkirk, Ont.

D.26791 WO II (SSM) A. A. Lawson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 767 Laporte Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B.40546 WO II (SSM) R. J. MacTavish, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 710 Goulding St., Winnipeg, Man.

G.410 WO II (Tech QMS) F. L. Myers, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Sussex, N.B.

B.69556 WO II (Mech QMS) T. G. Neelands, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 29 South St., South Lindsay, Ont.

G.17 WO II (SSM) J. R. Piers, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Hampton, N.B.

M.45624 WO II (Tech QMS) J. H. Quarton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Lloydminster, Sask.

D.26561 WO II (SSM) R. P. Ross, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 149 Woodfield Rd., Toronto, Ont.

A.44541 WO II (SSM) P. Sanford, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Kingsville, Ont.

D.59 WO II (SSM) J. R. Wilson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1665 St. Catherines St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

B.69685 SQMS A. Allan, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 174 Wineva St., Toronto, Ont.

G.352 SQMS H. R. Burgess, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Havelock, N.B.

D.61069 SQMS R. Charette, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3734 Verdun Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

P.1035 SQMS J. E. Croft, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 20 Secord St., Iberville, P.Q.

A.44001 SQMS T. A. Langley, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 78 Malakoff St., St. Thomas, Ont.

M.12103 SQMS M. J. Masters, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 423 Nelson St., Vancouver, B.C.

P.1121 Sgt. (A/WO II, SSM) G. L. Harding, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 137 Jacques Cartier St., St. Johns, P.Q.

H.26346 Sgt. (A/WO II, SSM) D. H. Issett, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 735 McCalman Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

H.147 Sgt. (A/WO II, SSM) J. Scott, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Colony St., Winnipeg, Man.

B.60544 Sgt. (A/WO II, QMS) W. F. B. Wilson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 3, Oshawa, Ont.

B.19037 Sgt. A. Abbott, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 97 Warren St., Oshawa, Ont.

F.30571 Sgt. G. C. Adams, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1130 Stanley St., Montreal, P.Q.

H.305 Sgt. D. A. S. Armstrong, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Morden, Man.

M.16097 Sgt. R. W. Beaudry, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Edmonton, Alta.

G.21 Sgt. W. F. Bell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Hampton, N.B.

D.26296 Sgt. J. L. Blais, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 67 Chatham, Lachute Mills, P.Q.

A.44235 Sgt. D. L. Blewett, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 6, St. Thomas, Ont.

C.58277 Sgt. S. J. Bowman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Morrisburg, Ont.

C.40213 Sgt. W. C. Busby, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 42 Ethel St., Eastview, Ont.

B.15709 Sgt. W. C. Carmon, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 260 West 124th St., New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

C.58003 Sgt. R. L. Casselman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 183 Water St., Ottawa, Ont.

D.76730 Sgt. F. J. Coxhead, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Shefford, Worden Co., P.Q.

K.53645 Sgt. J. P. Davis, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1830 Powell St., Vancouver, B.C.

B.2 Sgt. G. Dockray, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 322 St. Clarens Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.19502 Sgt. A. O. Dodds, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 102 West Lodge Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.77314 Sgt. C. J. Edwards, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Bowsman, Man.

B.69931 Sgt. H. T. Finbow, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 98 Golfview Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.19719 Sgt. G. E. Green, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 318 Toronto St., Winnipeg, Man.

D.3420 Sgt. C. R. Hamilton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 179 Bois Franc Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

D.114734 Sgt. D. M. Hodge, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2150 St. Joseph Blvd. E., Montreal, P.Q.

M.45178 Sgt. J. F. Houghton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, High River, Alta.

D.26093 Sgt. G. A. Hubert, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 107 Dion St., Montreal, P.Q.

M.63560 Sgt. G. F. Johnson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 654 Harris Rd., R.R. 4, New Westminster, B.C.

L.53617 Sgt. A. S. Kennaugh, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 289-1st Ave., Yorkton, Sask.

B.74527 Sgt. W. Lackowicz, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 36 Hudson Bay Ave., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

B.75053 Sgt. A. W. Lingard, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 42 Eversfield Rd., Toronto, Ont.

D.3854 Sgt. R. Lumsden, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1365 Bernard Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

K.2445 Sgt. W. C. McCutcheon, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 1 Summerland, B.C.

M.11410 Sgt. T. Mikulosik, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 115 Rose St., Winnipeg, Man.

M.27117 Sgt. W. Milne, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 288 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.

A.44098 Sgt. W. E. Moore, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Strathroy, Ont.

A.86656 Sgt. P. G. Myrtle, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 281 Ford Blvd., Windsor, Ont.

B.114919 Sgt. G. A. Parker, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 293 Queen St., Midland, Ont.

A.44255 Sgt. R. W. Parkins, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 44 North Omemee St., St. Thomas, Ont.

C.30497 Sgt. E. C. Phillips, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Osgoode, Ont.

A.42163 Sgt. F. G. Ralph, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Clyde St., Norwich, Ont.

H.26129 Sgt. J. E. Rogers, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Bissett, Man.

M.45611 Sgt. A. J. Sands, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Spirit River, Alta.

K.67249 Sgt. W. C. Savage, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3103 Waverley Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

D.46135 Sgt. J. S. Savard, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Coaticook, P.Q.

L.36021 Sgt. A. Schmidt, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 340-2nd Ave., Yorkton, Sask.

A.275 Sgt. W. J. Simpson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Blenheim, Ont.

B.253 Sgt. T. S. Wallis, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 13 St. Mathias Place, Toronto, Ont.

B.183 Sgt. D. A. Weir, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, St. Catharines, Ont.

B.61401 L/Sgt. W. A. D. Barron, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 73 Crawford St., South Porcupine, Ont.

A.44572 L/Sgt. H. G. Howse, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 338 Spencer St., Woodstock, Ont.

B.48972 L/Sgt. P. Kasper, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Winkler, Man.

D.62708 L/Sgt. T. Robinson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Dixville, P.Q.

H.95765 Cpl. J. Barnes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1191 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

C.40583 Cpl J. H. Bertrand, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Campbellford, Ont.

M.50710 Cpl. G. W. Brock, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Manola, Alta.

A.44164 Cpl R. E. Burford, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 35 Alexandria St., St. Thomas, Ont.

D.3299 Cpl. T. C. Cureton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1490 Fort St., Montreal, P.Q.

H.64874 Cpl. J. G. Fenelon, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Sioux Lookout, Ont.

B.69749 Cpl. J. Fisher, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 105 Auburn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

F.77935 Cpl. L. V. Jollymore, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 22 Cornwall St., Amherst, N.S.

H.23 Cpl. M. Krivoshea, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 186 Manitoba, Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

H.101659 Cpl. R. Pressey, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, The Pas, Man.

M.45059 Cpl. S. T. Rose, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Redcliff, Alta.

A.42183 Cpl. J. R. Sandham, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Tillsonburg, Ont.

A.99719 Cpl. R. F. Scott, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 101 Gladstone Ave., Chatham, Ont.

L.54722 Cpl. G. L. Stevens, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Nipawin, Sask.

K.826 Cpl. E. W. Wendell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vernon, B.C.

B.60730 L/Cpl. H. W. Johnson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Bobcaygeon, Ont.

H.1346 L/Cpl. R. Olimb, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Sprague, Man.

H.26098 L/Cpl. J. E. Selman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Mulvey Ave., Fort Rouge, Man.

B.70146 L/Cpl. W. R. Stitt, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 66 Ostend Ave., Swansea, Ont.

A621 L/Cpl. G. D. Walker, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 350 Lyle St., London, Ont.

B.133582 Tpr. (A/Sgt.) A. F. Hall, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 59 McRoberts Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.1174 Tpr. (A/Sgt.) R. M. Temple, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, U.S.A.

D.37 Tpr. J. G. Alcock, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 84 Rumsey Rd., Toronto, Ont.

H.103625 Tpr. B. J. Bird, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Portage La Prairie, Man.

K.2454 Tpr. J. Briscoe, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 1, Oliver, B.C.

L.102576 Tpr. V. Chaney, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Rock Dell, Sask.

A.55058 Tpr. W. H. Devitt, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 1, Kingsville, Ont.

A.104496 Tpr. E. A. Dorion, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Tilbury, Ont.

B.116556 Tpr. J. A. Forsyth, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 28 Crofton Rd., Toronto, Ont.

L.36056 Tpr. L. G. Garry, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Yorkton, Sask.

A.116530 Tpr. W. G. Gorman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 19 Fernwood Park Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.144138 Gdsm. R. J. Hanlon, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Havelock, Ont.

L.53255 Tpr. T. G. Hanna, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Midale, Sask.

K.49590 Tpr. J. R. Lakes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Nelson, B.C.

F.51943 Tpr. W. L. Langille, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Eastern Passage, N.S.

D.46207 Tpr. J. L. Leclerc, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 180 Lagauchetiere St. E., Montreal, P.Q.

B.135414 Gdsm. M. T. McFarland, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Victoria Harbour, Ont.

C.51504 Tpr. S. E. A. M. MacKay, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 83 Eccles .St., Ottawa, Ont.

B.137056 Tpr. J. H. Mizen, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 143 Douglas Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.2419 Tpr. W. E. Moncrief, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, St. Walburg, Sask.

H.63964 Tpr. K. Motkaluk, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 576 Burrows Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

B.134738 Tpr. G. J. Murphy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 156 Burlington St. E., Hamilton, Ont.

K.37410 Tpr. L. H. Noakes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Newton, B.C.

K.74350 Tpr. E. J. Pakenham, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 508 Richards St., Nelson, B.C.

D.26680 Tpr. H. C. Pelletier, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 36 Lafayette Ave., Montreal South, P.Q.

L.65549 Tpr. N. Ritco, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Wheatstone, Sask.

B.63142 Tpr. C. W. A. Smith, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 279 Queensdale Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

B.50845 Tpr. R. N. Suter, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps. Bracebridge, Ont.

K.73767 Tpr. K. B. Tasker, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

H.323 Tpr. J. A. Waterman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Carlyle, Sask.

Lt-Col. G. L. W. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1000 Terrace Ave., Victoria, B.C.

Lt-Col. J. H. D. Ross, *OBE, MC*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 45 Thornhill Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) J. W. Brice, *MBE*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 120 Lanark St., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) D. L. Gordon, *MBE*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 15 Wellington St. W., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) J. D. Southam, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 271 Laurier Ave. E,, Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. C. G. Benson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Bois de Chene, Ile Bizard, P.Q.

Maj. D. N. Byers, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4780 Victoria Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. R. J. Codere, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4739 Norte-Dame W., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. J. A. Cook, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 55 Hampton Rd., Victoria, B.C.

Maj. D. M. Cornett, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 52 Simcoe St. S., Oshawa, Ont.

Maj. R. G. Cowan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. Philippe d' Argenteuil, P.Q.

Maj. A. S. Dewar, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 109 Ruby St., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. J. F. Dobson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 46 Pleasant St, Dartmouth, N.S.

Maj. D'A. M. Doherty, *OBE*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 301 James St. S., Hamilton, Ont.

Maj. A. J. Dunn, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3442 Walkley Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. J. V. Emory, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 28 Summit Cres., Westmount, P.Q.

Maj. H. M. Gandier, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Meaford, Ont.

Maj. W. H. Gillespie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 813 Talbot St., London, Ont.

Maj G. K. Henderson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Montreal, P.Q.

Maj J. R. C. Hewett, *MBE*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 552 Falkland Rd., Victoria, B.C.

Maj J. M. McAvity, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Rothesay, N.B.

Maj D. R. McMaster, *MBE*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3141 Daulac Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj E. M. D. McNaughton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kingston, Ont.

Maj E. A. Olmstead, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 8 Westmount Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj N. Stavert, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Montreal, P.Q.

Maj L. A. Staysco, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 148-2nd Ave., Medicine Hat, Alta.

Maj R. C. D. Stewart, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 98 Blythwood Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. K. A. Toms, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1827 Princess Ave., Brandon, Man.

Maj. H. E. Vautelet, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3488 Durocher St., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj S. V. Walker, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1421 Bishop St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) E. H. Jater, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 87 Donald St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. F. Sadler, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Chatham, N.B.

Capt. (A/Maj.) D. A. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 141 Sterling St., London, Ont.

Capt. N. R. Allen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 153 Downie St., Stratford, Ont.

Capt. N. R. Allen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1225 Wolseley Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. R. H. Bain, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4775 Sherbrooke St. W., Westmount, P.Q.

Capt. J. A. Boyle, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kentville, N.S.

Capt. J. A. Brereton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1131-6th St., Brandon, Man.

Capt. H. M. Bruce, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 150 Balmoral Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. H. Buck, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 338 Stadacona St. W., Moose Jaw, Sask.

Capt. A. G. Campbell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Ste-Adele en Haut, P.Q.

Capt. W. F. Davey, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 720 Parkdale Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. F. J. Davis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 271 Mill St., Windsor, Ont.

Capt. W. M. Duncan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Carleton Place, Ont.

Capt. J. Fedder, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 218 Brunswick Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. S. Hamilton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 54 Servington Cres., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. W. Hood, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Okotoks, Alta.

Capt. R. T. Ingle, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 205 Perth St., Guelph, Ont.

Capt. J. F. L. P. LaPlante, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 7262 Christophe Colomb, Montreal, P. Q.

Capt. W. A. Leak, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 38 Edgar Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. M. Leatham, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2055 Lincoln Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. J. S. Leefe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kentville, N.S.

Capt. J. Legg, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. No. 5, Park Hill, Ont.

Capt. L. Lightstone, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 14 Roedan Cresc., Roehampton, London, Eng.

Capt. G. N. Manning, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Aneroid, Sask.

Capt. H. T. Markey, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 155 Earl St., Kingston, Ont.

Capt. R. J. Mawer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6137 Marguerite St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. J. O. V. F. Menard, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1172 Clifton Ave., Moose Jaw, Sask.

Capt. W. C. Newman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. G. E. Nixon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 85 Elgin St., Granby, P.Q.

Capt. C. H. O'Hara, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 350 William St., London, Ont.

Capt. H. R. Ostrom, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 38 Melrose Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. R. W. Paterson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 423 Third Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. R. T. S. Phipps, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5876 Adera St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. W. F. Roberts, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 136 George St., Fredericton, N.B.

Capt. R. A. Ryder, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. Stephen, N.B.

Capt. J. M. Slichter, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. G. T. Spurr, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Guysborough, N.S.

Capt. D. G. Struthers, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2 Spadina Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. C. Vander Burgh, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Walkerton, Ont.

Capt. S. J. Walker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Regina, Sask.

Capt. W. A. Walker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Canora, Sask.

Capt. L. Withers, *MC*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 122 St. Denis Ave., St. Lambert, P.Q.

Capt. G. D. Wood, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Mahone Bay, N.S.

Lt. (A/Capt.) A. E. Baker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 127 Helendale Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) K. M. Beckett, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 846-14th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) I. S. Brand, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 947 West 15th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) D. T. Christie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 81 Willow St., Truro, N.S.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. S. Gilchrist, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 999 West 13th St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) W. E. D. Gray, The Royal Canadian Artillery, La Malbaie, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) W. H. Green, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Balcarres, Sask.

Lt. (A/Capt.) W. A. Hand, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 16 Walker Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) G. W. Howden, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Columbus, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. D. Le Sueur, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 240 North Vidal St., Sarnia, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. E. Pincock, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. D. E. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 110 Nepean St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. A. E. Angus, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 420 Beaver St., Banff, Alta.

Lieut. J. E. Boughton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6337 Larch St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. J. R. Cameron, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. No. 5, Kingston, N.S.

Lieut. J. F. Connor, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 28 Edmonton St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. P. I. Cote, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 84 Moore St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Lieut. P. J. Goldsmith, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 25 Rathnalley Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. G. M. Green, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 350 East 14th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. W. E. Green, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 170 Aylmer Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. R. J. Hauser, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Fredericton, N.B.

Lieut. J. L. Ireland, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Smithfield, Ont.

Lieut. R. Jean-Marie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dixville, P. Q.

Lieut. T. C. McGilton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Stanstead, P.Q.

Lieut. L. J. J. B. Marois, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 514 Rue St. Jean, Quebec, P.Q.

Lieut. R. A. S. Perley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Westboro, Ont.

Lieut. G. F. F. Reynolds, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 214 Pretoria Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. A. G. Rodgers, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 735 Godin Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

Lieut. W. S. Russell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Regina, Sask.

Lieut. D. N. Solomon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 127 Arlington Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. T. Turnbull, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kenogami, P.Q.

Lieut. G. E. Walker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 87 Durham St., Lindsay, Ont.

A.32010 WO I (RSM) G. S. Lofthouse, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 240 Briscoe St., London, Ont.

D.13525 WO I (RSM) R. Malcolm, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 8 Tarrant St., Magog, P.Q.

H.35267 WO II (BSM) (A/WO I, RSM) J. W. Armstrong, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Gladstone, Man.

M.43490 WO II (BSM) (A/WO I, RSM) D. MacRae, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1114-2nd E., Calgary, Alta.

D.14503 WO II (BSM) G. A. Dougall, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. No. 1, Cowansville, P.Q.

H.56856 WO II (BSM) H. A. Duncan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. No. 1, Elm Creek, Man.

B.11247 WO II (BSM) J. H. Forde, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 68 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Man.

C.26300 WO II (BSM) H. D. Fox, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2088 Dundas St., Toronto, Ont.

B.15564 WO II (BSM) W. R. Gage, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 19 Amroth Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.43 WO II (BSM) H. Goertzen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Swift Current, Sask.

A.28015 WO II (BSM) W. Gray, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 59 Waterloo St. E., Guelph, Ont.

D.10839 WO II (RQMS) Kelley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Montreal, P.Q.

E.35027 WO II (BSM) C. Le Blanc, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Gaspe, P.Q.

M.3061 WO II (BSM) R. T. Morgan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 303-25th Ave., Calgary, Alta.

C.18522 WO II (BSM) A. W. Nelson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hastings, Ont.

H.60515 WO II (BSM) E. B. Rhodes, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 505 William Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

B.8116 WO II (BSM) T. G. Rimmer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 205 Queen St., Toronto, Ont.

H.60506 WO II (BSM) O. E. Whyte, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 279 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

A.35195 WO II (RQMS) D. S. Young, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 30 Yorkshore St. S., Guelph, Ont.

D.14013 BQMS H. L. Allen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 406 Pine Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B.8751 BQMS F. W. Bland, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 20 Glynn Ave., Ajax, Ont.

G.7119 S/Sgt. A. L. Casey, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. No. 1, Shediac, N.B.

M.34906 BQMS S. C. Ilott, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 310 - 14th Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.

D.10612 S/Sgt. J. J. McDermott, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6663 Delormier St., Montreal, P.Q.

G.8028 S/Sgt. C. W. Mullin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Chatham, N.B.

B.9930 S/Sgt. G. B. Stewart, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 29 William St., St. Catharines, Ont.

D.10559 Sgt. (A/WO II, BSM) S. A. Brown, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2708 - 4th Ave., Vancouver, B. C.

L.18199 Sgt. (A/WO II, BSM) W. J. Edgar, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 144 High St. E., Moose Jaw, Sask.

L.6093 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) J. L. Green, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Indian Head, Sask.

D.8066 Sgt (A/BQMS) F. Phelps, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5940 Hutchison St., Montreal, P.Q.

G.4016 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) R. Watt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Marysville, N.B.

E.0085 Sgt. J. C R. Beattie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Gaspe Harbour, P.Q.

E.35007 Sgt. F. Beebe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Farewell Cove, P.Q.

M.3852 Sgt. R. B. Brunton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. No. 1, Milner, B.C.

D.11665 Sgt. J. Burton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 203 McManamg St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

E.21906 Sgt. J. Comeau, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Barachois, P.Q.

L.11051 Sgt. R. E. Daliman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2343 St. Patrick Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.

D.119501 Sgt. R. Donald, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Smiley, Sask.

D.7023 Sgt. O. DuMagnee, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4574 St. Dominique St., Montreal, P.Q.

F.15312 Sgt. R. Haggerty, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 22 Pleasant St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

A.32143 Sgt. I. A. Hamilton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 321 Oakwood Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

B.13161 Sgt. G. H. Harwood, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 52 Edward St., Brantford, Ont.

D.10617 Sgt. B. E. Jamieson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 992 Moffat St., Verdun, P.Q.

M.2141 Sgt. A. W. Levitt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Provost, Alta.

A.31343 Sgt. H. A. Lippert, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 280 Frederick St., Kitchener, Ont.

K.15355 Sgt. B. S. McCreight, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 405-2nd St., Nelson, B.C.

M.62 Sgt. F. E. McDonald, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Turner Valley, Alta.

L.18482 Sgt. O. Maier, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Grenfell, Sask.

A.32206 Sgt. D. Morrison, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 754 Queen's Ave., London, Ont.

L.35065 Sgt. C. O. Payne, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Neville, Sask.

H.15200 Sgt. J. Redfern, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Keewatin, Ont.

K.17041 Sgt. A. Richardson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 845 Davie St., Vancouver B.C.

C.50072 Sgt. A. D. Rodgers, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 65 Wilson Rd., S., Oshawa, Ont.

B.6585 Sgt. J. W. Routledge, The Royal Canadian Artillery,, 209 Walnut St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

D.128052 Sgt. R. Samuel, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1303 Giguere, Montreal, P.Q.

D.118244 Sgt. G. E. Sedgwick, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5634 Bannantyne Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

C.26318 Sgt. L. G. Snook, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 20 Milbourne St., Lindsay, Ont.

M.82 Sgt. G. A. Spencer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Magrath, Alta.

M.1127 Sgt. J. Statham, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Carstairs, Alta.

D.13563 Sgt. C. R. Sullivan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2400 Tecumseh Rd., Sandwich E., Ont.

E.206 Sgt. L. Vibert, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Coin du Banc, Gaspe, P.Q.

D.118765 L/Sgt. C. Brooks, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2386 Moreau St., Montreal, P.Q.

D.7551 L/Sgt. C. James, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Waldeck, Sask.

M.34904 L/Sgt. S. W. McCraw, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 7-13th St. N.W., Calgary, Alta.

H.92478 L/Sgt. D. O. McLean, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 855-9th St., Brandon, Man.

L.22661 L/Sgt. W. C. Mason, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Nipawin, Sask.

F.15181 Bdr. (A/Sgt.) G. L. Brander, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. No. 2, Sea View, P.E.I.

C.10388 Bdr. (A/Sgt.) J. D. Honeywell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 28 Byron St., Ottawa, Ont.

B.22336 Bdr. J. F. Andrew, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Pickering, Ont.

B.22345 Bdr. J. A. Brennan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Angus, Ont.

B.11035 Bdr. C. H. Cardy, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 14 West River St., Paris, Ont.

K.65556 Bdr. K. E. Douglas, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 665 Byng St., Victoria, B.C.

C.18512 Bdr. J. D. Flint, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 229 Furness St., Cobourg, Ont.

F.88467 Bdr. A. Gadd, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 74 Furnace St., Whitney Pier, N.S.

A.66803 Bdr. G. A. Gray, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 56½ Kenwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.10080 Bdr. J. Hugh, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Flin Flin, Man.

G.8053 Bdr. L. M. Jardine, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Chatham, N.B.

D.10860 Bdr. W. E. Jeune, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1468 Dundas St., Toronto, Ont.

A.28376 Bdr. G. S. Johnston, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Bothwell, Ont.

F.89880 Bdr. J. L. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 41 Broadway Ave., Whitney Pier, N.S.

D.7603 Bdr. G. McLagan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 418 Metcalfe Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

H.54726 Bdr. A. H. Miller, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 200 Portage Ave., Fort Frances, Ont.

G.50551 Bdr. H. S. Norton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sevogle, N.B.

M.36254 Bdr. N. Oleksuik, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Tuffnell, Sask.

M.3775 Bdr. E. Parkins, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Scollard Alta.

F.77254 Bdr. R. B. Powell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Digby, N.S.

G.50642 Bdr. H. A. Price, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3441 Cote De Neiges Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

M.59306 Bdr. D. Ross, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Beaverlodge, Alta.

M.29222 Bdr. W. Sonnenberg, The Royal Canadian Artillery, North Battleford, Sask.

K.68776, Bdr. N. C. Tiller, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hartleyville, Alta.

B.23635 Bdr. C. H. Trinkwon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 17 Lippincott St., Weston, Ont.

F.16808 Bdr. G. H. Trott, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Barrington Head, N.S.

A.58856 Bdr. D. G. Trumper, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Port Dover, Ont.

F.88443 Bdr. P. E. White, The Royal Canadian Artillery, New Waterford, N.S.

C.26263 L/Bdr. A. D. Brown, 219 Victoria Lane, Port Hope, Ont.

B.8704 L/Bdr. A. Carney, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 191 Kensington Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

L.60744 LBdr. J. Dittrick, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Whitewood, Sask.

G.5115 L/Bdr. J. Felsing, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 565 Brunswick St., Fredericton, N.B.

F.10289 L/Bdr. M. A. Ferguson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kemp Road, N.S.

D.132315 L/Bdr. D. A. Fergusson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Stanstead, P.Q.

K.15368 L/Bdr. G. R. Gable, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Golden, B.C.

A.64718 L/Bdr., E. M. Goodhand, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2295 Louis Ave., Windsor, Ont.

M.43451 L/Bdr. H. A. McQuillan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Balzac, Alta.

H.29024 L/Bdr. A. A. Noakes, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 451-3rd St., Brandon, Man.

B.131343 L/Bdr. J. R. Phillipson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 69 North Park St., Brantford, Ont.

H.76143 L/Bdr. G. A. Pile, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Geraldton, Ont.

D.9223 L/Bdr. M. E. Pincombe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1684 Ville Marie St., Montreal, P.Q.

B.23630 L/Bdr. R. L. Richmond, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 175 Hamilton St., Toronto, Ont.

L.35227 L/Bdr. W. E. Strickland, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Broadview, Sask.

L.18306 L/Bdr. T. R. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Whitewood, Sask.

C.10507 L/Bdr. E. A. Waddell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 18 Montcalm St., Hull, P.Q.

D.11016 Gnr. R. P. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 50½ Lansdowne Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.22368 Gnr. G. F. Ashmore, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 50 Wiley Ave., East York, Ont.

M.28692 Gnr. M. L. Badry, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 10283-101st St., Edmonton, Alta.

B.18097 Gnr., N. C. Beattie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 11 Greendale Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.100959 Gnr. W. Bodnar, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Mayfair, Sask.

L.35076 Gnr. W. W. Bourget, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Ponteix, Sask.

M.59054 Gnr. A. H. Braaten, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kuroki, Sask.

P.6620 Gnr. W. H. Burchille, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5 Barrack St., Kingston, Ont.

C.477 Gnr. H. Burgess, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kingston, Ont.

B.44013 Gnr. R. Burman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 295 Park Ave., Brantford, Ont.

G.18645 Gnr. M. W. Campbell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Lawrence Station, N.B.

A.65783 Gnr. E. C. Carroll, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 67 Norfolk St., Guelph, Ont.

M.107211 Gnr. A. Conn, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 112-30th Ave. N.E., Calgary, Alta.

M. 10144 Gnr. F. R. E. Daniel, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 9732-105th St., Edmonton, Alta.

K.76815 Gnr. R. M. Dickhout, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Gibson's Landing, B.C.

B.15090 Gnr. A. L. Emmerson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Newmarket, Ont.

F.12141 Gnr. A. L. Feavyour, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Church St., Pictou, N.S.

B.94863 Gnr. K. Firth, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1203 Bloor St., Toronto, Ont.

B.89609 Gnr. H. H. Fountain, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 114½ King St., E., Hamilton, Ont.

F.82234 Gnr. J. E. Gillis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Howlan, P.E.I.

B.17545 Gnr. G. A. Gooding, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 54 Ezard St., Toronto, Ont.

B.88742 Gnr. G. W. Gunstone, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 8 Lark St., Toronto, Ont.

C.1748 Gnr. D. Hamilton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Woito, Ont.

L.6262 Gnr. R. A. Henderson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Melville, Sask.

C.51275 Gnr. P. C. G. Histed, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Camden East, Ont.

M.38255 Gnr. J. H. Hood, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. No. 3, Edmonton, Alta.

D.91934 Gnr. J. H. Huxley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5622 Orleans Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

C.39460 Gnr. J. S. Jackson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 419 Bronson Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

B.47896 Gnr. R. J. Johnston, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 25 Clare Ave., Hamilton Beach, Ont.

A.28417 Gnr. W. R. Johnston, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Bothwell, Ont.

M.35625 Gnr. M. C. Kelly, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Edmonton, Alta.

B.114286 Gnr. C. F. Linklater, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Desbarats, Ont.

B.15193 Gnr. J. R. Lovell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 541 Colbourne St., Brantford, Ont.

G.3508 Gnr. J. H. McDougall, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Chatham, N.B.

L.26412 Gnr. J. R. MacDougall, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kelso, Sask.

F.89945 Gnr. W. A. MacKenzie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 7 Terrace St., Sydney, N.S.

H.59516 Gnr. C. D. MacNee, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 45 Ellen St., Winnipeg, Man.

H.35563 Gnr. J. C. McLaughlin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 269 Park S., Moncton, N.B.

D.118992 Gnr. W. McMillan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3218 Rosemount Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.

B.6876 Gnr. J. Manuel, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Vanessa, Ont.

D.118380 Gnr. A. R. Maskell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5665 Jean Mance, Montreal, P.Q.

A.69312 Gnr. R. J. Morrison, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 288 Emma St., Sarnia, Ont.

B.22095, Gnr. W. M. Nichol, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Toronto, Ont.

C.42856 Gnr. D. B. Norton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 404 Blackthorne Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.416 Gnr. A. J. Patterson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Duncan, Vancouver Island, B.C.

H.69870 Gnr. J. H. Pert, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 150 Rupert Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

D.11613 Gnr. A. Poirier, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 145 London St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

B.11559 Gnr. D. M. Radoman, Schumacher, Ont.

B.131438 Gnr. D. J. Rhodes, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 8 Scarlet Rd., Weston, Ont.

B.13085 Gnr. W. T. Rushton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Simcoe, Ont.

G.49219 Gnr. H. A. Savage, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Stanley, N.B.

A.31227 Gnr. W. G. Scharbach, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Cargill, Ont.

D.14043 Gnr. R. R. Sheldon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Beebe, P.Q.

K.15259 Gnr. E. Singleton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Coal Creek, B.C.

B. 8211 Gnr. A. T. Smith, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Spruce St., Toronto, Ont.

A. 108814 Gnr. R. W. Stahlbaum, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 270 Elizabeth St., Guelph, Ont.

C. 50815 Gnr. D. T. Stork, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 241 Dundas St. E., Belleville, Ont.

B. 11584 Gnr. C. Strain, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 97 West St., Brampton, Ont.

C. 63610 Gnr. E. F. Tucker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Burnley, Ont.

F. 14317 Gnr. T. J. Turner, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hope River, P.E.I.

M. 66675 Gnr. A. Wall, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Coaldale, Alta.

A. 35393 Gnr. G. C. Wallace, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 47 Liverpool St., Guelph, Ont.

A. 28471 Gnr. G. F. White, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 55 Hinck St., Woodstock, Ont.

G. 18680 Gnr. M. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sussex, N.B.

H.92310 Gnr. M. E. Wolfe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Princeton, B.C.

Lt.-Col. W. K. MacDonald, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 169 Hawthorne Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. G. L. Bodwell, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 467 Spadina Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. J. E. Bright, The Corp of Royal Canadian Engineers, London, Ont.

Maj. J. H. Carmichael, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Revelstoke, B.C.

Maj. R. J. Carson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2 Summerhill Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. K. R. Ford, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Banff, Alta.

Maj. W. K. Lye, *MBE*, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 41 Glengowan Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. H. H. G. Moody, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 250 Portage Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. E. G. Moogk, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 6, Pembroke, Ont.

Maj. T. A. Somerville, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 631 Carleton Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Maj. A. J. E. Smith, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 365 Agnes St., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. B. G. Stewart, *MBE*, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 90 Glendonwynne Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) D. E. Finlayson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 10 Leonard Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt (A/Maj.) A. J. LeBlanc, *MBE*, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4581 St. Catherine St. E., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. F. H. Baxter, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Windsor, Ont.

Capt. C. Bridges, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 11244-101st St., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. J. M. Burk, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 3, Blenheim, Ont.

Capt. F. R. Dufton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 6642 Monkland Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. H. J. Gordon, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 343 Buena Vista Rd., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. A. F. Johnson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 116 Wellesley Cres., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. E. W. Labelle, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 11 Cobalt Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. E. W. McMahon, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 352 Walmer Rd., Hill, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. H. T. Ramsden, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2385 W. 5th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. B. W. Snyder, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1125 W. Pender, Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. J. Sumner, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 31 Noble Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lt. (A/Capt.) A. E. Dowden, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 315 Claremount Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) L. G. MacDonald, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 214 Fraser St., North Bay, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) H. G. Wroe, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 83 Vaughan Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. R. H. Ansley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 635 McMillan Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. H. C. Baker, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 44 Jackes Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. W. A. Bowman, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Hudson, Ont.

Lieut. M. C. M. Cameron, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. E. N. Cole, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Portage La Prairie, Man.

Lieut. F. B. Common, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 157 Edgehill Rd., Westmount, P.Q.

Lieut. H. B. Douglas, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Schumacher, Ont.

Lieut. F. J. Dwyer, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 91 West Gate, Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. K. G. Evans, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Piapot, Sask.

Lieut. A. W. MacKay, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 119 Wolseley Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. W. C. McKenzie, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1534 Edinburgh St., New Westminster, B.C.

Lieut. D. B. McLellan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2625 Hemlock St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. P. J. McNulty, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 20 Crang Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. J. R. Martin, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 377 Brock St., Kingston, Ont.

Lieut. W. R. Miller, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Bondville, P.Q.

Lieut. F. E. More, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 332 Somerset St. E., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. D. Murray, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 118 Forrest Ave., West Kildonan, Man.

Lieut. R. B. Snyder, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Lashburn, Sask.

Lieut. J. D. Taggart, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 865 Bronson Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. F. M. Woods, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 1, Todmorden, Ont.

H. 25222 WO I (SM) H. D. Bryan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 198 Beaver Brooke St., Winnipeg, Man.

H. 19232 WO II (CSM) J. W. Atwood, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 15 Cornish Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

M. 35907 WO II (SQMS) J. W. Hoyt, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1261-6th Ave., A., South Lethbridge, Alta.

D. 17127 WO II (CSM) F. Hulme, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 6791 1st Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B.23031 WO II (QMS) A. McDonald, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 70 Yarmouth St., Guelph, Ont.

D. 15262 WO II (Mech QMS) A. Nugent, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 804 Egan Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

L. 19108 WO II (CSM) J. S. Sangster, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Moosomin, Sask.

B. 26185 WO II (CSM) R. W. Smith, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 677 Mt. Pleasant Rd., Toronto, Ont.

C. 38663 S/Sgt. G. E. Donohoe, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 448 Charron St., Montreal, P.Q.

B. 28342 S/Sgt. G. E. Flannery, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 21 Yonge Blvd. Toronto, Ont.

B. 39942 CQMS J. T. Hulme, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 125 Bedford Park Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B. 23024 Sgt. (A/WO I, RSM) R. G. Knight, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Jackson's Cove, Nfld.

B. 28862 Sgt. R. W. Aseltine, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 614 Jepson St., Niagara Falls, Ont.

B. 27894 Sgt. W. J. Bernier, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Creighton Mine, Ont.

B. 82893 Sgt. D. R. Blythe, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Kapuskasing, Ont.

C. 33329 Sgt. C. Brooks, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 6 Bay St., Portsmouth, Ont.

C. 35501 Sgt. G. C. Brum, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 7, Pembroke, Ont.

B. 23092 Sgt. H. A. Carson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 100 O'Hara Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B. 27126 Sgt. F. G. Devine, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Waterdown, Ont.

M. 5062 Sgt. R. M. Dodd, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Royalties, Alta.

D. 15730 Sgt. P. E. Z. Dubuc, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2201 Desmarteaux St., Montreal, P.Q.

K. 29085 Sgt. C. H. Ellis, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 3, New Westminster, B.C.

B. 28081 Sgt. G. T. Gerigs, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 177 Greenwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C. 25723 Sgt. W. C. Hogg, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 563 MacLeod St., Ottawa, Ont.

M. 7312 Sgt. H. M. Houlette, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Waskatenau, Alta.

B.29376 Sgt. F. L. Johnston, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 66 Lascelles Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

H.25175 Sgt. G. M. D. MacDonald, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 407 Cumberland Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

M.41444 Sgt. N. McIntosh, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1163 Balmoral St., Medicine Hat, Alta.

D.16378 Sgt. W. A. McLachlan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1485 Holy Cross St., Montreal, P.Q.

D.15198 Sgt. M. M. McLean, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4969 Balwin Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

F.91704 Sgt. A. F. McMillan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Springhill, N.S.

H.13182 Sgt. R. D. Millar, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1241 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg. Man.

H.3566 Sgt. H. Rafferty, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 303 Nairn Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

P.10496 Sgt. E. Read, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 25 Strathcona Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

C.64039 Sgt. S. Yardy, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 78 William St., Trenton, Ont.

M.7085 L/Sgt. W. F. Brooks, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Prince Rupert, B.C.

B.28742 L/Sgt. P. P. Buckley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 82 Greenwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.54369 L/Sgt. J. C. Campbell, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Owendale, Alta.

M.41718 L/Sgt. W. Chowen, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2707 Commercial St., Vancouver, B.C.

K.70121 L/Sgt. M. W. Coutts, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Port Coquitlam, B.C.

D.16389 L/Sgt. B. P. Desveaux, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Montreal, P.Q.

M.35636 L/Sgt. R. G. Douglas, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Vermilion, Alta.

M.54545 L/Sgt. J. A. Durrant, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4204-17 Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

B.92966 L/Sgt. H. Crube, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Newdale, Man.

M.65263 L/Sgt. R. A. Imeson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Hayter, Alta.

C.30412 L/Sgt. A. J. Knight, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 260 Armstrong St., Ottawa, Ont.

F.91736 L/Sgt. M. E. Phillips, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Wentworth Creek, N.S.

A.20728 L/Sgt. L. W. Riehl, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 414 Ontario, St., Stratford, Ont.

H.82208 L/Sgt. J. L. Tabacak, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 535 McLeod St., Fort William, Ont.

L.22376 L/Sgt. P. W. Thauberger, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Dilke, Sask.

B.29004 Cpl. (AS/Sgt.) W. A. Serson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 2, Lanark, Ont.

A.58524 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) M. J. Schwindt, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 2, Waterloo, Ont.

F.77678 Cpl. R. W. Bond, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Rear 110 Townsend St., Sydney, N.S.

D.16629 Cpl. J. Booth, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 230-3rd Ave., Ville St. Pierre, P.Q.

B.39960 Cpl. F. W. Brown, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Bonny Brook, Mount Pleasant, Ont.

K.37977 Cpl. A. B. Crawford, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 503 Blackford St., New Westminster, B.C.

B.92876 Cpl. E. Florkosky, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Emerson, Man.

F.86124 Cpl. R. M. Garber, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Bridgewater, N.S.

A.59362 Cpl. H. C. Harris, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Marmora, Ont.

L.33040 Cpl. F. A. Jordon, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Neeb, Sask.

B.27511 Cpl. K. G. Lang, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 221 Bowood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.82242 Cpl. T. G. Lundman, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Erickson, Man.

M.59080 Cpl. C. J. W. McKay, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Carvel, Alta.

B.27203 Cpl. J. L. McKinnon, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Forest Hill, Ont.

F.86787 Cpl. A. G. Matheson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 3, Reid's Corner, P.E.I.

M.7215 Cpl. E. Pachal, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 9636-81st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

L.33081 Cpl. J. R. Paul, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Asquith, Sask.

M.7253 Cpl. J. A. Riddell, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 11906-86th St., Edmonton, Alta.

M.59163 Cpl L. Smith, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2nd St. E., Calgary, Alta.

A.102727 Cpl. T. J. Wooward, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 948 Pelissier St., Windsor, Ont.

B.15708 L/Cpl. H. Atkinson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 61 Parkmount Rd., Toronto, Ont.

M.66484 L/Cpl. W. Bahrynowski, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Wildwood, Alta.

C.90149 L/Cpl. A. Barbaro, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 84 Norman St., Ottawa, Ont.

B.39639 L/Cpl. D. W. Beatty, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 4, Barrie, Ont.

B.112513 L/Cpl. D. E. Betteridge, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Toronto, Ont.

B.29608 L/Cpl. J. B. Blomme, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 101 Pembroke St., Toronto, Ont.

B.25556 L/Cpl. E. R. Forshee, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 85 Kirsdale, Ave., Toronto, Ont.

G.3838 L/Cpl. J. R. Gallant, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Nordin, N.B.

B.113542 L/Cpl. C. E. Graham, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 15 Janet St., Renfrew, Ont.

M.7368 L/Cpl. O. N. Jenkinson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 738 Semlin Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

B.130938 L/Cpl. H. H. Lariviere, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 137 Main St. W., North Bay, Ont.

K.76451 L/Cpl. R. C. Muirhead, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3026-5th St., Victoria, B.C.

C.25791 L/Cpl. W. Richardson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 47 William St., Trenton, Ont.

B.92774 Spr. (A/Cpl.) L. G. Innes, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 40 Haydon Park Rd., Toronto, Ont.

A.18230 Spr. (A/Cpl.) H. C. Towns, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 225 Campbell St., Sarnia, Ont.

D.17055 Spr. J. A. Arthur, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2246 St. Antoine St., Montreal, P.Q.

D.63394 Spr. N. Belair, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1963 Rue Iberville, Montreal, P.Q.

B.22273 Spr. W. R. Cooley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2317 Churchill St., Niagara Falls, Ont.

K.71731 Spr. M. M. Cropley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 59 East 20th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

A.59381 Spr. R. F. Dawson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 2, Maidstone, Ont.

B.130173 Spr. W. E. Dearborn, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 3, Oshawa, Ont.

E.109013 Spr. J. B. Desjardins, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Riviere du Loup, P.Q.

E.48511 Spr. J-P. Drolet, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 9 Rue St. Real., Quebec, P.Q.

B.86151 Spr. S. J. Elz, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 93 Ellis Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

L.56845 Spr. R. E. Finch, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Kelvington, Sask.

A.18266 Spr. D. Hall, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 420 Glidden Ave., Riverside, Ont.

D.16444 Spr. T. P. Heavers, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Shawbridge, P.Q.

E.20038 Spr. L. Houde, 70 Lamontagne Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

B.131752 Spr. V. J. Lively, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 11 Pack St., Swastika, Ont.

D.26411 Spr. A. L. J. Lortitch, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Scotstown, P.Q.

F.22421 Spr. C. R. MacKenzie, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 884 George St., Sydney, N.S.

F.5292 Spr. J. T. MacNeil, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Margaree, N.S.

F.10329 Spr. A. F. McNeil, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, James St., New Waterford, N.S.

F.86775 Spr. S. E. Moland, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Chester, N.S.

H.82155 Spr. E. Owens, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, St. Jean Baptiste, Man.

E.0241 Spr. P. E. Roy, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 80 Cyr St., Thetford Mines, P.Q.

D.15549 Spr. R. Savard, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Ste. Scholastique, P.Q.

B.135554 Spr. C. G. Scott, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1585 Bloor St. W., Toronto, Ont.

B.40272 Spr. C. L. Skelliter, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Killarney, Ont.

B.11108 Spr. H. A. Stirling, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Beamsville, Ont.

F.95060 Spr. D. A. Taylor, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, River Hebert, N.S.

G.51031 Spr. P. J. Ultican, The Royal Canadian Engineers, Jacquet River, N.B.

B.145094 Spr. J. H. Valentine, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 250 Grooms Ave., Oshawa, Ont.

Lt-Col. H. B. Dean, *OBE. ED*, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 86 Glendonwynne Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. S. E. Alsop, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Westmount, P.Q.

Maj. T. P. Dunderdale, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 248 Simcoe St., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. E. Hulbert, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 300 University Ave., Kingston, Ont.

Maj R. H. Jenner, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1312 Broadway, Saskatoon, Sask.

Maj. P. R. Layard, *MBE*, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Ganges, B.C.

Maj. F. J. Storey, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 257 Grafton St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. S. Deacon, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 197 Bay St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) B. C. Nowlan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 5510 Queen Mary Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. E. Williams, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 345 Cranbrooke Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. W. Woods, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Petrolia, Ont.

Capt. A. L. Edgar, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 57 Falling Brooke Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. K. D. Grant, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1820 Chestnut Ave., Victoria, B.C.

Capt. H. G. A. Humphreys, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Wolfville, N.S.

Capt. D. W. Jenkins, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 404 Qu'Appelle Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. J. S. Kaiser, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, R.R. No. 2, Red Deer, Alta.

Capt. S. A. MacAulay, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Kilwinning, Sask.

Capt. J. W. Rintoul, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 11 Oriole Ave., Centre Island, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. Sharples, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1616-10th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. C. L. Stroud, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 30 Lower William St. Kingston, Ont.

Capt. M. A. Sugden, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 391 Kingston Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. C. M. Wiltshire, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 29 Woodlawn Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. G. Becker, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, March Rd., Britannia Heights, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. Bridges, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 817 McClure St., Victoria, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) G. S. Wright, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Shelburne, Ont.

Lieut. D. F. Fairgrieve, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 27 Indian Grove, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. M. S. Fergusson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 3390 Grandview Hwy., New Westminster, B.C.

Lieut. W. A. Rouse, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 146 Brooke Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. T. D. C. Smith, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 6789 Des Erables St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. W. W. M. Smith, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Scotland, Ont.

Lieut. R. B. Taylor, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 253 Westmoreland Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.31636 WO I (SSM) A. L. Hurst, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1362 Lincoln Rd., Windsor, Ont.

B.33000 WO I (RSM) C. P. Jenkins, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, R.R. No. 2, Stayner, Ont.

B.31360 WO II (RQMS) N. Henderson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 104 Walfrey Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.12132 WO II (CSM) E. Steinson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, R.R. No. 2, Bath, Ont.

B.32098 CQMS D. G. Christian, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 36 Birchview Cres., Toronto, Ont.

C.3120 CQMS C. J. Farr, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Ottawa, Ont.

M.55254 CQMS. J. G. Gare, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Trochu, Alta.

L.51172 CQMS H. V. Johnson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Woodville, Ont.

P.40023 S/Sgt. C. McGregor, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 115 Flora St., Ottawa, Ont.

C.3535 Sgt. A. R. Barker, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Almonte, Ont.

B.34630 Sgt. J. Beveridge, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 388 Charlton Ave. W., Hamilton, Ont.

F.28937 Sgt. P. N. Bourque, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Yarmouth, N.S.

B.31250 Sgt. B. R. Bunnett, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 94 Strathcona Ave., Toronto, Ont.

P.40315 Sgt. A. B. Cameron, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 12803-122nd St., Edmonton, Alta.

K.75221 Sgt. E. H. Essex, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Jasper, Alta.

E.28517 Sgt. G. H. Goodenough, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Danville, P.Q.

D.116048 Sgt. L. E. Gore, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Montreal, P.Q.

K.34820 Sgt. V. C. Hayes, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 85-33rd East, Vancouver, B.C.

B.31970 Sgt. G. A. Hibbins, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 314 Wychwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.16029 Sgt. A. Holoski, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 220-5th Ave. N.W., Portage La Prairie, Man.

B.33025 Sgt. L. W. Hunt, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 39 Soudan Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.34505 Sgt. G. Johnston, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Emerson, Man.

A.99755 Sgt. G. Moggach, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Beachville, Ont.

H.31139 Sgt. W. H. Nye, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 166 Lambton Ave., Mount Denis, Ont.

B.32021 Sgt. F. J. Regan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 14 Endean Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C.29559 Sgt. G. A. Reid, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Moscow, Ont.

M.9029 Sgt. D. W. R. Smith, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 934-6th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

P.40144 Sgt. R. W. Songhurst, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 291 Scott Rd., New Westminster, B.C.

M.41976 Sgt. K. H. Yeatheard, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 12893 Fort Rd., Edmonton, Alta.

B.31937 L/Sgt. R. M. Bird, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1081 Bloor St. W., Toronto, Ont.

H.38606 L/Sgt. F. J. Ewen, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Elgin, Man.

B.32326 L/Sgt D. B. Gilchrist, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Cambridge, Ont.

D.21370 L/Sgt. J. J. Hallinan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 5925-37th Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B.33166 L/Sgt. A. Jarrett, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 148 Ellerslie Ave., Willowdale, Ont.

L.26002 L/Sgt. E. J. Rayner, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Rose Lodge, Regina, Sask.

D.21311 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. F. Blackburn, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 3555 Hutchison St., Montreal, P.Q.

K.71816 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) H. A. Calhoun, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Prince George, B.C.

B.113894 Cpl. J. J. Brooks, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 14 Currie Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.35529 Cpl. G. Cheyne, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2169 Daniel St., Trail, B.C.

L.65427 Cpl. H. R. Medcoff, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Coleville, Sask.

B.32984 Cpl. G. Morgan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 130 Carter Ave., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

H.38628 Cpl. H. D. Palmer, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1516 Ross Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

D.109637 Cpl. T. F. Perry, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 240 Waverley St., Ottawa, Ont.

F.95166 Cpl. J. J. N. Purdy, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Great Village, N.S.

C110006 Cpl. L. D. Sawyer, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 472 Barrie St., Kingston, Ont.

D.116411 Cpl. W. R. Wert, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Avonmore, Ont.

L.22752 L/Cpl. S. Allen, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Lemberg, Sask.

D.13588 L/Cpl. J. T. Bagley, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, East Angus, P.Q.

B.32631 L/Cpl. A. S. Chapman, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Trout Creek, Ont.

M.9016 L/Cpl. P. Chapman, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1404 Bowness Rd., Calgary, Alta.

B.31911 L/Cpl. R. C. Demenco, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1230 Forfar St., Montreal, P.Q.

D.21535 L/Cpl. E. Moyle, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 302 Grand Allee St., Quebec, P.Q.

G.18298 L/Cpl. G. M. Porter, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Meductic, N.B.

H.38942 L/Cpl. A. E. Schnell, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 564 Flora Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

C.30430 L/Cpl. G. Teunion, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Ottawa, Ont.

B.32369 Sgmn. G. A. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Toronto, Ont.

B.46893 Sgmn. C. Davison, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Glen Williams, Ont.

H.38719 Sgmn. H. Frank, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 495 Maryland St., Winnipeg, Man.

C.6477 Sgmn. G. T. Goodman, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Iroquois Falls, Ont.

H.102239 Sgmn. J. R. Heal, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 361 Arlington St., Winnipeg, Man.

L.74736 Sgmn. L. E. Hoganson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, R. R. No. 3, North Battleford, Sask.

B.31743 Sgmn. R. H. Hyde, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Iroquois Falls, Ont.

K.42815 Sgmn. P. F. Leugner, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Bayard, Sask.

B.31877 Sgmn. L. T. O'Neill, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 555 Rosedale Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

C.101202 Sgmn. N. H. Stewart, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, R. R. No. 3, Almonte, Ont.

B.136375 Sgmn. F. C. Wyatt, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, London, Ont.

Lt-Col. J. F. R. Akehurst, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 107 Government Rd. E., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

Lt-Col. M. W. Andrew, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 189 Beverley St., Toronto, Ont.

Lt-Col. H. P. Bell-Irving, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 2810 S.W. Marine Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt-Col. D. B. Buell, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 410 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt-Col. F. A. Clift, *DSO, ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 1002 Lansdowne Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.

Lt-Col. R. C. Coleman, *DSO, MC,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

Lt-Col. G. C. Corbould, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 503-6th Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

Lt-Col. E. D. Danby, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 178 Laurier East, Ottawa, Ont.

Lt-Col. L. R. Fulton, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Byrtle, Man.

Lt-Col. N. M. Gemmell, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 333 Burnham St., Peterborough, Ont.

Lt-Col. A. S. Gregory, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 1451 King St., North Battleford, Sask.

Lt-Col. A. J. Hay, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sarnia, Ont.

Lt-Col. R. M. Lendrum, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Duncan, B.C.

Lt-Col. S. M. Lett, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 60 Waverley Rd., Pointe Claire, P.Q.

Lt-Col. J. W. H. Howley, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 128 Wellington St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt-Col. R. Rowley, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 383 Mariposa Rd., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt-Col. J. Runcie, *MC,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

Lt-Col. R. E. Somerville, *DSO,* 631 Carleton Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lt-Col. J. D. Stewart, *DSO, ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 North River Rd., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Lt-Col. V. Stott, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 3033-6th St. W., Calgary, Alta.

Lt-Col. S. W. Thompson, *DSO, MC,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Salmon Arm, B.C.

Lt-Col. The Lord Tweedsmuir, *OBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Elsfield Manor, Oxfordshire, England.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) J. R. Calkin, *MC,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Woodstock, N.B.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) R. D. Clendenning, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 311 Lonsdale Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) R. D. Hodgins, Canadian Infantry Corps, 322 Concession Rd., Preston, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) B. F. Neary, *MBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 1228 Yates St., Victoria, B.C.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col) W. J. C. Stikemane, *MBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 1610 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) C. M. Wightman, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 1720 Beach Dr., Victoria, B.C.

Maj. J. H. Adams, *MBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Cranbrook, B.C.

Maj. W. C. Baird, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1321 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. S. Beatty, Canadian Infantry Corps, 59 Davide St., Brampton, Ont.

Maj. J. G. Bongard, Canadian Infantry Corps, 41 Glencairn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. E. J. Brady, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Fort Erie, Ont.

Maj. C. H. Broad, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bancroft, Ont.

Maj. G. Brosseau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3449 Balmore Ave., Montreal, PQ.

Maj. J. R. Cameron, Canadian Infantry Corps, 12 Moran St., Halifax, N.S.

Maj. L. N. Carr, Canadian Infantry Corps, 40 St. John St., Port Hope, Ont.

Maj. C. D. Chisholm, Canadian Infantry Corps 62 Dundas St., Oakville, Ont.

Maj. S. A. Cobbett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4209 Oxford Ave., Montreal, PQ.

Maj. P. D. Crofton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ganges, B.C.

Maj. W. R. Eakin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Coristine Blvd., Montreal, PQ.

Maj. G. A. M. Edwards, Canadian Infantry Corps, 114 Blair Rd., Galt, Ont.

Maj. H. M. Eisenhauer, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lower La Have, N.S.

Maj. N. Hickling, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

Maj. R. C. Hilborn, Canadian Infantry Corps, Concession Rd., Preston, Ont.

Maj. G. C. Jarvis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3980 Cote de Neiges Rd., Montreal, PQ.

Maj. J. W. R. LeBlond, Canadian Infantry Corps, 385 19th St. W., Prince Albert, Sask.

Maj. G. C. A. MacArtney, Canadian Infantry Corps, Amberly Court, Monmouth, England.

Maj. D. B. MacKenzie, Canadian Infantry Corps. 2834 W. 24th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Maj. R. L. Marks, *MBE*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 296 Glen Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. W. R. Pell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Newcastle, N.B.

Maj. C. S. Platts, Canadian Infantry Corps, 205 Amherst St., St. James, Man.

Maj. W. J. Preston, Canadian Infantry Corps, 115 Brunswick St., Stratford, Ont.

Maj. C. J. Radcliffe, Canadian Infantry Corps, Regina, Sask.

Maj. J. M. Rutherford, Canadian Infantry Corps, 497 Oriole Parkway, Toronto, Ont.

Maj. H. A. Snelgrove, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lucan, Ont.

Maj. M. Tennant, Canadian Infantry Corps, 908-7th St. S., Lethbridge, Alta.

Capt. (A/Maj.) A. G. Bieber, Canadian Infantry Corps, 257½ Young St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Maj.) G. G. Black, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8 Springfield Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. H. Burton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 131 Emerald St. S., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. T. Carvell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Water St., Chatham, N.B.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. M. E. Clarkson, *MC*, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 2, Maple, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. L. Coleman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 20 Douglas Ave., Saint John, N.B.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. A. Colquhoun, Canadian Infantry Corps, 295 Ash St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. A. Dunlop, Canadian Infantry Corps, Moonstone, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. E. Fullerton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 448 Queen St., Saskatoon, Sask.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. J. Gilmor, *MBE*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 214 Pitt St., Cornwall, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) D. W. Grant, Canadian Infantry Corps, 136 Glencairn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) H. T. R. Gregg, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1127 Riverside Ave., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. (A/Maj.) D. C. Howat, Canadian Infantry Corps, 62 Home St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Maj.) G. F. Hoy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 126 Bartlett Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. W. Leach, Canadian Infantry Corps, Orangeville, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) S. B. McDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 201 Second St. W., Cornwall, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) B. A. Ouiton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cape Tormentine, N.B.

Capt. (A/Maj.) S. Robertson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 191 Forrest Hill Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) S. Roy, Canadian Infantry Corps, Windsor Mills, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. A. Simpson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 86 Kilbarry Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) G. V. Stott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1719-13th St. W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. E. V. Ardagh, Canadian Infantry Corps, 317-7th Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

Capt. W. O. Avery, Canadian Infantry Corps, Caledonia, Ont.

Capt. M. W. Babe, Canadian Infantry Corps, 341 South Marks St., Fort William, Ont.

Capt. G. Balcer, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5591 Cote Des Neiges, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. R. Beauvais, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8018 rue Lajeunesse, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. L. N. Begin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Riviere Aux Chiens, P.Q.

Capt. S. C. Bell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 107 Davisville Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. S. Blair, Canadian Infantry Corps, Armdale, N.S.

Capt. G. P. Boucher, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Philippe De Neri, P.Q.

Capt. H. Cassells, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. F. L. Cornes, Canadian Infantry Corps. 3866 Pandora St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. W. J. Curtis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 705 Water St., Peterborough, Ont.

Capt. G. M. C. Dale, Canadian Infantry Corps, 84 Woodlawn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. DesRivieres, Canadian Infantry Corps, 41 Rue St. Ursule, Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. A. J. Ellis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3434 Northcliffe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. D. I. Fairweather, Canadian Infantry Corps, Port Hammond, B.C.

Capt. G. T. Galbraith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2210 Dawlish Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.

Capt. J. J. L. A. Gaumond, Canadian Infantry Corps, 125 Park Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. T. R. Giles, Canadian Infantry Corps, 100 Gilmour St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. W. H. Gow, Canadian Infantry Corps, 537 Fieldon Ave., Humberstone, Ont.

Capt. W. G. Harvey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 94 Kilbarry Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. T. J. Henderson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 107 Sherbrooke St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. H. L. Hicks, Canadian Infantry Corps, 345 Jefferson Blvd., Riverside, Ont.

Capt. E. M. Hutchinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 256 John St., Stratford, Ont.

Capt. D. M. Jacquest, Canadian Infantry Corps, 14621 Summit Dr., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. J. L. Laliberte, Canadian Infantry Corps, 45 La Chevrotiere St., Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. C. F. Lawrence, Canadian Infantry Corps, 855 North Park St., Victoria, B.C.

Capt. G. Leclerc, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5163 Fabre St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. R. R. Macgillivray, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1029 Ave E., North, Saskatoon, Sask.

Capt. A. E. McAllister, Canadian Infantry Corps, Petitcodiac, N.B.

Capt. R. L. McDougall, Canadian Infantry Corps, 512 - 15th St. E., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. R. C. McNairn, Canadian Infantry Corps, South St., Dundas, Ont.

Capt. C. P. Malone, 112 Edinburgh Rd. S., Guelph, Ont.

Capt. R. W. Meanwell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1167 Kildare Rd., Walkerville, Ont.

Capt. F. H. Medcalf, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4 Farley Pl., St. Thomas, Ont.

Capt. C. D. Muir, Canadian Infantry Corps, 428 Niagara St., Fort Erie, Ont.

Capt. H. W. Mulherin, *GM*, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grand Falls, N.B.

Capt. R. F. Ogletree, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sackville, N.B.

Capt. K. F. Oxenham, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1006 Jessie Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. J. D. Paddon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 180 Hellens Ave., Welland, Ont.

Capt. H. J. S. Pearson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 12507 Stony Plain Rd., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. W. C. Pearson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lumsden, Sask.

Capt. R. E. Pogue, Canadian Infantry Corps, 32 Wineva St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. A. Quinn, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1215 Colville Rd., Esquimalt, B.C.

Capt. R. C. Rae, Canadian Infantry Corps, 126 Pearren Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. D. I. Rice, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bedford, N.S.

Capt. G. R. Robertson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2095 Lincoln Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. W. A. J. Robinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 52 Undermount Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. R. L. Rogers, Canadian Infantry Corps, 72 Airdrie Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. R. Z. Rouleau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1713 Rue St. Denis, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. L. A. G. Rounding, Canadian Infantry Corps, 406 Pine Ave. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. D. A. Scott, Canadian Infantry Corps, Riverside, London, Ont.

Capt. K. A. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 35 Hargrave St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. M. Stearns, *MBE*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 91 Glen Edyth Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. I. O. Stewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, Meaford, Ont.

Capt. W. A. Teed, Canadian Infantry Corps, Newcastle, N.B.

Capt. J. P. Verge, Canadian Infantry Corps, 25 Fraser St., Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. R. A. Virtue, Canadian Infantry Corps, 79 Park St., Brockville, Ont.

Capt. H. I. Wainman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lindsay, Ont.

Capt. D. E. Walker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 80 Park Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. S. R. Walker, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bancroft, Ont.

Capt. H. W. A. Ward, Canadian Infantry Corps, 40 Sham St., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. G. F. Williamson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Gibson's Landing, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) B. E. Boylan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 161 Iroquois St. E., Moose Jaw, Sask.

Lt. (A/Capt.) S. L. Chambers, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3392 W. 33rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. S. Choppin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 16 Eagle St., Newmarket, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) K. Coltman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 13 Cameron Blk., Calgary, Alta.

Lt. (A/Capt.) W. K. Dickie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Campbellton, N.B.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. G. Early, Canadian Infantry Corps, Church St., Georgetown, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) C. Falardeau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 117½ Cartier Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) C. M. Forsythe-Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, Wolfville, N.S.

Lt. (A/Capt.) E. A. Fowle, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2039 Rose St., Regina, Sask.

Lt. (A/Capt.) T. G. Fyfe, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kincardine, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. A. Gauthier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 835 Manning Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) D. A. Johnson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 218 Second St., Port Arthur, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. A. R. Larocque, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1033 Cartier St., Three Rivers, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) W. B. Misener, Canadian Infantry Corps, 111 South Oval, Hamilton, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) E. H. Musgrave, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2296 Lincoln Rd., Windsor, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) G. H. Nutter, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sussex, N.B.

Lt. (A/Capt.) M. Phillips, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3710 East Pender, Vancouver, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) W. H. Pope, Canadian Infantry Corps, 369 Daly Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) H. G. Robson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 871 Grosvenor Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lt (A/Capt.) D. A. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 242 St. John St., Fort William, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. J. Staples, Canadian Infantry Corps, 78 Caribou St. E., Moose Jaw, Sask.

Lt. (A/Capt.) N. F. Tanner, Canadian Infantry Corps, 789 St. Patrick St., Victoria, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) D. L. Thompson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 167 Humewood Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. E. Walsh, Canadian Infantry Corps, 39 Lorne Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. C. Willis, Canadian Infantry Corps, Aurora, Ont.

Lieut. R. E. J. Audette, Canadian Infantry Corps, 157 Belvedere, Quebec, P.Q.

Lieut. D. W. Beale, Canadian Infantry Corps, 175 Homewood Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Lieut G. M. Blakney, Canadian Infantry Corps, Riverside, N.B.

Lieut. W. E. Boivin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 51 Waterloo St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. N. M. Clyde, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1035 W. 11th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. D. B. Davidson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Prescott, Ont.

Lieut. B. E. Easton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 12 Gray St., Chatham, Ont.

Lieut. G. M. Flitcroft, Canadian Infantry Corps, 294 Stewart St., Peterboro, Ont.

Lieut. W. P. Grassick, Canadian Infantry Corps, 141 Windsor, Cres., London, Ont.

Lieut. D. G. MacCulloch, Canadian Infantry Corps, 681 Riverview Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

Lieut. N. A. Manchester, Canadian Infantry Corps, 29 Humber Trail, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. C. H. Maxwell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 73 Stanley St., Saint John, N.B.

Lieut. T. C. Miller, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8 Stanley Place, Halifax, N.S.

Lieut. J. O. Moxon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1320 W. 15th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. R. W. Nason, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fredericton, N.B.

Lieut. D. A. Rankin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2120 Retallack St., Regina, Sask.

Lieut. J. J. Regan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 259 Jedburg Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. J. D. L. Stewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11 Peel Ave., Brampton, Ont.

D.81098 WO I (RSM) A. F. Leitch, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1923 Descarrieres Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

F.49855 WO I (RSM) J. L. MacNeil, Canadian Infantry Corps, 56 Main St., Truro, N.S.

G.22050 WO I (RSM) R. B. Sullivan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Nordin, N.B.

E.4301 WO II (CSM) (A/WO I RSM) G. Dagenais, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1465 Maisonneuve, Montreal, P.Q.

E.23301 WO II (CSM) (A/WO I, RSM) I. Roy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 44½ Cote de la Fabrique, Quebec, P.Q.

K.47117 WO II (CSM) P. Abbot, Canadian Infantry Corps, 217 Maple Ave., Chilliwack, B.C.

M.1108 WO II (CSM) A. J. Baker, Canadian Infantry Corps, Redcliff, Alta.

D.81869 WO II (CSM) C. W. Bolton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5370 Notre Dame W., Montreal, P.Q.

A.11511 WO II (RQMS) C. T. Cartar, Canadian Infantry Corps, 356 Cambria St., Stratford, Ont.

H.16562 WO II (CMS) H. C. Cassels, Canadian Infantry Corps, Shoal Lake, Man.

H.19264 WO II (CSM) E. A. Cathcart Canadian Infantry Corps, 323 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

K.47887 WO II (CSM) P. M. Clark, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3215 West 6th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

D.56063 WO II (CSM) R. Daigle, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4638 De Bullion St., Montreal, P.Q.

B.96918 WO II (RQMS) J. H. Grierson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

A.11633 WO II (CSM) S. J. M. Halliday, Canadian Infantry Corps, Brownlee St., Teeswater, Ont.

E.42638 WO II (CSM) G. Hynes, Canadian Infantry Corps, 781 Brewester St. Montreal, P.Q.

B.63511 WO II (CSM) W. H. Ives, Canadian Infantry Corps, 413 Clinton St., Toronto, Ont.

B.55152 WO II (CSM) T. D. Jeffery, Canadian Infantry Corps, Magnetawan, Ont.

A.21278 WO II (CSM) G. W. Lucas, Canadian Infantry Corps, 925 Marion Ave., Windsor Ont.

H.19310 WO II (CSM) W. J. MacLeod, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1612 Ross Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

A.38012 WO II (CSM) G. K. Manning, Canadian Infantry Corps, 379 Brunswick St., Stratford, Ont.

K.57497 WO II (CSM) C. Morgan, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 1, Cumberland, B.C.

B.68256 WO II (CSM) W. C. Owen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 150 Bessborough Dr., Leaside, Ont.

M.67605 WO II (CSM) W. G. Reid, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11949-80th St., Edmonton, Alta.

D.86388 WO II (CSM) S. Rosen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4590 Jeanne Mance St., Montreal, P.Q.

F.54806 WO II (CSM) D. A. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 407 Shaw St., Toronto, Ont.

B. 41196 WO II (CSM) E. M. Snyder, Canadian Infantry Corps, High St., Port Credit, Ont.

E.42354 WO II (CSM) W. Sopp, Canadian Infantry Corps, 67 Rue Bagot, Bagotville, P.Q.

L.93728 WO II (CSM) N. Taylor, Canadian Infantry Corps, 706 Sherburn St., Winnipeg, Man.

H.41384 WO II (CSM) P. E. Wake, Canadian Infantry Corps, 231 Jefferson Ave., West Kildonan, Man.

L.12518 WO II (CSM) L. P. Warren, Canadian Infantry Corps, Regina, Sask.

B.74476 WO II (CSM) H. S. Webb, Canadian Infantry Corps, 41 Scarboro Beach Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

B.63501 WO II (RQMS) G. A. Wice, Canadian Infantry Corps, 88 Pears Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.31195 WO II (CSM) C. A. L. Wismer, Canadian Infantry Corps, Edmonton, Alta.

H.87833 CQMS (A/WO II, CSM) D. C. Cassin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 146, Arlington, St., Winnipeg, Man.

B.54529 CQMS. H. J. Bonany, Canadian Infantry Corps, 219 Fisher St., North Bay, Ont.

B.45543 CQMS. L. C. Cassidy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 16 Market Square, Hamilton, Ont.

K.62028 S/Sgt. W. A. Dennis, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cairnsmore St., Duncan, B.C.

B.37051 CQMS. W. F. Dukes, Canadian Infantry Corps, 106 Jackson St. E., Hamilton, Ont.

A.37384 CQMS. F. W. Hare, Canadian Infantry Corps, Park St., Port Credit, Ont.

B.59570 CQMS. J. B. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hilton Beach, Ont.

H.16076 S/Sgt. L. A. L. Madson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sidney, Man.

F.50287 CQMS. E. K. Murphy, Canadian Infantry Corps, River Hebert, N.S.

B.64441 CQMS. G. Saltstone, Canadian Infantry Corps, 197 Danforth Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.52206 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) D. T. Darnley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 315 Rhodes Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.17437 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) R. Durie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 960 Westminster Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

D.61242 Sgt. (A/WO II, RQMS) N. De la Bruere, Canadian Infantry Corps, 775 Blvd. St. Joseph, Montreal, P.Q.

G.52556 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) P. F. Mitchell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Wilsons Beach, N.B.

B.96924 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) G. J. Hotrum, Canadian Infantry Corps, 424 Strathmore Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

D.82576 Sgt. H. Aubry, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2314 Doridon St., Montreal, P.Q.

C.118540 Sgt. E. T. Bangs, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 2, Hawkesbury, Ont.

H.46301 Sgt. C. Barker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 626 First St., Fort Frances, Ont.

B.132631 Sgt. F. L. Bennett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 28 Mill St., Oshawa, Ont.

K.86296 Sgt. F. Bentham, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3358 Glasgow Ave., Victoria, B.C.

D.61977 Sgt. J. R. R. Bergeron, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10667 Chambord, Montreal, P.Q.

M.16585 Sgt. J. Birmingham, Canadian Infantry Corps, 9517-110th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

B.32809 Sgt. D. Boyd, Canadian Infantry Corps, 17 Lockwood Rd., Toronto, Ont.

A.37682 Sgt. L. E. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vittoria, Ont.

C.5120 Sgt. E. C. Browne, Canadian Infantry Corps, Picton, Ont.

M.17289 Sgt. W. R. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 9731-92nd St., Edmonton, Alta.

F.59965 Sgt. A. T. Cannon, Canadian Iinfantry Corps, Grand Tracadie, P.E.I.

D.150059 Sgt. A. R. Carriere, Canadian Infantry Corps, Magog, P.Q.

A.11270 Sgt. H. Crawford, Canadian Infantry Corps, Wiarton, Ont.

B.79052 Sgt. N. L. Crawford, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

F.50168 Sgt. M. K. Crowell, Canadian Infantry, 11 Church St., Truro, N.S.

M.12356 Sgt. R. M. Cunningham, Canadian Infantry Corps, Alhambra, Alta.

F.5591 Sgt. M. Danyluk, Canadian Infantry Corps, 133 Wallaces Rd., Glace Bay, N.S.

H.20077 Sgt. W. W. Dennis, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fort William, Ont.

H.20474 Sgt. L. D. Ferguson, Canadian, Canadian Infantry Corps. Deloraine, Man.

G.27489 Sgt. M. A. Fougere, Canadian Infantry Corps, Shediac Island, N.B.

F.50178 Sgt V. D. Frizzell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1144 Prince St., Truro, N.S.

D.56291 Sgt. J. J. Gaudreau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5 Lafleur Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

G.23252 Sgt. E. H. Gilks, Canadian Infantry Corps, Millerton, N.B.

B.76943 Sgt. J. E. A. Harlow, Canadian Infantry Corps, 13 Barrington Ave., Toronto, Ont.

F.39619 Sgt. M. A. Haughan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lunenburg, N.S.

M.15734 Sgt. D. H. Hicks, Canadian Infantry Corps, Edmonton, Alta.

F.45234 Sgt. J. W. Higgins, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ford St., Stellarton, N.S.

B.78737 Sgt. H. H. Jeffrey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11-3rd Ave., Weston, Ont.

L.27861 Sgt. A. K. Johnston, Canadian Infantry Corps, Mortlach, Sask.

G.64806 Sgt. A. G. Johnstone, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lower Newcastle, N.B.

B.55548 Sgt. G. P. Kelson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Orangeville, Ont.

H.45795 Sgt. W. Kinch, Canadian Infantry Corps, 683 Griffith St., Sudbury, Ont.

C.40904 Sgt. A. J. Kirkey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 701 Montreal Rd., Cornwall, Ont.

K.47706 Sgt. W. H. Laine, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1144 Ave. "K" South, Saskatoon, Sask.

E.4750 Sgt. R. Langlois, Canadian Infantry Corps, 809 Demontigny, Montreal, P.Q.

L.93614 Sgt. S. G. Larden, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1050 Oliver St., Victoria, B.C.

D.81924 Sgt. L. P., LeBlanc, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2171 Laurier E., Montreal, P.Q.

A.49707 Sgt.. E. H. Levitt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 246 Cameron St., Sarnia, Ont.

P.22339 Sgt. H. E. McDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 340 Machray Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

F.78585 Sgt. H. D. McLellan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Meat Cove, N.S.

H.42256 Sgt. O. G. Martin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 848 Sherborn St., Winnipeg, Man.

K.37067 Sgt. N. W. Massey, Canadian Infantry Corps, Almer Hotel, Vancouver, B.C.

B.55153 Sgt. B. D. Meek, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11328-65th St., Edmonton, Alta.

K.62188 Sgt. F. A. Menzies, Canadian Infantry Corps, 25 Haliberton St., Nanaimo, B.C.

C.5014 Sgt. W. E. Morris, Canadian Infantry Corps, Brancroft, Ont.

C.21413 Sgt. F. M. Mulvey, Canadian Infantry Corps, Metcalfe, Ont.

D.82773 Sgt. J. D. Nicholson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Beaupre, P.Q.

D.109567 Sgt. H. Nutik, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4908 Sherbrooke St. W., Westmount, P.Q.

D.51175 Sgt. M. O. Paquette, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10705 A Grande Allée ave., Montreal, P.Q.

L.27521 Sgt. A. H. Parker, Canadian Infantry Corps, Big River, Sask.

B.78574 Sgt. G. J. Pate, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4125 Dundas St., W., Lambton Mills, Ont.

F.55002 Sgt. J. W. Petite, Canadian Infantry Corps, Brook St., North Sydney, N.S.

D.167279 Sgt. G. R. E. Pilon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2124 Belanger St., Montreal, P.Q.

C.21525 Sgt. W. Prud'homme, Canadian Infantry Corps, 124 Royal Ave., Westboro, Ont.

B.51715 Sgt. E. J. Roberts, Canadian Infantry Corps, Church St., Oakville, Ont.

A.11858 Sgt. O. E. Rowland, Canadian Infantry Corps, Mitchell, Ont.

M.11658 Sgt. S. Sadler, Canadian Infantry Corps, Strathmore, Alta.

B.46378 Sgt. L. Sayer, Canadian Infantry Corps, 358 Fairfield Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

B.63582 Sgt. H. V. P. Schneider, Canadian Infantry Corps, Haileybury, Ont.

F54890 Sgt. J. Simms, Canadian Infantry Corps, 91 Water St., Glace Bay, N.S.

B.76260 Sgt. J. A. Stevenson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1334 Danforth Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C.40603 Sgt. A. C. Stickle, 1245 King St., Toronto, Ont.

C.38277 Sgt. J. Shymzyshym, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 6, Belleville, Ont.

H.45801 Sgt. J. V. Tapp, Canadian Infantry Corps, 35 Emmerson Ave., Port Arthur, Ont.

A.3351 Sgt. W. A. Tichbourne, 247 Briscoe St., London, Ont.

B.74770 Sgt. E. Waller, Canadian Infantry Corps, 59 John St., Oakville, Ont.

D.82401 Sgt. P. Woodcock, Canadian Infantry Corps, 438-6th Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

Mentions in Despatches

B.111044 L/Sgt. A. B. Bain, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 4, Caledonia, Ont.

B.20588 L/Sgt. L. C. Brant, Canadian Infantry Corps, 45 Bristol St., Hamilton, Ont.

C.578 L/Sgt. F. Dempsey, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lyn, Ont.

B.79639 L/Sgt. F. E. C. Dennis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 110 Jones Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.104072 L/Sgt. F. Evans, Canadian Infantry Corps, Edmonton, Alta.

B.137595 L/Sgt. D. R. Fairborn, Canadian Infantry Corps, 76 Alfred St., Brantford, Ont.

D.57740 L/Sgt. R. Gingras, Canadian Infantry Corps, 130 Briere St., St. Jerome, P.Q.

C.101602 L/Sgt. G. E. Newman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 26 Grange Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

C.21430 L/Sgt. J. S. Prime, Canadian Infantry Corps, Eganville, Ont.

L.1821 L/Sgt. N. Solly, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lloydminster, Sask.

B.78918 L/Sgt. M. C. Weir, Canadian Infantry Corps, 40 MacKay Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.114458 Cpl. (A/Sgt) Crain, Canadian Infantry Corps, 343 New St. Jean St., Orillia, Ont.

E.10226 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) I. Doiron, Canadian Infantry Corps, Shippegan, N.B.

H.20385 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. G. Duncan, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Vital, Man.

C.4325 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) F. D. Edwards, Canadian Infantry Corps, 172 Sackville St., Toronto, Ont.

H.46182 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) G. W. Hicks, Canadian Infantry Corps, Castlegar, B.C.

K.62175 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) G. H. Jackson, Canadian Infantry Corps, East Wellington, V.I., B.C.

B.137893 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) A. D. Jones, Canadian Infantry Corps, Eau Claire, Ont.

F.43579 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) F. W. B. Kelly, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bridgewater, N.S.

B.134359 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) A. D. Lepage, Canadian Infantry Corps, 974 Cumberland St., Hamilton, Ont.

F.45174 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) W. L. MacKay, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 4, River John, N.S.

A.106026 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) W. D. Nunn, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8 St. Andrew St., Galt, Ont.

D.77622 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) M. G. O'Brien, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2239 St. Antoine St., Montreal, P.Q.

D.72298 Cpl (A/Sgt.) J. A. Pietroniro, Canadian Infantry Corps, 6544 Marquette St., Montreal, P.Q.

L.12690 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) W. E. Shasaroski, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bienfait, Sask.

L.93686 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) D. Sinclair, Canadian Infantry Corps, Avonlea, Sask.

D.86187 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) T. S. Staszuk, Canadian Infantry Corps, 864 Hibernia Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

K.16307 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) R. H. Tutte, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 1, Sidney, V.I., B.C.

G.21086 Cpl. L. Charette, Canadian Infantry Corps, Edmundston East, N.B.

M.104609 Cpl. J. G. Cissell, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 1, Crossfield, Alta.

C.65485 Cpl. A. F. Coulas, Canadian Infantry Corps, Barry's Bay, Ont.

F.87139 Cpl. H. T. Craze, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kentville, N.S.

B.77368 Cpl. R. M. Deuchars, Canadian Infantry Corps, 32 Richard St., Toronto, Ont.

B.55413 Cpl. K. B. Edgar, Canadian Infantry Corps, 15 Air Base Rd., Botwood, Nfld.

L.106274 Cpl. H. B. French, Canadian Infantry Corps, Nipawin, Sask.

F.49675 Cpl. A. Glennie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Stewiacke, N.S.

H.16298 Cpl. J. G. Hamilton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 36 Ruby St., Winnipeg, Man.

B.17810 Cpl. W. R. Herbert, Canadian Infantry Corps, MacTier, Ont.

K.57151 Cpl. W. Knowles, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1385 Vista Heights, Victoria, B.C.

F.82481 Cpl. J. F. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 66 King St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

A.54668 Cpl. G. McDermid, Canadian Infantry Corps, 893 Langlois Ave., Windsor, Ont.

B.136356 Cpl. N. E. McKay, Canadian Infantry Corps, 46 Roncesvalles Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.74736 Cpl. R. J. McNalty, Canadian Infantry Corps, 755 Lansdowne Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.54908 Cpl. A. W. Marshall, Canadian Infantry Corps, 12 Brunel St., Huntsville, Ont.

H.204107 Cpl. A. J. Metner, Canadian Infantry Corps, Moosehorn, Man.

B.72878 Cpl. G. Outhwaite, Canadian Infantry Corps, 126 Christie St., Toronto, Ont.

F.89093 Cpl. J. L. Price, Canadian Infantry Corps, 587 Roost St., Glace Bay, N.S.

A.37821 Cpl. J. E. Quinn, Canadian Infantry Corps, Elora, Ont.

K.52258 Cpl. H. Rankin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3570 Hull St., Vancouver, B.C.

C.12477 Cpl. L. Rooney, Canadian Infantry Corps, 157 Nelson St., Ottawa, Ont.

F.59827 Cpl. S. W. Scully, Canadian Infantry Corps, Roseneath, P.E.I.

M.60703 Cpl. W. J. H. Sherring, Canadian Infantry Corps, Frank, Alta.

A.105044 Cpl. C. R. Sproule, Canadian Infantry Corps, 112 Delatre St., Woodstock, Ont.

B.79735 Cpl. H. W. Wesley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 236 Sherbrooke St., Montreal, P.Q.

B.68138 Cpl. A. C. White, Canadian Infantry Corps, 336 Lippincott St., Toronto, Ont.

C.20843 Cpl. A. W. White, Canadian Infantry Corps, 531 Lyon St., Ottawa, Ont.

K.47331 Cpl. T. A. Whitehead, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2547 Turner St., Vancouver, B.C.

K.42895 L/Cpl. S. Chance, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hutton Mills, B.C.

B.116528 L/Cpl. J. E. Fish, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 2, Freeman, Ont.

B.117997 L/Cpl. W. A. Gibson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Tehkummah, Manitoulin Island, Ont.

C.101309 L/Cpl. I. N. Gilchrist, Canadian Infantry Corps, Prescott, Ont.

F.22407 L/Cpl. A. Gledhill, Canadian Infantry Corps, New Waterford, N.S.

A.107530 L/Cpl. E. E. Hallman, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 2, Kitchener, Ont.

F.77954 L/Cpl. W. A. McKay, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ohio, N.S.

A.11870 L/Cpl. W. J. O'Donnell, Canadian Infantry Corps, R. R. No. 1, Rothsay, Ont.

D.57393 L/Cpl. M. Pelletier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2064 Notre Dame, Montreal, P.Q.

H.26500 L/Cpl. G. S. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, Virden, Man.

F.45527 L/Cpl. W. F. Saunders, Canadian Infantry Corps, Westville, N.S.

A.82290 L/Cpl. L. A. J. Schaefer, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1942 Aubin Rd., Windsor, Ont.

F.57009 L/Cpl. W. D. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oxford, N.S.

L.22331 L/Cpl. S. J. R. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Weyburn, Sask.

B.67438 Pte. (A/Cpl.) K. J. Chambers, Canadian Infantry Corps, 812 Dundas St., London, Ont.

A.82185 Pte. (A/Cpl.) C. H. Jolly, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dufferin Ave., Petrolia, Ont.

B.45104 Pte. (A/Cpl.) C. R. Kelly, Canadian Infantry Corps, 162 Melville St., Dundas, Ont.

D.106532 Pte. (A/Cpl.) C. Main, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1944 Springland Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B.74052 Pte. (A/Cpl.) L. Turnbull, Canadian Infantry Corps, 204 Dovercourt Rd., Toronto, Ont.

L.102765 Pte. (A/Cpl.) M. J. Undseth, Canadian Infantry Corps, Battrum, Sask.

B.55192 Pte. (A/Cpl.) W. O. Vallier, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cochrane, Ont.

K.54072 Pte. D. D. Archibald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 829 Powell St., Vancouver, B.C.

D.57879 Pte. E. Binette, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Eustache Rd., Montagnes, P.Q.

K.48022 Pte. C. I. Birdsall, Canadian Infantry Corps, 22275 West 14th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

A.59711 Pte. H. J. Blakey, Canadian Infantry Corps,, 536 Elizabeth St., London, Ont.

D.109687 Pte. L. P. Bourassa, Canadian Infantry Corps, 804 Rue Lejuine, Three Rivers, P.Q.

B.42103 Pte. C. H. Bowman, Canadian Infantry Corps, R. R. No. 2, Caledonia, Ont.

B.74665 Pte. L. R. Brooks, Canadian Infantry Corps, Port Credit, Ont.

C.100687 Pte. L. Buffam, Canadian Infantry Corps, Water St., Almonte, Ont.

G.6390 Pte. H. C. Butler, Canadian Infantry Corps, 108 Somerset St., Saint John, N.B.

B.116581 Pte. O. F. Cave, Canadian Infantry Corps, Liberty, Sask.

H.195649 Pte. W. Chisz, Canadian Infantry Corps, Broad Valley, Man.

C.65113 Pte C. Claringhold, Canadian Infantry Corps, 68 Boultbee Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C.21040 Pte. N. Cooper, Canadian Infantry Corps, 127 Gore St. E., Perth, Ont.

K.42308 Pte. A. F. D'Arcangelo, Canadian Infantry Corps, Revelstoke, B.C.

L.106593 Pte. A. G. Dennis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1023 Harwood St., Vancouver, B.C.

A.11412 Pte. C. Diebel, Canadian Infantry Corps, Allenford, Ont.

B.51676 Pte. A. Donaldson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oakville, Ont.

B.40368 Pte. G. Doyle, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kenilworth, Ont.

C.53892 Pte. W. A. Foley, Canadian Infantry Corps, R. R. No. 4, Athens, Ont.

D.57960 Pte. J. D. R. Garneau, Canadian Infantry Corps, Napierville, P.Q.

A.107365 Pte. F. W. Gehl, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2 Peppler Blvd, Kitchener, Ont.

B.51704 Pte. C. M. Gervais, Canadian Infantry Corps, East Mary St. Milton, Ont.

K.52774 Pte. W. W. Gorrill, Canadian Infantry Corps, Creston, B.C.

A.49624 Pte. R. M. Hall, Canadian Infantry Corps, 518 Central Ave., London, Ont.

B.135932 Pte. A. Harrison, Canadian Infantry Corps, 52 New St., Burlington, Ont.

K.128 Pte. R. Hillyard, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

B.135786 Pte. C. S. Hinrichs, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2¼ Sumach St., Toronto, Ont.

K.47463 Pte. K. A. Holt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 514-2nd St., New Westminster, B.C.

B.134816 Pte. F. F. Houghton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Park Ave., Havelock, Ont.

L.13430 Pte. G. Howard, Canadian Infantry Corps, Monton, Sask.

F.75954 Pte. S. Humeniuk, Canadian Infantry Corps, 19 Ferris St., Sydney, N.S.

A.106133 Pte. M. G. Hutcheson, Canadian Infantry Corps, R. R. No. 1, Beachville, Ont.

H.8296 Pte. F. L. Jansen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 48 Inman Ave., St. Vital, Man.

A.104420 Pte. C. G. Jones, Canadian Infantry Corps, R. R. No. 4, Bothwell, Ont.

A.109488 Pte. I. A. Jones, Canadian Infantry Corps, 38 Hibernia St., Stratford, Ont.

H.16969 Pte. L. V. Kidd, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1401 Palmer Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.

B.55171 Pte. P. J. R. King, Canadian Infantry Corps, 82 Gorman St., North Bay, Ont.

D.125071 Pte. A. Lacoursiere, Canadian Infantry Corps, 890 Des Carrieres St., Joliette, P.Q.

D.72194 Pte. A. Lang, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5119 St. Lawrence Blvd, Montreal, P.Q.

K.362 Pte. A. J. MacKay, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3255 West 2nd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

F.82376 Pte. A. B. C. MacPherson, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Mary's Rd., Glen William, P.E.I.

B.73983 Pte. J. Michaluk, Canadian Infantry Corps, R. R. No. 5, Gilbert Plains, Man.

C.53846 Pte. W. S. Miller, Canadian Infantry Corps, Brockville, Ont.

D.132967 Pte. W. H. Mitchell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2026 Melrose Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

F.60440 Pte. J. F. Mossey, Canadian Infantry Corps, Souris, P.E.I.

D.115507 Pte. W. T. O'Brien, Canadian Infantry Corps, 120 Empire Ave., Greenfield Park, P.Q.

G.64939 Pte. L. Pare, Canadian Infantry Corps, Mineval, N.B.

B.148354 Pte. C. H. Pierson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 64 McDonald Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

E.11170 Pte. A. Racine, Canadian Infantry Corps, 20 Rue Julien, Quebec, P.Q.

F.86589 Pte. H. V. Rawding, Canadian Infantry Corps, Northfield, N.S.

F.65190 Fus. A. W. Ring, Canadian Infantry Corps, 54 Park Ave., Dartmouth, N.S.

F.32491 Pte. A. J. Sampson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lower L'Ardoise, N.S.

K.65383 Fus. C. W. Simmons, Canadian Infantry Corps, Prince George, B.C.

A.114081 Pte. J. H. Sippel, Canadian Infantry Corps, R. R. No. 1, New Hamburg, Ont.

L.101963 Pte. J. A. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 844 Montague St., Regina, Sask.

L.106218 Pte. W. O. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, Melville, Sask.

M.16695 Pte. W. H. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, Browning, Sask.

D.71398 Pte. J. H. Stevens, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kingsbury, P.Q.

B.75824 Pte. E. W. Strong, Canadian Infantry Corps, 70 Dufferin Rd., Ottawa, Ont.

B.63647 Rfn. G. C. Sutherland, Canadian Infantry Corps, 106 Macpherson Ave., Toronto, Ont.

G.50234 Pte. F. R. Tait, Canadian Infantry Corps, 80 Eastbourne Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

A.102185 Pte. W. J. Taylor, Canadian Infantry Corps, 171 Bridge Ave., Windsor, Ont.

A.4076 Pte. F. G. Valiquette, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8360 Casgrain Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B.101538 Pte. P. Vitale, Canadian Infantry Corps, 361 Pacific Ave., Toronto, Ont.

G.23550 Pte. E. J. Votour, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chatham Head, N.B.

M.16481 Pte. T. Waitt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 115 Pine St., Nanaimo, B.C.

M.30911 Pte R. S. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Peace River, Alta.

F.35075 Pte. H. P. Winters, Canadian Infantry Corps, Albro Lake Rd., Dartmouth, N.S.

H/Lt.-Col. G. L. Cherrier, *OBE,* Canadian Chaplain Services, 17 Crestview Rd., Toronto, Ont.

H/Maj. (A/H/Lt.-Col.) J. I. McKinney, Canadian Chaplain Services, Winnipeg, Man.

H/Maj. S. E. Higgs, Canadian Chaplain Services, 1612 E-18th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

H/Maj. J. M. Malone, Canadian Chaplain Services, 9862 - 87th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

H/Capt. J. F. P. Gagnon, Canadian Chaplain Services, 4450 Rue St. Hubert, Montreal, P.Q.

H/Capt. C. H. MacLean, Canadian Chaplain Services, Oxford, N.S.

H/Capt. F. C. McRitchie, Canadian Chaplain Services, 578 Indian Rd., Toronto, Ont.

H/Capt. J. M. Mongeon, Canadian Chaplain Services, St. Joseph Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.

H/Capt. A. R. Perkins, Canadian Chaplain Services, 24 Newton St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

H/Capt. H. G. Walker, Canadian Chaplain Services, 33 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Man.

Lt.-Col. D. Douglas, *OBE*, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4870 Cote Des Neiges Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. G. D. Ross-Smith, *OBE*, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 87 London St., Peterborough, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) W. A. Lucas, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 31 Sparkhall Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. F. T. Adams, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 3545 Decarie Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. A. E. H. Basing, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. A. H. Bolton, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 305 Grande Allee, Quebec, P.Q.

Maj. N. R. V. Faiers, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 510 Greenwood Place, Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. A. Gagnon, *MBE*, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 55 Scott St., Quebec, P.Q.

Maj. E. Housley, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2560 Windsor Rd., Victoria, B.C.

Maj. E. L. MacKay, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1126 W-11th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Maj. D. Morwood, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. M. Turner, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps 355 C. Elgin St., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. G. Walker, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 166 Brock St., Peterborough, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. C. Conochie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 34 John St., Galt, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. H. De Veber, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 15 Whitney Ave., Sydney, N.S.

Capt. (A/Maj.) G. E. Eagle, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 74 Victoria Ave., N., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) C. M. Longbotham, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 989 St. Clarens Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. K. S. Manuel, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 504 St. James St., London, Ont.

Capt. W. O. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Silton, Sask.

Capt. J. A. Bailey, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2401 Queen St. E., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. G. W. C. Baker, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Yarmouth, N.S.

Capt. P. E. Bergeron, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2007 Mansfield St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. W. C. Bower, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 173 Florence St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. D. A. Brennan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 61 Fairmont Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. T. C. Bricker, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1 St. Georges Place, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. H. B. Brodie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 213 Paling Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt W. Brown, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 7 Quay Ave., St. Vital, Man.

Capt. J. A. Cameron, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 65 Westgate St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. A. K. Campbell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 21 Edgemount S., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. M. C. Carter, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 430 Ontario St., London, Ont.

Capt. J. D. W. Clarke, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 90 Park Rd., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. F. E. Cochran, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 37 Duggan Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. H. Corrigan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 11 Harper Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. K. Davidson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 10033 108 St., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. A. E. Eagles, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1185 Main St., Moncton, N.B.

Capt. A. W. Edwards, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Stettler, Alta.

Capt. J. E. Forbes, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 325 Tower Rd., Halifax, N.S.

Capt. D. W. Francis, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Britannia, Ont.

Capt. H. H. Gomery, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 203 Victoria St., Kingston, Ont.

Capt. R. A. Hallonquist, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Hargrave St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. W. T. Hunter, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 6408 Marine Dr., Horseshoe Bay, B.C.

Capt. I. L. Jennings, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 47 Poplar Plains Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. G. J. Johanson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1070 Lajore Ave., Outremount, P.Q.

Capt. R. B. Johnston, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Danville, P.Q.

Capt. F. Leaman, *MBE*, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Westmount, P.Q.

Capt. A. V. Loftus, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 21 Eva Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. B. S. McElhiney, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 17 Inglewood Pl., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. W. E. McKinney, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 3101 Yew St., Victoria, B.C.

Capt. R. Mennie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 85 Lakeshore Dr., Pointe Claire, P.Q.

Capt. E. J. Moran, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 15 Waverley St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. G. S. Peppin, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 3019-6 St. W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. P. M. Peterson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Lloydminster, Sask.

Capt. L. S. Pommet, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 14 Joly St., Riviere Du Loup, P.Q.

Capt. J. E. Priest, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Pictou, N.S.

Capt. K. G. Rose, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 115 Sherbrooke St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. R. W. Scott, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 113 Charlton Ave., W., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. W. S. Treasure, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 48 Noble Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. M. I. Walton, *MBE*, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 821-18th Ave., N.W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. J. G. West, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 278 Indian Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. H. Wyand, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 639 Foul Bay Rd., Victoria, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) S. G. K. Ault, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1034 High Park Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. W. Barrett, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Grand Valley, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. H. Brais, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Kingston, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) C. S. Brodie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 100 College Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) D. H. Fillmore, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 60 Craig St., London, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) K. Mawson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 24 Wychwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) F. S. Westwood, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Rapid City, Man.

Lieut. E. E. Aus The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 17 Butternut Terrace, Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. P. W. Dunne, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 633 St. Clair Ave., W., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. J. K. Frizzell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2758 Brantford Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

Lieut. L. L. Gregoire, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Boutmont, P.Q.

Lieut. R. M. Hamilton, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 599 Homewood Ave., Peterborough, Ont.

Lieut. N. Lafrance, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 669 King Edward Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. D. R. Leacock, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 107 Grant Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Lieut. W. M. Markham, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4015 Hampton Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. W. F. Pickersgill, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Calgary, Alta.

Lieut. D. W. Slater, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 253 Overdale St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. J. R. Watson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 64 Duchess Ave., London, Ont.

B.51522 WO I (RSM) J. H. Alger, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 230 Langley Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.20917 WO I (Mech SM) L. Hansen, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 325-3rd Ave. W., Drumheller, Alta.

H.51896 WO I (Mech SM) M. Rolfe, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1372 Elm Ave., Windsor, Ont.

B.84410 WO II (CSM) R. Binns, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 20 Ellen Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.70290 WO II (Mech QMS) R. C. Browning, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Langley Prairie, B.C.

B.22124 WO II (CSM) H. Hang, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 563 University Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D.24138 WO II (CSM) W. Mimee, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2572 Dandurand St., Montreal, P.Q.

B.98369 WO II (CSM) O. Read, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Homestead Ave., West Hill, Ont.

B.4485 WO II (QMS) W. J. G. St. Clair, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 145 Dunlop St., Barrie, Ont.

C.30124 WO II (CSM) H. G. Stotts, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 84 Ossington Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

G.42606 WO II (CSM) R. M. Watson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 64 City Rd., Saint John, N.B.

H.65191 Mech S/Sgt. (A/WO I, Mech SM) F. Sheir, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 60 Broadway Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

L.8197 Mech S/Sgt. D. I. Bailey, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Alida, Sask.

H.2272 CQMS S. Callaghan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Transcona, Man.

P.27936 Mech S/Sgt. R. Dallaire, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 36 Artillerie St., Quebec, P.Q.

L.782(CQMS H. L. Evans, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Port Dover, Ont.

A.9294 S/Sgt. D. J. Jackson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 7, Guelph, Ont.

M.36515 Mech S/Sgt. S. J. Jones, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Camrose, Alta.

D.115377 S/Sgt. J. F. Leckman, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2536 Montgomery St., Montreal, P.Q.

C.12546 S/Sgt. J. R. Long, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 627 Chapel St., Ottawa, Ont.

P.28139 S/Sgt. J. R. Mahoney, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 257 Concession Ave., Kingston, Ont.

B.88654 CQMS T. J. Miller, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 77 Massey St., Toronto, Ont.

B.86475 S/Sgt. P. E. Peters, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 233 East 8th St., Hamilton, Ont.

M.55906 Mech S/Sgt. S. G. Robbins, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Red Deer, Alta.

B.24005 S/Sgt. A. W. Slade, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 25 Adelaide St., Toronto, Ont.

B.83444 CQMS J. J. R. Stringer, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Eganville, Ont.

D.91490 S/Sgt. S. Tedlie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 3578A Peel St., Montreal, P.Q.

H.65153 CQMS R. Torrans, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 140 Jane St., Toronto, Ont.

B.3538 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) R. G. Rider, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 496 Brunswick Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C.11317 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) K. A. Paynter, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 33 Fourth Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

B. 83073 Sgt. (A/Mech S/Sgt.) L. E. Raby, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 11 Willow St., Merritton, Ont.

K.25584 Sgt. G. R. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Port Alberni, B.C.

83166—380

C.30038 Sgt. J. A. Bryan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 604 Somerset St. W., Ottawa, Ont.

M.11133 Sgt. G. S. Coen, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 1, Kye Bay, Comox, B.C.

H.37488 Sgt. J. Conway, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps 262 Commercial Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

K.76081 Sgt. E. G. Cronk, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Port Alberni, B.C.

M.59210 Sgt. C. E. Dobson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Aldersyde, Alta.

M.55474 Sgt. V. Erickson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1102 Bellevue Ave., Calgary, Alta.

P.3189 Sgt. J. L. Evans, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 615 College Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

H.37855 Sgt. A. C. Fraser, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 153 Skinner St. Nanaimo, B.C.

K.52174 Sgt. G. W. Furlong, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

F.67778 Sgt. H. C. Hurry, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 2, Milton, P.E.I.

B.41392 Sgt. R. Jones, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 50 Holmes Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

D.123226 Sgt. R. LeCavalier, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4289 Brebeuf St., Montreal, P.Q.

F.91697 Sgt. C. E. P. MacAulay, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Pictou, N.S.

H.3955 Sgt. J. C. McAree, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 85 Evanson St., Winnipeg, Man.

M.20758 Sgt. W. C. Margach, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 211-15th Ave. N.E., Calgary, Alta.

B.80313 Sgt. J. Marshall, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 229 Vaughan Rd., Toronto, Ont.

L.7326 Sgt. C. L. Menzies, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Ogema, Sask.

L.7329 Sgt. R. A. Morrison, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Regina, Sask.

H.65373 Sgt. H. Omansky, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 408 Boyd Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

B.90949 Sgt. J. A. Reid, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 1, Todmorden Oriole, Ont.

A.47521 Sgt. K. R. Rollo, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 246 Ottawa St. S., Kitchener, Ont.

D.91478 Sgt. W. A. Rose, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 18 Maple St., Ville St. Pierre, P.Q.

H.52119 Sgt. D. L. Sanderson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Minnedosa, Man.

M.40588 Sgt. H. T. Saunders, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1020 Eighth Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

A.63207 Sgt. S. J. Stevens, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Petrolia, Ont.

B.82602 Sgt. C. Swan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Thornhill, Ont.

P.1703 Sgt. J. C. Thomas, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 67 Allan Ave., Guelph, Ont.

K.75652 Sgt. J. V. Valentine, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 321 East Columbia St., New Westminster, B.C.

L.7525 Sgt. W. J. Walker, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Esterhazy, Sask.

L.74012 Sgt. J. H. Watts, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Borden, Sask.

H.37887 Sgt. J. E. Westbrook, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 589 William Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

A.57766 Sgt. W. A. Wigle, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 77 Talbot St. E., Leamington, Ont.

K.79043 Sgt. W. R. Williamson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 526 Joffre St., Victoria, B.C.

C.30309 Sgt. M. Winer, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 404 Laurier Ave., Ottawa,, Ont.

F.91012 Sgt. M. E. Young, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Kentville, N.S.

L.7606 L/Sgt. A. Koropatniski, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Sheho, Sask.

F.79053 L/Sgt. R. D. Simpson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Middleton, N.S.

H.11155 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) H. G. Mayotte, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Stanley, Ont.

L.64369 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) S. G. W. Read, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Sturgeon River, Sask.

D.127041 Cpl. S. Brownstein, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 5656 Clarke St., Montreal, P.Q.

K.78890 Cpl. F. J. Bryant, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 169 East 19th Ave, Vancouver, B. C.

K.65352 Cpl. A. Coldham, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Peachland, B.C.

A.57823 Cpl. R. G. Easter, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 11 Grant St., Chatham, Ont.

F.49974 Cpl. J. H. Eaton, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Springhill, N.S.

H.37231 Cpl. H. A. Elliott, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1517 E 2nd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

A.9475 Cpl. T. F. Ellis, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 83 Lansdowne Ave., Chatham, Ont.

B.92299 Cpl. W. E. Fryer, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 383 Gerrard St. E., Toronto, Ont.

B.85804 Cpl. W. Gill, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 508½ Bay St., North, Hamilton, Ont.

A.29376 Cpl. C. M. Houston, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 1, Perkinsfield, Ont.

A.61143 Cpl. S. H. Kennedy, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Clinton, Ont.

C.101560 Cpl. M. H. Leitch, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 227 Elgin St., Arnprior, Ont.

K.78894 Cpl. R. McGaw, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 329 Douglas St., Victoria, B.C.

B.86556 Cpl. J. McGurrin, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 29 Bennett St., Brockville, Ont.

K.66464 Cpl. G. Peters, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Fernie, B.C.

A.115559 Cpl. R. B. Shaw, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 133 Elizabeth St., Chatham, Ont.

B.89550 Cpl. J. F. Simon, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 242 Wellington, St., Brantford, Ont.

B.80536 Cpl. H. T. Smart, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 506 Merton St., Toronto, Ont.

B.56080 Cpl. N. R. Somerville, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 122 Woodington Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.52136 Cpl. N. C. Thorsteinson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Hanausa, Man.

B.51575 Cpl. J. D. Young, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Acton, Ont.

B.108653 L/Cpl. E. W. Cheal, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 11 Hanley St., Toronto, Ont.

H.65300 L/Cpl. S. Chrupalo, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Winnipegosis, Man.

K.79080 L/Cpl. R. W. Clark, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Morden, Man.

D.105572 L/Cpl. W. J. Collins, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 63 Rochester St., Ottawa, Ont.

L.64589 L/Cpl. P. Dyck, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Vanguard, Sask.

E.14426 L/Cpl. N. Ferland, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 2, Ste. Marie, P.Q.

B.80630 L/Cpl. W. Harris, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Long Branch, Ont.

B.43788 L/Cpl. C. W. Lambken, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 1, Tara, Ont.

K.70766 L/Cpl. J. A. Mathews, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 116-45th Ave. S.E., Calgary, Alta.

A.63151 L/Cpl. H. F. Montgomery, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 39 James St., Brantford, Ont.

L.7824 L/Cpl. W. F. Novosel, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 11526-83 St., Edmonton, Alta.

M.36710 L/Cpl. A. Sage, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 3415 Elbow Dr., Calgary, Alta.

K.51349 L/Cpl. B. L. Silbernagel, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 6287 MacDonald St., Vancouver, B.C.

C.92241 Pte. (A./Sgt.) G. W. Lake, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 50 Rusholme Rd., Toronto, Ont.

L.41052 Pte. (A/Cpl.) R. Fern, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Semans, Sask.

H.45914 Pte. (A/Cpl.) N. LeClaire, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Fort William, Ont.

H.65010 Pte. (A/Cpl.) E. Meyers, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 432 Galloway St., Winnipeg, Man.

H.20320 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. G. Pabke, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 757 St. Cyrille St., Quebec, P.Q.

B.92031 Pte. (A/Cpl.) G. Paquette, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1084 Cartier St., Montreal, P.Q.

H.195399 Pte. (A/Cpl.) D. F. Paxson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 518 Red River Rd., Port Arthur, Ont.

C.267 Pte. (A/Cpl.) A. H. V. Perfect, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 25 Rusholme Rd., Toronto, Ont.

B.86444 Pte. (A/Cpl.) F. O. Rogers, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 37-East 32nd St., Hamilton, Ont.

L.7239 Pte. (A/Cpl.) A. C. Sheppard, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Bassano, Alta.

B.84532 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. S. Terescsik, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Canboro Rd., Fonthill, Ont.

C.12104 Pte. (A/Cpl.) H. J. Wittenberg, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 53 Sussex St., Ottawa, Ont.

L.54602 Pte. G. A. Aikman, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Moose Range, Sask.

A.61014 Pte. L. E. Arnold, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 3, Wiarton, Ont.

B.85161 Pte. E. R. Baker, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 64 Malvern Ave., Toronto, Ont.

E.15225 Pte. J. A. L. L. Belanger, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 518 Rue St. Francois, Quebec, P.Q.

A.116883 Pte. W. J. Bentley, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Blenheim, Ont.

B.139267 Pte. J. H. Branch, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 409 Dupont St., Toronto, Ont.

B.118379 Pte. C. W. Butson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Port Perry, Ont.

C.34863 Pte. A. Carriere, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 2, Dalkeith, Ont.

D.106645 Pte. E. F. Carroll, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4351 Verdun Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

M.55992 Pte. D. C. Cavanagh, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Evansburgh, Alta.

B.88098 Pte. B. C. Chapman, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Porcupine, Ont.

B.86966 Pte. C. E. Dunn, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 250 Benson Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.55899 Pte. L. G. Edwards, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Ceylon, Ont.

B.87469 Pte. H. D. Feagan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 1, Goderich, Ont.

B.85618 Pte. A. N. Finlayson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Plummer Twp. and P.O., Ont.

K.37426 Pte. J. Furness, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

H.38976 Pte. F. P. Genest, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 373 Desautels St., St. Boniface, Man.

B.15115 Pte. H. G. Gillingham, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 24 Elm St., Merritton, Ont.

B.80103 Pte. M. W. Goslet, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 132 Chester Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.80498 Pte. W. J. Gray, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 271 Bain Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.52205 Pte. E. Grieg, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 276 Aubrey St., Winnipeg, Man.

B.85213 Pte. K. E. Herrington, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 1, Belleville, Ont.

G.52661 Pte. R. D. Holmes, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Elm Hill, N.B.

L.8333 Pte. H. F. Hundt, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Sidewood, Sask.

D.123529 Pte. W. E. Kellett, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 163-4th Ave., Wille St. Pierre, P.Q.

D.127869 Pte. W. King, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 264-6th Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

K.70145 Pte R. C. Lolk, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

M.58506 Pte. A. A. Lovell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Calgary, Alta.

G.32505 Pte. W. E. Lucy, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Sherrington, P.Q.

H.37913 Pte. G. Ludwig, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 271 Pritchard Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

F.78377 Pte. A. McIntosh, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Bridgeport, N.S.

M.63148 Pte. B. A. McLeod, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1014-19th Ave. N.W., Calgary, Alta.

B.85911 Pte. J. A. P. Maguire, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 89 Park St. N., Hamilton, Ont.

D.76397 Pte. W. J. Martin, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.

H.65382 Pte. H. Meldrum, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Deloraine, Man.

B.116558 Pte. P. Meleschuk, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 90 Grange Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.78829 Pte. G. G. Merrick, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1250 Newport Ave., Victoria, B.C.

B.98382 Pte. R. K. Montgomery, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 81 Gordon St., Brantford, Ont.

M.55688 Pte. R. A. Moore, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Fort Saskatchewan, Alta.

B.40581 Pte. W. F. Nicholls, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 118 Alameda Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.20773 Pte. J. Oneski, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 607-12th Ave. E., Calgary, Alta.

K.70400 Pte. D. H. Padley, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 156 West 6th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

B.80703 Pte. W. C. J. Paine, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 107 Edgewood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

A.58216 Pte. D. L. Parker, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 197 Dundas St., Galt, Ont.

B.37760 Pte. C. M. Petrie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 23½ Kenilworth Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

L.12691 Pte. W. J. Pickard, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Bienfait, Sask.

B.57267 Pte. J. E. Pickles, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 101 Inchbury St., Hamilton, Ont.

L.4113 Pte. R. J. Reynolds, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Preeceville, Sask.

M.50827 Pte. R. A. Richardson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Burmis, Alta.

K.70983 Pte. A. Schrawen, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Kamloops, B.C.

E.14044 Pte. L. Simard, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 34 Rue St. Amable, Quebec, P.Q.

F.31046 Pte. F. J. Skerry, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 25 Davison St., Halifax, N.S.

K.40918 Pte. L. G. Smith, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 849-26th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

C.52251 Pte. W. C. Stansel, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Mille Roches, Ont.

A.58508 Pte. R. Sullivan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 65 Gunn St., London, Ont.

H.87361 Pte. E. W. West, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Gilbert Plains, Man.

Lt-Col. J. M. Spence, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1185 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) F. S. Brien, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 806 Ouellette Ave., Windsor, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) W. M. Couper, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 4950 Coronet Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. H. W. Fish, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 10328-123 St., Edmonton, Alta.

Maj. E. W. Flahiff, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 98 Princefield Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. S. Hanson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1301 Cabot St., Calgary, Alta.

Maj. E. A. Lovell, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 179 Simcoe St. S., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. A. B. Sinclair, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 12 Brubacher St., Kitchener, Ont.

Maj. E. G. Spooner, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 11224-99th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Maj. C. R. Trask, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Yarmouth North, N.S.

Maj. K. J. R. Wightman, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 210 Geraldine Ave., Peterborough, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. Cowan, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Princeton, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. M. Taylor, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 15 Pine Cres., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. B. Benson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 126 Walton St., Port Hope, Ont.

Capt. R. F. Boettger, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 32 Essex St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. B. L. P. Brosseau, *MC*, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1469 Drummond St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. B. W. Casselman, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 162 Church St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

Capt. J. N. Cunningham, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 307 Rushton Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. T. Dalrymple, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2092 W. 42nd St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. R. E. Fisher, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1020 Pentrelew Place, Victoria, B.C.

Capt. J. H. S. Geggie, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 577 Roslyn Ave., Westmount, P. Q.

Capt. J. Greenblatt, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 233 Stewart St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. J. E. Howes, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1128 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. S. Kling, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Swift Current, Sask.

Capt. G. B. McCall, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 248 Briscoe St., London, Ont.

Capt. J. S. S. Martin, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3 Montcalm Place, Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. S. M. Medine, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2076 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. J. K. Morrison, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Morris St., Halifax, N.S.

Capt. R. D. Oatway, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Dominion City, Man.

Capt. J. E. G. Soucie, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Church St., Moonbeam, Ont.

Capt. J. B. Tindall, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 5 Lowrey Ave. N., Galt, Ont.

Lieut. D. P. Melville, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, King St. W., Cobourg, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) L. C. Allen, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 78 O'Connor St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) P. G. Beamish, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Saanichton, B.C.

Lt. (N/S) M. S. Bell, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 218 Balliol St., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) D. M. Boddy, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 40 Quebec St., Oshawa, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) M. E. Bray, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 270 Logan St., St. Lambert, P.Q.

Lt. (N/S) C. M. Brown, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 12525-104th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Lt. (N/S) M. C. Brown, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Lacombe, Alta.

Lt. (N/S) M. Burton, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 930 Chico St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt. (N/S) C. S. Clark, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Kamloops, B.C.

Lt. (N/S) E. Cleland, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) M. E. Coutts, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 35 Thurston Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) E. L. Covert, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 55 Duncannon Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) E. M. Cunningham, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 233 Wolseley St., Port Arthur, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) F. L. Ferguson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, R.R. No. 3, Victoria, B.C.

Lt. (N/S) C. Golightly, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, High River, Alta.

Lt. (N/S) L. J. Harding, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 10 Francis St., Lindsay, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) M. Harris, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 114 Chudleigh Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) S. A. Horning, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Binscarth, Man.

Lt. (N/S) M. E. Jerrom, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 17 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Man.

Lt. (N/S) L. M. Larkin, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 188 Douglas Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) G. Layman, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Fogo, Nfld.

Lt. (N/S) A. W. Lindsay, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Notre Dame du Sacre Coeur, P.Q.

Lt. (N/S) M. A. MacKay, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Wawota, Sask.

Lt. (Diet) G. M. McCurdy, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1030 Wellington Cres., Winnipeg, Man.

Lt. (Diet.) A. P. McGuigan, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Head of Wellesley Pl., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) M. H. McPherson, the Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Arnprior, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) A. Meadows, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1703-6th Ave., N.W., Calgary, Alta.

Lt. (N/S) I. A. Metzler, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 967 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) G. M. Meyer, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Morrisburg, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) C. M. Morris, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 383 Homewood Ave., Peterborough, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) A. R. Mowatt, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Harvey, N.B.

Lt. (N/S.) M. J. O'Toole, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Louisburg, Cape Breton, N.S.

Lt. (N/S) M. E. Robinson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Vernon, B.C.

Lt. (N/S) G. J. Roy, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Bainsville, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) A. Schraefel, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Kerrobert, Sask.

Lt. (N/S) H. I. Sutcliffe, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Weyburn, Sask.

Lt. (N/S) E. B. C. Tilyard, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 149 Rose Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. (N/S) R. M. Wilkinson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 11 James St., Barrie, Ont.

2/Lt. (H/S) A. A. C. Baines, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1107 Newport Ave., Victoria, B.C.

2/Lt. (H/S) P. Vallee, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 22 Rue Ste. Anne, Quebec, P.Q.

G.47206 WO I (RSM) O. D. Dole, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Sussex, N.B.

A.27005 WO I (RSM) E. C. M. McKeough, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 22 Neeve St., Guelph, Ont.

P.30332 WO I (RSM) R. M. McLuckie, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 177 Donlands Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.21069 WO II (QMS) A. E. Collett, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1345 Forget St., Regina, Sask.

B.95283 WO II (QMS) D. Harrison, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 113 Gledhill Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C.93015 WO II (QMS) D. D. Perkins, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 100 Flora St., Ottawa, Ont.

G.44915 S/Sgt. A. V. Bleakney, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Salisbury, N.B.

K.80528 S/Sgt. H. A. Bosher, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3228 Albion St., Victoria, B.C.

K.89506 S/Sgt. J. V. Harbord-Harbord, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1946 Mayfair Dr., Victoria, B.C.

B.93221 S/Sgt. J. P. Mardall, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 15 Penrose Rd., Toronto, Ont.

E.15148 S/Sgt. M. Paquet, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 11 Dablond St., Quebec, P.Q.

B.72213 Sgt. H. A. Giallonardo, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 5 Main Ave., Timmins, Ont.

G.44948 Sgt. C. D. Henderson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 198 Princess St., Saint John, N.B.

B.91926 Sgt. G. K. Ingram, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 39 Dala Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D.94504 Sgt. R. D. Isaac, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

B.93205 Sgt. W. H. Moores, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 82 Birch Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.91400 Sgt. F. E. Pink, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Henry Street, Meaford, Ont.

A.103722 Sgt. E. G. Taylor, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Belmont, Ont.

B.90766 Sgt. R. M. Weir, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 33 Adams Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.93299 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) N. A. Wice, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 122 Rears Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.93235 Cpl. G. W. Devitt, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 231 Front St., Orillia, Ont.

A.17055 Cpl. R. Goldsmith, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 306 Christina St. S., Sarnia, Ont.

M.25624 Cpl. W. Kosakewich, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Thorhild, Alta.

M.102302 Cpl. J. K. Lowther, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 533-7th St. S., Lethbridge, Alta.

B.72221 Cpl. R. C. Murdoch, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 36 South Bonnington Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.60054 Cpl. W. H. Seaman, The Royal Canadian Medical Corps,10429-98th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

C.100180 Cpl. T. W. Sholea, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 53 Wurtington Cres., Sudbury, Ont.

B.95922 L/Cpl. E. Dillane, The Royal Canadian Medical Corps, Schomberg, Ont.

F.67732 L/Cpl. K. Morton, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, East Stewiacke, N.S.

B.107542 Pte. (A/Sgt.) D. D. Watson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2345 Lundy's Lane, Niagara Falls, Ont.

L.41026 Pte. J. M. Beattie, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Saskatoon Sask.

G.2696 Pte. S. Bourque, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Scoudouc, N.B.

E.108549 Pte. B. Cabot, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 296 de la Salle St., Quebec, P.Q.

H.3643 Pte. J. R. Davis, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 51 Vernon St., Halifax, N.S.

A.102323 Pte. G. F. G. Duffield, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Harrow, Ont.

A.99371 Pte. S. G. Fink, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 261 Hill St., London, Ont.

K.66167 Pte. R. M. Irving, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3207 Adanac St., Vancouver, B.C.

G.18124 Pte. H. F. Kierstead, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Lower Penniac, N.B.

C.29846 Pte. E. C. St. Jean, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 945 Wellington St., Ottawa, Ont.

A.42083 Pte. S. J. Stratton, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 92 Grand River St., Paris, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) H. R. Ferris, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 158 James St., Saint John, N.B.

Capt. (A/Maj.) A. S. Findlater, *BEM*, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 727-12th Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. (A/Maj.) S. Pollock, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Kinistino, Sask.

Capt. A. H. Clark, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 206 Millwood Rd. ,Toronto, Ont.

Capt. A. A. Eckardt, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 200 Roselawn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. A. Hawreliak, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Daysland, Alta.

Capt. C. R. Jones, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Saint John, N.B.

Capt. W. C. Maxwell, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 904 Jubilee Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. M. W. Nedved, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 760 William St., London, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) H. Browning, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 59 Pinehurst Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. Ralph, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 2950 Orillia St., Victoria, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) C. G. Smith, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 1986 W. 12th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. G. S. Blake, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, R.R. No. 2, Ida, Ont.

Lieut. A. W. Dervin, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 249 Fifth Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

P.35283 WO I (Sub-Condr) H. G. Chapman, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 183 Holland Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

B.49373 WO I (Sub-Condr) T. C. Clark, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 119 Donlea Dr., Toronto, Ont.

B.58445 WO I (Condr) M. R. Dickey, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 110 Erskine Ave., Toronto, Ont.

U.1533 WO I (Sub-Condr) K. C. Hill, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 11 Ordnance Depot ,Vancouver, B.C.

P.34942 WO I (Sub-Condr) A. N. G. Scott, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 65½ Artillery St., Quebec, P.Q.

C.30423 WO II (C.S.M.) (A/WO I, Sub-Condr) B. C. T. Elliott, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Shawville, P.Q.

H.16991 WO II (S.Q.M.S.) D. Bowman, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 804 Simcoe St., Winnipeg, Man.

D.128951 WO II (S.Q.M.S.) F. A. Brenton, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 1250 St. Matthew St., Montreal, P.Q.

M.28886 WO II (S.Q.M.S.) K. G. Kempf, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Delia, Alta.

G.3423 WO II (Q.M.S.) N. A. Higgins, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, R.R. No. 2, Lower Southampton, N.B.

H.2524 WO II (C.S.M.) E. G. Lord, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 496 Victor St., Winnipeg, Man.

C.15829 WO II (C.S.M.) W. O. Weeks, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 64 Coady Ave, Toronto, Ont.

H.2636 S/Sgt. J. D. McNay, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 101-6th Ave., E. N., Saskatoon, Sask.

H.3822 Sgt. W. Ascott, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

C.696 Sgt. C. J. Baker, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 111 Jean St., Sudbury, Ont.

C.42278 Sgt. H. K. Bulpit, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 30 Metcalfe, St., Trenton, Ont.

A.29594 Sgt. H. J. Dietz, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 217 Lancaster St. E., Kitchener, Ont.

D.11006 Sgt. W. V. Doe, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 174 Dennison, Granby, P.Q.

D.129495 Sgt. D. H. Fadden, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Sutton, P.Q.

K.45765 Sgt. L. N. Fowler, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 1001 West 8th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

C.15561 Sgt. L. H. Ginn, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 201 Booth St., Ottawa, Ont.

C.10518 Sgt. D. S. Mercer, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Osgoode, Ont.

B.79517 Sgt. G. Metcalfe, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 70-31st St., Long Branch, Ont.

F.78091 Sgt. J. L. Rushton, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Amherst, N.S.

D.166210 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) F. Bacal, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 714A Bloomfield Ave., Outremont, P.Q.

H.95736 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) C. F. Gordon, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Selkirk, Man.

C.100337 Cpl. O. D. Davis, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, R.R. No. 1, Lakefield, Ont.

A.56764 Cpl. J. H. F. Gellatly, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 40 Fairview Ave., Kitchener, Ont.

B.110828 Cpl. W. C. Ingram, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Maple, Ont.

L.67060 Cpl. M. A. Lewis, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Lanigan, Sask.

D.116629 L/Cpl. L. G. Angles, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 314 Barton St. W., Hamilton, Ont.

M.56473 L/Cpl. A. P. Cook, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Didsbury, Alta.

H.36481 L/Cpl. A. C. Cross, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Molson, Man.

D.11067 L/Cpl. J. A. Cuthbertson, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 25 St. Patrick St., Farnham, P.Q.

M.53238 L/Cpl. E. E. Eckman, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 110 Aberdeen St., Medicine Hat, Alta.

H.95673 L/Cpl. N. A. Gauvreau, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 319 Notre Dame St., St. Boniface, Man.

K.90022 L/Cpl. B. F. Hickman, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 1530 Bank St., Victoria, B.C.

L.27228 L/Cpl. H. J. Nicholson, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 1342 Edward St., North Battleford, Sask.

H.64894 L/Cpl. D. A. Phillips, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, St. Mary's Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

C.42224 Pte. (A/Cpl.) Cooper, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 31 Cockburn St., Perth, Ont.

A.55033 Pte. C. A. Gilbert, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 980 Campbell Ave., Windsor, Ont.

L.9767 Pte. R. E. Gillanders, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Melfort, Sask.

F.57548 Pte. T. A. Isenor, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Lantz Siding, N.S.

C.15599 Pte. H. H. Reaume, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 121 Lees Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

C.42807 Pte. W. C. Wetherall, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Carrying Place, Ont.

Lt-Col. L. D. McGee, *MBE*, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 3 Fenwick Ave., Montreal West, P.Q.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) J. R. Dunlop, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 57 First Ave., Ottawa.

Maj. G. Barclay, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 2981 Foul Bay Rd., Victoria. B.C.

Maj. G. A. Blackburn, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Aylesford, N.S.

Maj. W. G. Cooke, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 298 Oxford St., Halifax, N.S.

Maj. J. M. Harding, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 451 Blythwood Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. J. J. de C. Legate, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Westmount, P.Q.

Maj. J. A. McTavish, *MBE*, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 35 Braemore Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. J. A. Stewart, *OBE*, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 2 Spadina Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) M. F. Carriere, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 299 Evelyn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) A. O. Drysdale, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 10 Ste. Anne St., Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. E. Lane, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 826A Grosvenor Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. V. MacInnes, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. H. S. Aspinall, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 26 Maher Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. H. Bapty, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 2176 Windsor Rd., Victoria, B.C.

Capt. A. H. Caldicott, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1203 Tamarac Ave., Trail, B.C.

Capt. B. F. Grimmelt, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Winnipegosis, Man.

Capt. E. C. Hall, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Cupar, Sask.

Capt. G. Hepburn, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 25 Kelway Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. H. C. Hodgson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1514 MacKay St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. F. H. Howard, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 135 Victoria St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. S. Jickling, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 950 St. Catharines W., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. S. G. Jones, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 2327 Queen St. E., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. F. R. Kaye, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 737 Walker Ave., Winnipeg, Man

Capt. D. H. MacHale, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 78 Mulcaster St., Barrie, Ont.

Capt. A. L. MacLean, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 594 Lakeshore Ave., Hanlan's Pt., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. D. MacLean, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 396 Cameron Ave., Windsor, Ont.

Capt. H. E. Marion, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Renfrew, Ont.

Capt. W. G. Murray, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1683 Dundas St. W., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. L. T. Poulter, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 430 East Francis St., Fort Wiliam, Ont.

Capt. L. B. Screaton, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 511 St. James St., London, Ont.

Capt. W. T. S. Thompson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Balmoral Pl., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. R. G. Trout, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Estevan, Sask.

Lieut. R. M. Allemang, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 320 Willard Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. B. Cowan, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 36 Camberwell Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. B. O. Dick, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 236 Niagara St., Welland, Ont.

Lieut. R. W. Kennedy, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 6922 De Montmagny Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. P. W. Pinn, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, R.R. No. 1, Kelowna, B.C.

Lieut. A. E. Pritchard, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 308 Fifth Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

L.9113 WO I (Armt. SM) W. Lasuta, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineer, 1956 E-52nd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

K.74128 WO II (Armt QMS) K. M. Anderson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 621 Comox Rd., Nanaimo, B.C.

L.10213 WO II (Armt QMS), F. C. Bridges, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Spencerville, Ont.

H.37136 WO II (Armt QMS) R. F. Dean, Royal Canadian Electric and Mechanical Engineers, Pine Falls, Man.

A.29003 WO II (Armt QMS) J. H. Ferraby, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Kedleston, Sask.

A.2125 WO II (Armt QMS) C. L. Harris, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 277 Harris St., Ingersoll, Ont.

A.11125 WO II (Armt QMS) V. A. Heywood, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Exeter, Ont.

H.58593 WO II (Armt QMS) R. G. Jeffery, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Eston, Sask.

B.51735 WO II (Armt QMS) H. Litchfield, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 18 Dundas St., Oakville, Ont.

B.3856 WO II (Armt QMS) W. S. MacDonnell, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 65 Lee Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C.16560 WO II (Armt QMS) W. P. Midmer, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, R.R. No. 7, Collins Bay, Ont.

P.35420 WO II (Armt QMS) H. J. Millen, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 50 Laurence St., Halifax, N.S.

B.2824 WO II (Armt QMS) F. W. Powell, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 43 Redpath Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.41022 WO II (Armt QMS) W. H. Royer, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Gem, Alta.

G.41244 WO II (SQMS) J. W. Stark, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 96 Willow St., Halifax, N.S.

F.31900 WO II (SQMS) R. H. Watt, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 665 Prince St., Sydney, N.S.

M.4074 S/Sgt. W. H. Bennett, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.

L.27009 S/Sgt. V. J. Campbell, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1933 Athol St., Regina, Sask.

H.40873 S/Sgt. W. H. Hooey, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 683 Lyndale Dr., Norwood, Man.

K.74486 S/Sgt. J. S. Linnell, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 489 West 23rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

A.9818 Art S/Sgt. J. P. McKenna, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 43 Woodrow Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.36415 S/Sgt. T. A. Norman, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Bowden, Alta.

B.9458 Armt S/Sgt. M. C. Osmond, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 92 Arlington Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.51094 S/Sgt. E. T. Palmer, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Vidora, Sask.

B.57381 S/Sgt. E. Rule, *BEM*, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 33 Long Branch Ave., Long Branch, Ont.

A.86053 Armt S/Sgt. W. J. Smythe, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 203 Langarth St., London, Ont.

B.53037 S/Sgt. R. A. Vollick, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Coldwater, Ont.

C.92057 Sgt. (A/WO II, Armt QMS) H. J. Gamman, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 30 Lewis St., Ottawa, Ont.

D.117335 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) W. R. Brown, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Matheson, Ont.

B.95667 Sgt. (A/Art/S/Sgt.) T. A. McCreadie, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 47 Springhurst Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.37117 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) H. F. Roberts, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 52 Balmoral Pl., Winnipeg, Man.

D.117469 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) G. N. Wilson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 6th Street, Trenton, N.S.

H.63516 Art Sgt. E. C. Delmage, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, R.R. No. 3, Minnedosa, Man.

F.86401 Art Sgt. H. DeW. Lloyd, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, South Waterville, N.S.

B.67833 Sgt. F. Sheldon, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Cochrane, Ont.

L.67127 Sgt. A. T. Simpson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 125-12th St., Prince Albert, Sask.

L.66473 Sgt. K. R. Turnbull, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 485 Metcalfe St., Ottawa, Ont.

D.128584 Sgt. A. M. Warhaft, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 82 Duluth Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

F.65371 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) E. F. Eaton, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Dartmouth, N.S.

D.166431 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) C. E. Eikle, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 4730 Queen Mary Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

B.89429 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) D. K. McConachie, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Saltfleet, Ont.

A.86154 Cpl. V. F. Berdux, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 600 Adelaide St. N., London, Ont.

E.74565 Cpl. A. Breton, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Rimouski, P.Q.

F.45486 Cpl. S. F. Burns, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Duke St., Trenton, N.S.

D.122624 Cpl. T. Dow, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Stratton Ave., Mackayville, P.Q.

B.112795 Cpl. V. J. Drybrough, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 214 St. Clarens Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.83617 Cpl. M. McCallum, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1326 Harwood St., Vancouver, B.C.

D.166848 Cpl. K. R. Younie, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Howick, P.Q.

M.36408 L/Cpl. T. A. Bailey, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 213 10½ St. N.W., Calgary, Alta.

D.109691 L/Cpl. G. Ethier, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 577 rue Labelle, St Jerome, P.Q.

C.36560 L/Cpl. G. D. Lakins, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, R.R. No. 3, Kingston, Ont.

M.28142 L/Cpl. J. Oshust, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 322 Heatley Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

L.100626 L/Cpl. W. A. Prowse, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 169 Stadaconna St. W., Moose Jaw, Sask.

K.48175 Cfn. (A/Cpl.) H. A. C. Gildemeester, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1136-10th Ave. E., Vancouver, B.C.

K.65631 Cfn. E. I. Dowie, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 6111 Churchill St., Vancouver, B.C.

C.98513 Cfn. J. G. P. George, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical, Engineers, Ottawa, Ont.

B.52712 Cfn. J. H. McIlroy, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1922 Queen St. E., Toronto, Ont.

B.53088 Cfn. R. T. Osborne, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 166 Bartlett Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.52416 Cfn. K. L. R. Pearce, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1676 Laurier Ave. E., Montreal, P.Q.

M.50473 Cfn J. J. Simpson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Twin Butte, Alta.

L.54932 Cfn. W. T. Smylie, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Star City, Sask.

M.104436 Cfn. F. Wigelsworth, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Edmonton, Alta.

Maj. J. P. Curran, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 697 Eglinton Ave., W., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. R. C. Gorham, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Charlotte St., Saint John, N.B.

Maj. J. McInnes, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Mount Pleasant, Ont.

Capt. J. S. Brydon, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Yarmouth, N.S.

Capt. Z. M. Hamilton, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Estevan, Sask.

Capt. E. A. G. Laframboise, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 1455 Drummond St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. G. W. Lake, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Shawville, P.Q.

Capt. I. A. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Wharncliffe, Rd., Duncan, B.C.

Capt. J. A. McLeod, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Whitewood, Sask.

Capt. P. C. Martin, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 40 Greenwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. L. G. Mowat, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 24 Murray Dr., Trail, B.C.

Capt. J. L. Muirhead, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 223 Robert St., Victoria, B.C.

A.329 WO II (SQMS) W. W. Page, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 2 Salem Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.63054 Sgt. C. T. Sparks, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 218 Wolfe St., Peterborough, Ont.

M.15608 WO II (QMS) (A/WO I, SM) T. McDonald, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 12022-62nd St., Edmonton, Alta.

A.57430 WO II (QMS) D. A. H. Bristol, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 18 Young St., Stratford, Ont.

E.21005 WO II (QMS) R. Renault, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 35 Cremazie, Quebec, P.Q.

A.22045 S/Sgt. (A/WO II, QMS) R. C. Robson, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Meaford, Ont.

A.99621 S/Sgt. J. N. Falconer, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Petrolia, Ont.

H.9925 S/Sgt. D. G. Levenick, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Brandon, Man.

M.41147 S/Sgt. J. McColl, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 402 Hillside Ave., Victoria, B.C.

D.106837 S/Sgt. W. E. Preston, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 2241 Quesnel St., Montreal, P.Q.

L.24020 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) L. Young, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Fairholme, Sask.

C.30019 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) D. H. Coghill, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 308 First Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

B.83134 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) A. S. Kingdon, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 119 Glenforest Rd., Toronto, Ont.

C.96265 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) H. M. Taylor, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 97 Sunnyside Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

A.20123 Sgt. G. H. Backman, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 916 William St., London, Ont.

B.87400 Sgt. A. C. Haughton, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 299 Silver Birch Ave., Toronto, Ont.

G.6216 Sgt. W. B. McBay, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 217 Victoria St., Saint John, N.B.

D.106843 Sgt. D. J. MacLeod, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 59 Prospect St., Montreal, P.Q.

C.53301 Sgt. J. Murphy, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 548 Elm St., Peterborough, Ont.

C.11959 Sgt. A. N. Rosser, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Merrickville, Ont.

H.2844 Sgt. J. Roth, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 604 Talbot Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

A.22409 Sgt. T. Whitfield, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 2274 Marentette Ave., Windsor, Ont.

D.127446 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) R. Ion, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 2350 Sherbrooke St. E., Montreal, P..Q

C.96556 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. Pleet, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 131 Chapel St., Ottawa, Ont.

B.52259 Cpl. R. M. Imrie, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 205 Vaghan Rd., Toronto, Ont.

M.11 Cpl. F. H. G. Lippingwell, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 122-20th St. N., Lethbridge, Alta.

A.22198 Cpl. H. A. McIntosh, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 3334 Sandwich St. W., Windsor, Ont.

M.41164 Cpl. R. E. Stewart, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 11320-102nd Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

B.79357 Cpl. M. Toole, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 369 Soudan Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D.137944 Pte. (A/Cpl..) H. E. Cuthbert, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 1089 Desmarchais Blvd., Verdun, P.Q.

K.46910 Pte. (A/Cpl.) R. Erickson, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 3516 Triumph St., Vancouver, B.C.

B.112618 Pte. H. T. Bailey, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 94 Jackson, Toronto, Ont.

B.80078 Pte. K. L. Chow, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 81 Pine St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

G.17081 Pte. C. F. Fowler, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 161 Manawagonish Rd., Fairville, N.B.

M.104349 Pte. A. G. Peverell, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 1206 Haro St., Vancouver, B.C.

K.69281 Pte. R. A. Phillips, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 2745 Beach Dr., Victoria, B.C.

A.58111 Pte. K. H. Rossiter, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 422 Baker St., London, Ont.

B.24422 Pte. W. C. Smith, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 18 Ormond Ave., St. Catharines, Ont.

G.53069 Pte. H. E. Stephens, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Blackville, N.B.

Lt-Col. K. M. Baird, *OBE*, Canadian Dental Corps, 349 Sherwood Dr., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt-Col.) J. A. Grant, Canadian Dental Corps, 6 Elmhurst Ave., Simcoe, Ont.

Maj. R. T. Lamb, Canadian Dental Corps, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.

Capt. J. G. Helm, Canadian Dental Corps, 54 Perry St., Woodstock, Ont.

Capt. F. G. Pedlar, Canadian Dental Corps, Oxbow, Sask.

L.25838 WO II (CSM) C. R. Jackson, Canadian Dental Corps, Swift Current, Sask.

B.89425 WO II (CSM) R. V. Jones, Canadian Dental Corps, 430 Main St., Toronto, Ont.

K.84841 Sgt. (A/WO II, QMS) D. G. Sutherland, Canadian Dental Corps, 409 East 19th St., Vancouver, B.C.

G.45227 Sgt. D. E. MacLean, Canadian Dental Corps, 4 Maple Row W., Saint John, N.B.

B.84933 L/Cpl. F. Bigley, Canadian Dental Corps, 21 Marlborough Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C.78052 Pte. E. J. Allen, Canadian Dental Corps, 192 Wolsley St., Peterborough, Ont.

A.55353 Pte. T. W. Bennet, Canadian Dental Corps, 1531 Gladstone Ave., Windsor, Ont.

Capt. J. W. T. Jackson, Canadian Postal Corps, Whitewood, Sask.

Lt. (A/Capt.) I. R. Brown, Canadian Postal Corps, 264 Albert St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

Lieut. G. O. B. Inglis, Canadian Postal Corps, Weyburn, Sask.

Lieut. E. E. Taylor, Canadian Postal Corps, 36 Gwynne Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. A. J. Willis, Canadian Postal Corps, Binscarth, Man.

C.97218 Sgt. R. H. Milthorpe, Canadian Postal Corps, 245 Eglinton Ave. W., Toronto, Ont.

B.28516 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) H. G. Pearce, Canadian Postal Corps, Sprucedale, Ont.

C.97359 Cpl. G. A. Fisher, Canadian Postal Corps, 226 Underwood Block, Calgary, Alta.

C.97487 Pte. E. J. Chalk, Canadian Postal Corps, Waldeck, Sask.

Capt. F. A. Love, Canadian Provost Corps, Wilkie, Sask.

Capt. J. D. F. Morrison, Canadian Provost Corps, 2320 Belgrove Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. J. M. Walsh, Canadian Provost Corps, 201 Henry St., Sydney, N.S.

Lt. (A/Capt.) T. Crawshaw, Canadian Provost Corps, Spirit River, Alta.

K.24055 WO I (RSM) G. W. Oakes, Canadian Provost Corps, Saanichton, V.I., B.C.

B.95468 WO II (CSM) S. Young, Canadian Provost Corps, 160 Kingsmount Park Rd., Toronto, Ont.

B.82663 S/Sgt. R. D. Gallagher, Canadian Provost Corps, 69 Hogarth Ave., Oshawa, Ont.

A.56749 CQMS. J. A. Hanna, Canadian Provost Corps, 17 Foster Ave., Guelph, Ont.

K.25508 CQMS. S. R. Prestage, Canadian Provost Corps, 226 Fletcher Ave., Chilliwack, B.C.

D.109620 Sgt. (A/WO I, R.S.M.) E. R. Cappiello, Canadian Provost Corps, 4 Prospect St., Hamilton, Ont.

H.32053 Sgt. P. A. Beaman, Canadian Provost Corps, 39½ Bon Accord St. Moncton, N.B.

M.49762 Sgt. R. W. Duff, Canadian Provost Corps, 554 West 22nd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

C.472 Sgt. D. S. Moore, Canadian Provost Corps, 214 Birch St. N., Timmins, Ont.

H.100005 Sgt. E. Sombert, Canadian Provost Corps, 3950 Clydesdale St., New Westminster, B.C.

L.22398 Sgt. A. C. M. Wiberg, Canadian Provost Corps, Paddockwood, Sask.

M.20555 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) F. Rowlandson, Canadian Provost Corps, Calgary, Alta.

G.48723 Cpl. F. S. Allingham, Canadian Provost Corps, Campbellton, N.B.

F.21335 Cpl. B. L. DeWolfe, Canadian Provost Corps, Halifax, N.S.

H.16728 Cpl. G. R. Johnson, Canadian Provost Corps, Inchkeith, Sask.

L.35157 Cpl. C. A. Milot, Canadian Provost Corps, Wood Mountain, Sask.

C.32960 Cpl. F. S. Morris, Canadian Provost Corps, Church St., Sussex, N.B.

C.75818 Cpl. I. W. Pickerill, Canadian Provost Corps, 262 North Kootenay St., Vancouver, B.C.

D.108507 Cpl. N. R. Yeatman, Canadian Provost Corps, 1428 Nicolet St., Montreal, P.Q.

H.37587 L/Cpl. R. W. Anderson, Canadian Provost Corps, Deloraine, Man.

L.55331 L/Cpl. J. M. Balycky, Canadian Provost Corps, Glen Elder, Sask.

E.80213 L/Cpl. H. Evans, Canadian Provost Corps, Mutton Bay, P.Q.

H.59032 L/Cpl. W. Hangle, Canadian Provost Corps, 612 Mulvey Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

L.27902 L/Cpl. D. O. Keeton, Canadian Provost Corps, Bluffton, Alta.

E.52851 L/Cpl. R. Lacelle, Canadian Provost Corps, 1091 MacKay St., Montreal, P.Q.

D.136514 L/Cpl. I. E. F. Lussier, Canadian Provost Corps, 588 Valois St., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. R. Bonnar, Canadian Forestry Corps, 119 Powell Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. D. A. MacPhail, *MBE*, Canadian Forestry Corps, 876 Charlotte St., Fredericton, N.B.

Capt. R. K. Allen, Canadian Forestry Corps, Yarmouth North, N.S.

Capt. G. M. Thomas, Canadian Forestry Corps, 213 Delaware Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. J. T. Westman, Canadian Forestry Corps, 2350 Cornwall St., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. O. Clouthier, Canadian Forestry Corps, Petawawa, Ont.

E.21002 WO I (S.M.) G. W. Upton, Canadian Forestry Corps, 4 Dessane Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

L.50184 WO II (C.S.M.) S. Thomson, Canadian Forestry Corps, Yorkton, Sask.

C.48029 S/Sgt. G. M. McCready, Canadian Forestry Corps, 139 Argyle St., Fredericton, N.B.

H.56216 Sgt. J. W. J. F. Hebert, Canadian Forestry Corps, Fort Frances, Ont.

H.56310 Sgt. F. J. McKay, Canadian Forestry Corps, Strathadam, N.B.

B.17166 Sgt. M. J. Post, Canadian Forestry Corps, Rosseau Rd., Sudbury, Ont.

E.62662 Sgt. D. M. Smith, Canadian Forestry Corps, Magog, P.Q.

H.53372 Sgt. W. Starchuk, Canadian Forestry Corps, 125 S. Vickers St., Fort William, Ont.

W.15068 Cpl. M. I. Dennis, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 76 Carleton St., St. Catharines, Ont.

W.1004 Cpl. K. I. Roe, Canadian Women's Army Corps, R.R. No. 2, London, Ont.

W.15117 Cpl. H. M. Steggles, Canadian Women's Army Corps, Rivers, Man.

Maj. W. E. Austin, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 255 Friel St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. (A/Lt.-Col.) C. B. MacFarlane, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 148 Markland St., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. R. S. M. Hannesson, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. D. G. E. Molnar, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 1766-7th St. W., Calgary, Alta.

Lt. (A/Capt.) W. Blane, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 2607-45th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. R. Prefontaine, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 44B Wellington Ave. N., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. R. Taylor, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Cultus Lake, B.C.

Lieut. J. E. McEachern, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 8 MacNaughton Rd., Leaside, Ont.

C.55 WO II (C.S.M.) W. B. Lefebvre, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 34 Prince Albert St., Cornwall, Ont.

B.48962 WO II (C.S.M.) J. P. Sullivan, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Durham, Ont.

M.11797 Sgt. (A/WO II, C.S.M.) E. H. Denzler, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Rumsey, Alta.

M.7006 Sgt. A. L. Gracie, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 10731-85 Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

L.2446 Sgt. W. Lutz, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Colonsay, Sask.

A.50094 Sgt. B. V. Smith, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 629 Josephine Ave., Windsor, Ont.

B.92799 Sgt. B. M. Sevenson, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 499 St. Clarens Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. D'A. J. Baldwin, *MBE*, General List, 221 Maple St., Chilliwack, B.C.

Lt.-Col. A. G. Cherrier, *OBE*, General List, 81 Somerset St. W., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. C. Clunie, *OBE*, General List, 405 Wellington St., Sarnia, Ont.

Lt.-Col. L. J. Flynn, *OBE*, General List, 125 King St. E., Kingston, Ont.

Lt.-Col. W. Kennedy, General List, Ebenezer, Sask.

Lt.-Col. R. B. Mowat, General List, 597 Victoria Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. G. F. C. Pangman, *OBE, ED*, General List, 45 Blair Rd., Galt, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) V. S. J. Richmond, General List, 349 Brock St., Kingston, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) W. G. White, General List, 1368 Chilver Rd., Walkerville, Ont.

Maj. W. H. Broughall, *MBE*, General List, 172 Bay St., S., Hamilton, Ont.

Maj. C. F. Carsley, General List, 3024 St. Sulpice Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. J. B. Hamilton, General List, 175 Royal York Rd. N., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. A. N. Kearns, General List, 61 Water St., Waterloo, Ont.

Maj. W. L. Lovering, General List, 22 Thornwood Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. N. C. Phillips, General List, 2 Beaumont Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. R. Martin, General List, 327 Bay St. S., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. A. M. Birks, General List, Bowmanville, Ont.

Capt. R. B. Hungerford, General List, 127 Albert St., London, Ont.

Capt. W. D. Wetmore, General List, Annapolis Royal, N.S.

Capt. F. M. Winch, General List, 25 Tecumseth St., Orillia, Ont.

Supvr. W. J. Snowden, General List, 305 Herkimer St., Hamilton, N.S.

Major W. J. MacCallum, *ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, Campbellton, N.B.

Capt. (A/Maj.) I. Shragovitch, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 6151 Durocher Ave., Outremont, P.Q.

Capt. E. Aiello, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Fernie, B.C.

Lieut. F. A. Lefever, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1546 W-12th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Maj. H. W. Hook, Canadian Infantry Corps, 254 Spence St., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. M. T. G. MacAulay, *DCM., ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 31 Laurentide Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

Lieut. W. B. Bradley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 57 Aberdeen St., Quebec, P.Q.
Lieut. J. E. Dunderdale, Canadian Infantry Corps, 114 Lenore St., Winnipeg, Man.
Lieut. J. F. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, Spencerwood, Quebec, P.Q.
Lieut. A. B. Scott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8 Brullard, Preston Park, P.Q.
E.30547 Sgt. M. D'Avignon, Canadian Infantry Corps, Marieville, P.Q.
A.9220 Sgt. G. S. MacDonell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 351 St. David St., Stratford, Ont.
H.6118 Sgt. K. E. Porter, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.
K.35468 Sgt. C. J. Sharp, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 617 Constance Ave., Victoria, B.C.
E.30270 Sgt. L. R. Stickles, Canadian Infantry Corps, 111 Laidlaw St., Timmins, Ont.
H.6104 Sgt. J. M. Thom, Canadian Infantry Corps, 103 Harvard Ave. W., Transcona, Man.
H.6090 Sgt. C. Watson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 274 Selkirk Ave., Verdun, P.Q.
E.21822 Cpl. J. J. Fitzpatrick, Canadian Infantry Corps, 54 Julis St., Quebec, P.Q.
E.29957 Cpl. E. Harrison, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grand Cascapedia, P.Q.
E.30092 Cpl. L. R. Latimer, Canadian Infantry Corps, Noranda, P.Q.
H.6838 Cpl. E. C. McFarland, Canadian Infantry Corps, 611 Langside St., Winnipeg, Man.
E.29951 Cpl. G. W. McRae, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chandler, P.Q.
H.6341 Cpl. S. A. Sheffer, Canadian Infantry Corps, Carleton Place, Ont.
H.6101 L/Cpl. E. G. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 777 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.
H.6851 Pte. F. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, 202 Roger St., Norwood Grove, Man.
E.30659 Rfn. B. Castonguay, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5147 De Lanaudière, Montreal, P.Q.
D.3385 Sgmn. R. Damant, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 721 Lacasse St., Montreal, P.Q.
E.30077 Rfn. M. I. Davies, Canadian Infantry Corps, 128-6th St., Noranda, P.Q.
K.85488 Pte. A. P. Flegg, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lac du Bonnet, Man.
H.6186 Pte. N. C. Galbraith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1633 Elgin Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
H.6044 Pte. N. C. Matthews, Canadian Infantry Corps, Red Deer, Alta.
F.40323 Rfn. L. L. Roblee, Canadian Infantry Corps, Springhill, N.S.
F.29945 Rfn. J. A. Wallace, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kentville, N.S.
Major W. B. Mottrom, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kelvington, Sask.
Major A. J. Primeau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 453 Des Meurons St., St. Boniface, Man.
Capt. R. C. Keary, Canadian Infantry Corps, 72-1st St., New Westminster, B.C.
Capt. A. D. Lang, Canadian Infantry Corps, 50 Academy Road, Montreal, P.Q.
Capt. A. R. McIntosh, Canadian Infantry Corps, 774 Duplex Ave., Toronto, Ont.
Capt. M. M. Stanlow, General List, 5640 Stamford St., Vancouver, B.C.
Lieut. W. I. Eamon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 9 Charles St., Brockville, Ont.
Lieut. E. F. Larret, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1563 Pillette Rd., Windsor, Ont.
Lieut. K. J. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Nakina, Ont.
A.3029 Pte. J. W. Stewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 29 Weston St., London, Ont.
H.32044 Cpl. H. Nelson, Canadian Provost Corps, 397 Howe St., Winnipeg, Man.
Lieut. J. A. Woodhouse, Canadian Infantry Corps, 839 Shaw St., Toronto, Ont.
Capt. B. Bernstein, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Cochrane, Ont.
D.116199 Sign. G. Rodrigues, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 4600 Couin Blvd. W., Cartierville, P.Q.
Capt. R. C. Hicks, Canadian Infantry Corps, 49 Poplar Plains Rd., Toronto, Ont.
Capt. J. R. Turnbull, Canadian Infantry Corps, 580 Devonshire St., Windsor, Ont.
Capt. A. H. Turney, The Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Calgary, Alta.
Lieut. G. D. Harvey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 188 Herkimer St., Hamilton, Ont.
Lieut. W. A. Millar, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 8009-112th St., Edmonton, Alta.
M.27153 WO II (SSM) R. Cordner, The Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 10524-106 Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
B.66644 Sgt. E. J. Kirkman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 95 Millwood Road, Toronto, Ont.
B.25103 L/Sgt. S. J. Cleasby, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1139 College St., Toronto, Ont.
F.33358 Pte. (A/L/Cpl.) A. G. Ivany, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8 Ferris St., Whitney Pier, Sydney, N.S.
A.105964 L/Cpl. C. B. Reynolds, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cedar Springs, Ont.
G.52256 Sigmn. C. A. Barnes, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 257 Westmorland St., Fredericton, N.B.
B.62275 Tpr. L. H. Beaudin, The Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3 Maple St., N. Timmins, Ont.
B.127506 Pte. R. O. Belgue, Canadian Infantry Corps, 132 Victor Ave., Toronto, Ont.
B.46980 Pte. W. G. M. Browne, Canadian Infantry Corps, Norval, Ont.
D.77627 Tpr. W. C. Connor, The Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3920 St. Christophe St., Montreal, P.Q.
B.31676 Sigmn. J. J. F. Deans, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2104 Queen St. E., Toronto, Ont.
B.65822 Pte. C. E. E. Follest Canadian Infantry Corps, 94 Eldon Ave., Oshawa, Ont.
D.144280 Pte. L. A. Harpes, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4732 Lefontaine St., Montreal, P.Q.
C.120988 Pte. W. F. Heasman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Stirling, Ont.
B.60641 Tpr. G. W. Huggins, The Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 46 Frank St., Peterborough, Ont.
H.69872 Gnr. S. J. Hyatt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Fort Frances, Ont.
K.68798 Pte. W. J. Melnechenko, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sheho, Sask.
A.21682 Pte. A. F. A. Montroy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 13826 Vandyke Ave. Detroit, Mich., U.S.A.
M.104930 Pte. G. A. Rooke, Canadian Infantry Corps, Athabaska, Alta.
H.13183 Spr. F. A. Tamblyn, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 554 Langside St. Winnipeg, Man.
B.78622 Pte. D. J. Wain, Canadian Infantry Corps, 354 Cummer Ave., Newtonbrook, Ont.
Major G. C. Gray, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1-A Langley Ave., Toronto, Ont.
H/Capt. F. J. Deloughery, Canadian Chaplain Services, 357 D'Arcy St., Pembroke, Ont.
Capt. A. A. MacMillan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3 Lemesurier Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

Lieut. L. B. Corrigan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Swift Current, Sask.

H.6061 WO I (RSM) O. C. Kennan, *MM*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 21 Elm Park Rd., St. Vital, Man.

E.29809 WO I (RSM) L. W. Shore, Canadian Infantry Corps, Riverbend, P.Q.

E.29838 WO II (CSM) J. M. McCarron, Canadian Infantry Corps, Harvey, N.B.

E.29806 WO II (CSM) J. B. Thomson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1615 Trafalgar St., Vancouver, B.C.

D.110142 S/Sgt. R. Cote, Canadian Dental Corps, St. Georges de Beauce, P.Q.

H.6167 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) A. E. E. Mawson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Broadway Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

H.6198 Sgt. G. L. Coutts, Canadian Infantry Corps, 800 Ashburn St., Winnipeg, Man.

H.6027 Sgt. R. Manchester, Canadian Infantry Corps, 391 Balmoral St., Winnipeg, Man.

H.6026 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) R. F. Veale, Canadian Infantry Corps, 814 Sargent Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

E.29919 Cpl. S. D. Henderson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Richmond, P.Q.

E.30053 Cpl. A. MacRae, Canadian Infantry Corps Scotstown, P.Q.

E.30520 L/Cpl. F. J. Kelly, Canadian Infantry Corps, Campbellton, N.B.

H.6899 L/Ppl. B. Kohut, Canadian Infantry Corps, 609 Bannatyne Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

E.30271 L/Cpl. J. P. Poirier, Canadian Infantry Corps, Nouvelle, P.Q.

E.30161 Rfmn. (A/Cpl.) R. Claricoates, Canadian Infantry Corps, Windsor Mills, P.Q.

E.30285 Rfmn. (A/Cpl.) M. J. J. M. Doiron, Canadian Infantry Corps, Matapedia, P.Q.

E.30730 Rfmn. (A/Cpl.) A. F. Drover, Canadian Infantry Corps, 92 Cabot St., St. John's Nfld.

H.6643 Pte. (A/Cpl.) A. S. Johnson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fife Lake, Sask.

C.5942 Rfmn. J. F. Burns, Canadian Infantry Corps, Rome, N.Y., U.S.A.

H.6863 Pte. M. G. McKnight, Canadian Infantry Corps, 785 Valour Rd., Winnipeg, Man.

H.6736 Pte. J. C. Matheson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 568 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.

C.6352 Rfmn. G. A. Wurm, Canadian Infantry Corps, Arnprior, Ont.

Supervisor, F. G. O'Neill, Aux. Ser. Offr., K. of C., 168 Fitzroy St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

E.5488 Pte. W. Bolduc, Canadian Infantry Corps, 60 Clinton Ave., Waterville, Maine, U.S.A.

B.36650 Pte. J. M. A. Harding, Canadian Infantry Corps, 275 Mary St., Hamilton, Ont.

B.66579 Cpl. W. H. Peaks, Canadian Infantry Corps, 246 Bain Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.17473 Tpr. E. G. Anderson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2132A Dundas St. W., Toronto, Ont.

B.67111 Tpr. M. O. Campbell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 653 Clendenan Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.37521 Tpr. R. Carleton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 317 Hawkes Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

A.21899 Pte. E. Kemp, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3106 Wyandotte St. W., Windsor, Ont.

B.25310 Sgt. W. B. Lee, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 1, Kennedy Rd., Scarboro Jct., Ont.

ZD.1860 Capt. P. C. M. Meunier, General List, 147 Abbott Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lieut. W. D. Elsdon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3985 West 12th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

B.44587 Cpl. R. M. Fetherston, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 179 Lawlor Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.130424 Spr. J. D. Garrett, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 601 Huron St., Toronto, Ont.

Major E. A. Dunlop, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2 Clarendon Ave., Toronto, Ont.

British Empire Medal (B.E.M.)
Non-Operational

D.111732 Cpl (A/Sgt.) H. Marsden, Veterans Guard of Canada, 623 Cadillac St., Montreal, P.Q.

A.21334 Cpl. D. K. Barclay, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Merlin, Ont.

B.158254 L/Bdr. F. R. Welch, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Pefferlaw, Ont.

D.91363 Sgt. F. Berry, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1540 Guy St., Montreal, P.Q.

B.3407 Sgt. J. R. Treloar, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 31 Copeland Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.168369 Pte. B. A. Cudmore, Veterans Guard of Canada, 387 Vaughn Rd., Toronto, Ont.

H.422230 Rfn. A. Garnett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 406 McGregor St., Winnipeg, Man.

K.77224 Sgt. (A/WO II (SQMS)) T. M. Britton, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 303 8th St. E., North Vancouver, B.C.

L.7197 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) F. Ridsdale, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Regina, Sask.

K.97776 Sgt. C. C. Mavius, Canadian Provost Corps, 2433 East 19th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

G.27119 Cpl. R. Watkins, Veterans Guard of Canada, Newcastle Bridge, N.B.

G.18247 Pte. E. V. Bartlett, Veterans Guard of Canada, Upper Mills, N.B.

K.50249 Sgt. T. Brower, Canadian Provost Corps, 1531 Haro St., Vancouver, B.C.

FOREIGN AWARDS (FRENCH)

Officier de La Legion d'Honneur

Maj.-Gen. E. L. M. Burns, *OBE, MC,* Canadian Army, 541 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. (A/Maj.-Gen.) C. Vokes, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, 433 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. H. Chaballe, *MC, VD,* General List, 263 MacLaren St., Ottawa, Ontario.

Chevalier Legion D'Honneur and Croix de Guerre avec Palme

Colonel J. P. Carriere, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 51 Aylmer Rd., Hull, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. (A/Col.) M. Forget, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 108 Rue Champlain, St. Jean, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. (A/Col.) J. G. McQueen, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 505 Aberdeen St., Medicine Hat, Alta.

Colonel, R.E.A. Morton, *DSO,* Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Rothesay, N.B.

Lt.-Col. DeRome, *OBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 5272 Mentane St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. H. E. T. Doucet, *OBE, ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 183 Wilbrod St., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj.-Gen. R. H. Keefler, *CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 1610 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj.-Gen. A. B. Matthews, *CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 3 Clarendon Crescent, Toronto, Ont.

Maj.-Gen. H. A. Young, *CB, CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, 1537 Summerhill Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Brig. E. L. Booth, *DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, Penetanguishene, Ont.

Brig. F. N. Cabeldu, *CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 622 Falkland Rd., Victoria, B.C.

Brifi. D. G. Cunningham, *CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, Kingston, Ave.

Brig. C. M. Drury, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, 57 Cluny Drive, Toronto, Ont.

Brigadier H. D. Graham, *CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 44 Kingsview Driveway, Ottawa, Ont.

Col. R. W. Moncel, *DSO, OBE,* Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 20 Charles St., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. M. Noel, *CBE, ED,* Canadian Army, 4691 Adam St., Montreal, P.Q.

Brig. R. A. Wyman, *CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, Victoria Central Saanich Rd., Royal Oak, Victoria, B.C.

Col. J. E. G. P. Mathieu, *DSO, ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 11 des Ramparts St., Quebec, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. P. W. Bennett, *OBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Pinewood Ave., York Mills, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. R. W. T. Bessonette, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Thorn Vale, N.W.A., Halifax, N.S.

Col. H. M. Cameron, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 125 Park Rd., Rockliffe, Ont.

Brig. J. P. E. Bernatchez, *DSO, OBE,* Canadian Army, 80 St. Jean Baptiste, Montmagny, P.Q.

Brig. I. S. Johnston, *DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 81 Binscarth Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A./Maj.) P. Triquet, *VC,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 1231 St. Catherine St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Brigadier E. A. Blais, *CBE, MC,* Canadian Army, Quebec, P.Q.

Croix de Guerre avec Palme

Lt.-Col. D. Menard, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 189 Blvd. de le'Entents, Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. P. E. Labelle, *MC,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Marieville, P.Q.

Capt. L. G. D'Artois, *DSO,* General List, 132 St. James St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj.-Gen. E. L. M. Burns, *OBE, MC,* Canadian Army, 541 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. (A/Maj.-Gen.) C. Vokes, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, 433 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt. Col. (A/Brig.) J. P. E. Bernatchez, *DSO, OBE,* Canadian Army, Montmagny, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. I. S. Johnston, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 81 Binscarth Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. G. W. Robinson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 277 Regent St., London, Ont.

Lt.-Gen. C. Foulkes, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, 100 Lisgar Rd., Rockliffe, Ont.

Lt.-Col. G. G. Simonds, *CB, CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj.-Gen. H. W. Foster, *DSO,* Canadian Army, Winnipeg, Man.

Maj.-Gen. R. F. L. Keller, *CBE,* Canadian Army, 2480 Cardigan Rd., Uplands, Victoria, B.C.

Maj. G. D. A. Bieler, *DSO, MBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 5439 Earnscliffe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt. R. M. Caza, *MBE,* General List, 262 Friel St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt. A. L. J. Sirois, *MBE,* General List, Box 93, Vonda, Sask .

Lt.-Col. D. G. Worthington, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2635 1st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt.-Col. T. C. Lewis, *DSO,* Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 52 Academy Rd. Westmount, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. S. S. T. Cantlie, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 3065 Cedar Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. H. L. Bisaillon, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 4551 Coolbrooke St., N.D.G. Montreal, P.Q.

Croix de Guerre avec Etoile Vermeil

Capt. J. H. Moss, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3670 Lafontaine Park St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. M. E. J. Pariseault, Canadian Infantry Corps, 85 Calixa Lavallee, Quebec, P.Q.

Maj. R. B. Somerville, Canadian Infantry Corps, 631 Carleton Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. M. P. Bogert, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 1227 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. B. J. S. MacDonald, *OBE, ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 1195 Argyle Rd., Windsor, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. P. Page, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 55 Mason Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. A. B. Conron, *DSO,* Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 484 Dufferin Ave., London, Ont.

Maj. B. F. MacDonald, *DSO,* Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 9917-116th St., Edmonton. Alta.

Lt.-Col. F. A. Clift, *DSO, ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 198 Concession St., Kingston Ont.

Lt.-Col. E. D. Danby, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 178 Laurier Ave. E., Ottawa, Ont.

Col. J. D. Forin, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 6262 Marguerite Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt.-Col. J. M. P. Sauve, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 5621 Canterbury Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. J. A. A. Dugas, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 228 Querbes Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. J. C. A. H. Lapointe, Canadian Infantry Corps, 344 Chemin St. Louis, Quebec, P.Q.

Maj. N. A. Waldron, Canadian Infantry Corps, 174 George St., Hamilton, Ont.

K.46773 Tpr. W. R. Thomas, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 615 Mahon Ave., North Vancouver, B.C.

Croix de Guerre avec Etoile d'Argent (French)

E.46982 Gnr. P. E. Leclerc, The Royal Canadian Artillery, De Gaspe, P.Q.

Maj. H. D. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 175-15th Ave., E., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. A. E. Andrews, General List, 74 Sunnyside Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Capt. F. A. Barnes, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 49 Roselawn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. G. K. M. Johnston, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 42 Robertson Ave., Chatham, Ont.

Capt. E. W. MacDonald, *ED,* The Royal Canadian Artillery, Cupar, Sask.

Maj. P. Sevigny, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 76 Avenue de Bernieres, Quebec, P.Q.

Lt. R. Barre, Canadian Provost Corps, 368 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt. R. E. Robichaud, Canadian Infantry Corps, 105 Rideau Terrace, Ottawa, Ont.

K.53452 Sgt. J. Faucher, Canadian Provost Corps, Duck Lake, Sask.

Maj. G. V. Baudry, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, River Bend, P.Q.

Capt. T. W. Platt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Box 252, Wingham, Ont.

Lt.-Col. G. A. Turcot, Canadian Infantry Corps, 35 Rue St. Ursule, Quebec, P.Q.

Maj. J. L. Y. Dube, Canadian Infantry Corps, 261 Rue St. Antoine, Trois Rivieres, P.Q.

H/Maj. L. Gratton, *MBE, ED,* Canadian Chaplain Services, 1962 Gauthier St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. D. A. Kellough, The Royal Candaian Corps of Signals, Box 1171, Selkirk, Man.

Lt.-Col. J. R. Painchaud, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Ave des Braves, Quebec, P.Q.

Capt. R. C. W. Bowery, Canadian Infantry Corps, 164 Dundas St., Brantford, Ont.

H/Capt. G. E. Darrach, Canadian Chaplain Services, West Branch, Pictou Co., N.S.

Capt. W. L. McGregor, Canadian Infantry Corps, 810 Devonshire Rd., Windsor, Ont.

Capt. J. A. Turner, Canadian Infantry Corps, 310 Horace St., Norwood Grove, Man.

Capt. B. Dorion, Canadian Infantry Corps, 335 Booth St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt. D. L. Anderson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Sheet Harbour, N.S.

Lt. A. G. Coulter, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 25 Roxborough Drive, Toronto, Ont.

Lt. L. G. Kempton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Box 180, Weyburn, Sask.

Lt. W. H. Scott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1457 Victoria Ave., Windsor, Ont.

Lt. R. S. Stewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 925 St. Clair Ave. W., Toronto, Ont.

Lt. N. M. Watson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 339½ North Christina St., Sarnia, Ont.

Lt. W. G. R. Wedd, Canadian Infantry Corps, 174 Fairlawn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.12416 WO I (R.S.M.) R. H. Strumm, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1040-13th St. E., Saskatoon, Sask.

A.484 Sgt. L. J. McIntosh, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 7, Park Hill, Ont.

D.61148 L/Sgt. J. P. Beauvais, Canadian Infantry Corps, 6628 De Gaspe St., Montreal, P.Q.

B.18672 L/Bdr. D. L. Gillespie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Box 152, Orangeville, Ont.

K.66018 L/Bdr. F. A. S. Ryder, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Vancouver, B.C.

Croix de Guerre avec Etoile de Bronze

D.61055 C.Q.M.S. J. P. Bourque, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1420 Laurier St. E., Montreal, P.Q.

F.77153 C.Q.M.S. L. J. Dethy, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Brantford, Ont.

D.105828 Sgt. J. Gardner, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 320 Desmarchais Blvd., Verdun, P.Q.

A.21455 Sgt. W. J. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, 417 London St. E., Windsor, Ont.

D.117203 Sgt. F. A. J. Sundborg, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 155 Murray Ave., Greenfield Park, P.Q.

L.19325 L/Sgt. E. L. Bellows, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Beachy, Sask.

A.2368 L/Sgt. J. Travis, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 216 Egerton St., London, Ont.

B.37491 Cpl. R. V. West, Canadian Infantry Corps, 199 Murray St., Brantford, Ont.

B.82046 Pte. D. H. Brand, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 31 Glebe Rd. W., Toronto, Ont.

D.61926 Pte. C. Forget, Canadian Infantry Corps, 189 St. Zotique Est., Montreal, P.Q.

B.85171 Pte. A. W. Kennedy, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 84 Branstone Rd., Toronto, Ont.

E.42170 Pte. J. Labillois, Canadian Infantry Corps, Micuasha, P.Q.

C.2223 Spr. L. P. Lafrance, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 70 Young St., Ottawa, Ont.

B.37360 Pte. H. F. McCourt, Canadian Infantry Corps, Eganville, Ont.

E.9275 Pte. L. Madore, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Germain, P.Q.

H.26683 Tpr. K. H. Minshull, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Angusville, Man.

H.19122 Pte. W. J. Morris, Canadian Infantry Corps, 501 Warwick Apts., Winnipeg, Man.

H.38637 Sigmn. G. T. Mountain, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Winter St., Sussex, N.B.

B.66669 Pte. A. H. Timleck, Canadian Infantry Corps, 58 Close Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Médaille de la Reconnaissance Française

Capt. C. R. R. Douthwaite, *MBE,* Canadian Intelligence Corps, New Glasgow, N.S.

Capt. R. H. Nobie, *MBE,* Canadian Intelligence Corps, 356 MacLaren St., Ottawa, Ont.

Order of Agricultural Merit (Degree of Officer)

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) J. H. Tremblay, General List, 77 Kindersley, Ville Mont-Royal, Montreal, P.Q.

Chevalier de l'Ordre de la Santé Publique

Lt.-Col. H. A. Ansley, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Billings Bridge, Ont.

FOREIGN AWARDS (BELGIAN)

Grand Officer of the Order of Leopold

General A. G. L. McNaughton, *CH, CB, CMG, DSO,* Canadian Army, 28 Goulburn Avenue, Ottawa, Ont.

Commander of the Order of Leopold with Palm and Croix de Guerre 1940 with Palm

Lt.-Gen. G. G. Simonds, *CB, CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, 18 Debary Apts., Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Officer of the Order of Leopold with Palm and Croix de Guerre 1940 with Palm

Brigadier W. J. Megill, *DSO,* Canadian Army, 127 Powell Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario.

Brigadier J. M. Rockingham, *DSO,* Canadian Army, 825 Foul Bay Road, Victoria, B.C.

Col. G. W. Ball, *OBE,* Canadian Provost Corps, Ste. 1, Lonsdale Apts., Edmonton, Alta.

Col. M. C. G. Meighen, *OBE,* Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 57 Castle Frank Cres., Toronto, Ont.

Col. H. O. Moran, *MBE,* General List, 216 Waverley Road, Toronto, Ont.

Chevalier of the Order of Leopold with Palm and Croix de Guerre 1940 with Palm

Lt.-Col. P. W. Bennett, *OBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Valley Crest, Pinewood, Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. W. J. Brigger, *ED,* Royal Canadian Artillery, Apt. 4, 105 Wentworth St., Hamilton, Ont.

Lt.-Col. H. M. Cathcart, *OBE, ED,* General List, 706 Echo Drive, Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. A. G. Cherrier, *OBE,* General List, 81 Somerset St. W., Ottawa Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. C. Clunie, *OBE,* General List, 405 Wellington St., Sarnia, Ont.

Lt.-Col. D. A. Keith, *MBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 9 Kingsgrove Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. F. L'Esperance, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4171 Decarie Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. F. E. D. Wallace, *OBE, ED,* General List, 55 Chestnut Ave., Brantford, Ont.

Commander of the Order of the Crown with Palm and Croix de Guerre 1940 with Palm

Major-General D. C. Spry, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, Kingsmere, Ont.

Officer of the Order of the Crown with Palm and Croix de Guerre 1940 with Palm

Lt.-Col. W. A. B. Anderson, *OBE,* Royal Canadian Artillery, 369 Daly Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. D'A J. Baldwin, *MBE,* General List, 221 Maple Street, Chilliwack, B.C.

Chevalier of the Order of the Crown with Palm and Croix de Guerre 1940 with Palm

Major H. M. A. Baker, *MBE,* Canadian Provost, Corps, 8 St. George's Place, Westmount, P.Q.

Major E. D. Bell, Royal Canadian Artillery, Wingham, Ont.

Major C. G. Brown, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Mirror Lake, British Columbia.

Major H. L. Day, Canadian Infantry Corps, Upper Woodstock, New Brunswick.

Major M. R. Douglas, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2151 Retallack Street, Regina, Sask.

Major R. C. Farrow, Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. No. 3, Victoria, B.C.

Major D. A. Fergusson, *MBE,* Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Iroquois, Ontario.

Major B. G. Fox, Canadian Infantry Corps, Colborne, Ontario.

Major R. H. D. Gentles, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1015 Second Ave., N.E., Moose Jaw, Sask.

Chevalier of the Order of Leopold II with Palm and Croix de Guerre 1940 with Palm

Major L. C. Hogan, Royal Canadian Artillery, Rockingham, Halifax Co., N.S.

Major A. R. Jessup, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 16 Kilbarry Rd., Toronto, 12, Ont.

Major. A. J. Lavoie, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 511-A-6th Ave., Medicine Hat, Alta.

Major T. A. Leishman, General List, Box No. 112, Lucknow, Ont.

Major W. A. Marlow, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 289 Keele St., Rear Apt., Toronto, Ont.

Major P. A. Mayer, Canadian Infantry Corps, 454 St. Patrick's Sq., Port Arthur, Ont.

Major D. F. Morris, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 19907 Belmont, Avenue, Victoria, B.C.

Major A. R. MacFarlane, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 47 Harmer Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Major K. B. MacPherson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 887 Minto St., Winnipeg, Man.

Major R. A. McAlpine, Royal Canadian Artillery, Ste. 25, Coronada Apts., Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.

Major L. M. K. Reed, Canadian Infantry Corps, 313-36th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

Major N. R. Rushforth, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 46 Balmoral Place, Winnipeg, Man.

Major L. E. Sarantos, *MBE,* Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Halifax, N.S.

Major B. A. Upjohn, Canadian Infantry Corps, 42 Cluny Drive, Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Cal. T. F. Whiteley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 186 Balmoral Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. N. G. Ashby, Canadian Intelligence, Corps, 229 Kensington Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Capt. W. H. Barkman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 79 Kohner Ave., Kitchener, Ont .

Capt. S. Breen, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 136-2nd Ave., Yorkton, Sask.

Capt. W. B. C. Burgoyne, Royal Canadian Artilery, 25 Bellevue Terrace, St. Catharines, Ont.

Capt. E. B. Burnett, Royal Canadian Artillery, Durham, Ont.

Capt. G. W. Carnegie, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, No. 2 The Aberdeens, Bain Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. F. R. Caron, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10 Kirby Ave., Timmins, Ont.

Capt. A. D. Cossaboom, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 99 Abercombie Rd., New Glasgow, N.S.

H/Capt. J. R. Fife, Canadian Chaplain Services, Trinity Rectory, Aurora, Ont.

Major R. I. Findlater, Royal Canadian Artillery, 260 Metcalfe St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. T. G. Fyfe, Canadian Infantry Corps, Box No. 85, Kincardine, Ontario.

Capt. C. W. Dansey, Canadian Infantry Corps, Caulfield's P.O., West Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. J. L. Gallagher, Canadian Infantry Corps, 869 West 26th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. R. G. Glover, Canadian Infantry Corps, The Royal Bank of Can., Port Hope, Ont.

Capt. R. M. Godard, Canadian Infantry Corps, 47 Mountain Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. J. W. Gross, Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 52 Water St., Kitchener, Ont.

Capt. E. J. Hooper, Royal Canadian Artillery, 20 St. Andrew's Gardens, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. T. J. Kearns, Royal Canadian Artillery, Kipling, Sask.

Capt. S. J. Lea, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 3276 West 36th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. D. H. MacLean, Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Almonte, Ont.

Capt. W. H. McKelvey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 174 Rosedale Hts. Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. F. J. B. McKinstry, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4005 West 34th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. J. B. P. Mahony, Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 70 Leonard Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. G. L. Marshall, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 70 Gormley Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. S. Moglove, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ste. 24, Carman Apts., Winnipeg, Man.

H/Capt. A. J. Mowatt, Canadian Chaplain Services, Maple Ave., Hudson Heights, P.Q.

Capt. C. B. Newman, Canadian Provost Corps, Colquitz, Victoria, B.C.

Capt. G. H. Nutter, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sussex, King's Co., N.B.

Capt. R. F. Orme, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 687 Mountjoy Ave., Victoria, B.C.

Capt. L. W. Peat, Royal Canadian Artillery, Petrolia, Ont.

Capt. L. S. Pommett, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 14 Joly St., Riviere de Loup, P.Q.

Capt. J. L. Pond, Canadian Infantry Corps, 19 Benlamond Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. J. P. Pootmans, Canadian Intelligence Corps, St. Eustache Sur Le Lac, Province de Quebec.

Capt. R. J. Roberts, Royal Canadian Artillery, Wingham, Ont.

Major W. A. E. Roelofson, Canadian Infantry Corps. 272 Water St. N., Galt, Ontario.

Capt. J. H. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, 290 Melbourne Ave., E., Kildonan, Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. R. L. Segsworth, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 117 Glen Road, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. E. Seybold, Royal Canadian Artillery, 331 Lansdowne Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Chevalier of the Order of Leopold II with Palm and Croix de Guerre with Palm

Capt. W. L. Sharpe, Royal Canadian Artillery, 28 Constance St., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) B. G. Shellon, Canadian Infantry Corps, Apt. 8, 8 Hudson Bay Ave., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) A. W. Sinclair, Royal Canadian Artillery, Neepawa, Man.

Capt. R. H. Smith, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3769 Marlowe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. B. W. Snyder, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1125 West Pender St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. M. Stearns, *MBE*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 91 Glen Edyth Drive, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. G. B. Taylor, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4870 Cote des Neiges Rd., Montreal 26, P.Q.

Capt. A. R. Turnbull, Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 158 Dunlop St., Barrie, Ont.

Capt. W. A. Wilson, Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1021 Windermere Rd., Windsor, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) A. H. Wilson, Royal Canadian Artillery, 326 Main St. S., Moose Jaw, Sask.

Lieut. H. A. P. Alderesey, Royal Canadian Artillery, P.O. Box No. 21, Duncan, B.C.

Lieut. G. A. Allen, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Box 124 High River, Alta.

Lieut. M. C. M. Cameron, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Royal Bank of Canada, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

Lieut. C. H. Chirnside, Canadian Infantry Corps, 32 Hopedale Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. A. I. Clark, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Ardath, Sask.

Lieut. J. S. Drury, Canadian Infantry Corps, Petitcodiac, New Brunswick.

Capt. G. C. Embury, Canadian Provost Corps, 178 Arlington St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. J. P. Grenier, Royal Canadian Artillery, Newville, Portneuf Co., P.Q.

Capt. R. D. Livingstone, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1417 4th Ave., Lethbridge, Alta.

Capt. P. Lloyd-Craig, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 677 Manning Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

Lieut. C. W. Phelps, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Box No. 414, Minnedosa, Man.

Lieut. W. G. Speechley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 232 Home St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. D. H. Thomson, Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Beaverton, Ont.

Lieut. H. L. Van Wyck, Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 440 12th St. W., Owen Sound, Ont.

Major J. M. Veness, Canadian Infantry Corps, 777 Charlotte St., Fredericton, N.B.

Lieut. A. N. Wright, Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Box No. 91, Woodlands, Chateauguay Co., P.Q.

Croix de Guerre 1940 avec Palme

M.9052 WO I (RSM) J. E. Burman, Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 820 23rd Ave., S.E., Calgary, Alta.

M.15711 WO I (RSM) J. T. P. Ferguson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1146 127th St., Edmonton, Alta.

B.54993 WO I (RSM) J. J. Forestell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 109 Nieve St., Guelph, Ont.

D.56201 WO I (RSM) M. Gingras, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2609 St. Catherine St., Montreal, P.Q.

K.24055 WO I (RSM) G. W. Oakes, Canadian Provost Corps, Saanichton, Vancouver Island, B.C.

H.19652 WO I (RSM) S. Taylor, Canadian Infantry Corps, 141 Blenheim Ave., St. Vital, Manitoba.

D.81800 WO II (CSM) L. C. Vincent, Canadian Infantry Corps, 939 Beaumont Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B.11005 WO II (BSM) E. A. Ayers, Royal Canadian Artillery, 122 Mountville Ave., Mt. Hamilton, Ont.

B.64210 WO II (CSM) T. J. Chivers, Canadian Infantry Corps, 17 Pepler Ave., Toronto 6, Ont.

F.87843 WO II (CSM) J. L. Robertson, Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Box 198, Elmwood St., Westville, Pictou Co., N.S.

B.75547 WO II (CSM) J. A. McNamara, Canadian Infantry Corps, 832 Pape Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

B.37917 WO II (SM) W. F. P. Maloney, Canadian Infantry Corps, 25 Elgin St., Brantford, Ont.

K.62193 WO II (CSM) J. L. Nimmo, Canadian Infantry Corps, Westholme, B.C.

F.54806 WO II (CSM) D. A. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 407 Shaw St., Toronto, Ont.

C.30818 WO II (CSM) T. B. Tait, Canadian Provost Corps, 9203 112th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

A.60158 WO II (CSM) C. B. Trachsel, Canadian Infantry Corps, Shakespeare, Ont.

C.73018 WO II (RQMS) M. J. Redmond, Royal Canadian Artillery, 151 James St., Cobourg, Ont.

L.12460 CQMS M. Faille, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Herbert's Mission, via Whitewood, Sask.

B.55313 CQMS A. A. Mallon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 208 Durand St., Sarnia, Ont.

M.41163 S/Sgt. R. E. Roy, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 823 3rd Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.

D.136750 Sgt. L. S. Anton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 17c Warner St., Port of Spain, Trinidad, B.W.I.

C.5703 Sgt. H. C. Bowen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3 Grandview Ave., Peterborough, Ont.

B.20588 Sgt. L. C. Brant, Canadian Infantry Corps, 45 Bristol St., Hamilton, Ont.

83166—382

K.78890 Sgt. F. J. Bryant, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 169 East 19th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

A.22091 Sgt. S. Chamko, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1482 Westcott Rd., Windsor, Ont.

B.28731 Sgt. C. J. Dorzinsky, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 87 Main St., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

A.102783 Sgt. E. J. Gaines, Canadian Infantry Corps, 990 Erie St. E., Windsor, Ont.

L.17195 Sgt. R. Herron, Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Moosomin, Sask.

D.3136 Sgt. R. W. G. Johnson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 0681 Charlevoix St., Montreal, P.Q.

L.27983 Sgt. L. G. Klughart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 950 18th Street West, Prince Albert, Sask.

D.63473 Sgt. A. Lebouthiller, Canadian Infantry Corps, Beaubois, Gloucester Co., N.B.

L.13321 Sgt. H. Lester, Canadian Infantry Corps, Leste, Cowgroves, near Winborne, Dorset, England.

D.3216 Sgt. M. J. Lyons, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 751 Walker Ave., Montreal, P. Q.

H.42326 Sgt. W. S. Mann, Canadian Infantry Corps, Rounthwaite, Man.

A.86394 Sgt. J. H. Murrell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 379 Hamilton Rd., London, Ont.

D.66310 Sgt. J. C. A. R. Ouimet, Canadian Infantry Corps, 168 St. Faustin St., St. Jerome, P.Q.

D.41119 Sgt. G. Prefontaine, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2381 Laframboise St., St. Hyacinthe, P.Q.

D.46135 Sgt. J. S. Savard, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Coaticook, P.Q.

C.58132 Sgt. L. Shaw, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Ottawa, Ont.

B.77230 Sgt. J. B. Stone, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bank of Toronto, Toronto, Ont.

M.42131 Sgt. J. F. Tarrant, Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 234 8th Avenue N.E., Calgary, Alta.

C.79340 Sgt. H. W. Taylor, Canadian Infantry Corps, 61 Timothey St., Newmarket, Ont.

L.12666 Sgt. J. Wetsch, Canadian Infantry Corps, Taylorton, Sask.

B.55821 L/Sgt. V. A. Brown, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R. R. No. 4, Glanford Station, Ont.

B.9173 L/Sgt. B. D. Hunt, Royal Canadian Artillery, 124 Lyndhurst Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.46314 L/Sgt. P. J. Lawson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 30 Cedar Island, Orillia, Ont.

H.40701 L/Sgt. J. E. Long, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fisher Branch, Man.

A.31383 L/Sgt. A. Munro, Royal Canadian Artillery, Fergus, Ont.

B.52057 L/Sgt. A. W. Ott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 109 John Street North, Hamilton, Ont.

M.104586 Cpl. L. J. Berezay, Canadian Infantry Corps, General Delivery, Whiskey Gap, Alta.

D.71490 Cpl. S. Berry, Canadian Infantry Corps, Louise, P.Q.

A.118190 Cpl. V. A. Carroll, *MM*, Canadian Infantry Corps, Box No. 84, Corunna, Ont.

L.101734 Cpl. A. Christensen, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, General Delivery, Viscount, Sask.

L.155525 Cpl. G. A. Couse, Canadian Infantry Corps, General Delivery, Vancouver, B.C.

D.137944 Cpl. H. O. Cuthbert, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 1089 Desmarchais Blvd., Verdun, P.Q.

D.6866 Bdr. W. Cumming, Royal Canadian Artillery, 5689 Waverly St., Montreal, P.Q.

H.77692 Cpl. F. R. Gliddon, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Beausejour, Man.

K.34775 Cpl. W. E. E. Hall, Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 787 Bute St., Vancouver, B.C.

H.69920 Cpl. E. Halverson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1106 2nd St. E., Fort Frances, Ont.

D.21395 Cpl. M. J. Hunt, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 339 St. Antoine St., Lachine, P.Q.

A.49672 Cpl. J. P. King, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 2, Tilbury, Ont.

B.46610 Cpl. J. M. Craig, Canadian Infantry Corps, 29 Maple St., Merritton, Ont.

L.65119 Cpl. J. L. McGregor, Canadian Infantry Corps, Tompkins, Sask.

B.93252 Cpl. O. R. McClure, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R. R. No. 3, Newmarket, Ont.

D.26473 Cpl. J. K. Rankle, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 95-16th Ave., Lachine, P.Q.

B.55510 Cpl. P. J. Ruddy, Canadian Infantry Corps, Haileybury, Ont.

H.26543 Cpl. G. O. Scarrow, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Spy Hill, Sask.

B.63569 Cpl. A. T. Shepherd, Canadian Infantry Corps, 243 Dovercourt Rd., Toronto, Ont.

B.39639 L/Cpl. D. W. Beatty, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 4, Barrie, Ont.

B.115038 L/Cpl. E. P. Constantineau, Canadian Infantry Corps, Espanola, Ont.

G.42620 L/Cpl. T. L. Hayes, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Apohaqui, N.B.

B.136549 L/Cpl. H. W. Mitchell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 496 Montrose Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.42229 L/Cpl. D. F. Ruth, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 111 East 27th St., Vancouver, B.C.

F.77496 L/Cpl. T. Tellum, Canadian Provost Corps, Dodd St., Bridgeport, N.S.

H.37380 L/Cpl. R. M. Waddell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Box 21, Sperling, Man.

F.33340 L/Cpl. C. Wiseman, Canadian Infantry Corps, New Waterford, N.S.

B.124682 Gnr. C. J. Barlow, Royal Canadian Artillery, 96 E. 32nd St., Hamilton, Ont.

B.111666 Cfn. J. B. Abercrombie, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, St. Vincent St., Meaford Ajax, Ont.

L.22633 Rfn. J. Buschta, Canadian Infantry Corps, Candiac, Sask.

B.132754 Tpr. L. P. Clutterbuck, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 44 Wellington St., St. Catharines, Ont.

B.75270 Pte. J. H. Davidson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11 Beatty St., Chatham, Ont.

B.124716 Pte. E. S. Desjardins, Canadian Infantry Corps, 30 Wood St., Espanola, Ont.

H.104055 Spr. P. J. Fleury, The Corps of Royal Caandian Engineers, Binscarth, Man.

M.35214 Pte. A. H. Fredine, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sylvan Lake, Alta.

A.50530 Pte. H. J. Geroux, Canadian Infantry Corps, 64 Dover St., Chatham, Ont.

H.10576 Pte. D. R. Grant, Canadian Infantry Corps, Beaconia, Man.

K.66741 Gnr. D. G. Havard, *MM*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2251 Cadboro Bay Rd., Victoria, B.C.

B.91556 Pte. W. J. Hobson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 56 Arnold Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.41246 Pte. P. C. Jones, Canadian Infantry Corps, 234 Ontario St., St. Catharines, Ont.

C.103030 Pte. J. P. C. Legault, Canadian Infantry Corps, 116 Waller St., Ottawa, Ont.

K.74032 Gnr. W. E. London, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Wickham, N.B.

F.60672 Pte. P. McKearney, Canadian Infantry Corps, Westville, N.S.

F.60304 Pte. F. P. McMaster, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dundas Centre, P.E.I.

L.36439 Tpr. M. A. Martin, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Okla, Sask.

K.49288 Pte. C. G. Patriquin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 111 Nelson St., Vancouver, B.C.

L.107689 Pte. E. M. Paul, Canadian Infantry Corps, General Delivery, Indian Head, Sask.

C.10086 Pte. A. F. Popkie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Pembroke, Ont.

H.41604 Rfn. J. A. Ratte, Canadian Infantry Corps, 265 Major St., Toronto, Ont.

H.67133 Pte. J. K. J. Stokes, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 31 King St. W., Chatham, Ont.

E.11157 Pte. M. Therriault, Canadian Infantry Corps, Five Fingers, N.B.

Gen. H. D. G. Crerar, *CH, CB, DSO,* Canadian Army, Laurier Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

FOREIGN AWARDS (U.S.A.)

The Distinguished Service Cross

Lt-Col. D. A. MacKenzie, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 4 New Market Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. G. Gamache, Canadian Infantry Corps, 135 Labonte St., St. Longueil, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) I. H. Martin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 Teddington Pk., Toronto, Ont.

K.48825 Pte. R. R. Secord, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1109 Nelson St., Vancouver, B.C.

Legion of Merit, Degree of Commander

Col. O. M. Biggar, General List, 197 Clemow Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj-Gen. W. W. Foster, *CMG, DSO, VD,* Canadian Army, 2468 Ottawa Ave., Hollyburn, B.C.

Lt-Gen. G. G. Simonds, *CB, CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Brig. J. E. Genet, *CBE, MC,* Canadian Army, Kingston, Ont.

Brig. W. C. Murphy, *DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 4350 Marguaret Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Brig. N. E. Rodger, *CBE,* Canadian Army, R.R. No. 1, Hull, P.Q.

Brig. G. E. R. Smith, *CBE,* Canadian Army, 144 Wellington St., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. G. Walsh, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, Oakville, Ont.

Lt-Gen. M. A. Pope, *CB, MC,* Canadian Army, 369 Daly Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt-Gen. K. Stuart, *CB, DSO, MC,* Canadian Army, 162 Metcalfe St., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj-Gen. G. P. Vanier, *DSO, MC,* Canadian Army, 61 St. Louis St., Quebec, P.Q.

Maj-Gen. R. O. Alexander, *CB, DSO,* Canadian Army, 2551 Beach Dr., Victoria, B.C.

Maj-Gen. L. F. Page, *CB, DSO,* Canadian Army, 1109 Burnaby St., Vancouver, B.C.

General H. D. Crerar, *CH, CB, DSO,* Canadian Army, 477 Manor Rd., Rockcliffe, Ont.

Maj-Gen. G. R. Pearkes, *VC, CB, DSO, MC,* Canadian Army, Victoria, B.C.

Maj-Gen. H. F. G. Letson, *CB, CBE, MC, ED,* Canadian Army, 474 Lansdowne Rd., Rockcliffe, Ont.

First Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster to Legion of Merit, Degree of Commander

Maj-Gen. H. F. G. Letson, *CB, CBE, MC, ED,* Canadian Army, Government House, Ottawa, Ont.

Legion of Merit, Degree of Officer

Col. G. V. Gurney, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Hollis St., Halifax, N.S.

Col. (A/Brig) A. J. Creighton, *ED,* Canadian Army, 1286 West 26th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Brig. H. V. D. Laing, *CBE, ED,* Canadian Army, 53 Cambridge St., Halifax, N.S.

Brig. J. G. Gauvreau, *DSO,* Canadian Army, 2739 Maplewood Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Brig. S. F. Clark, *CBE,* Canadian Army, 176 Crescent Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Brig. C. A. Campbell, *DSO, OBE,* Canadian Army, 141 Leo Ave., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

Brig. R. A. MacFarlane, *DSO,* Canadian Army, Toronto, Ont.

Col. L. C. Montgomery, *OBE, MC,* The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 4469 Montrose Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Col. C. Sale, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4525 Klingle St. N. W., Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Major R. I. Jack, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5581 Queen Mary Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. C. H. Cook, Canadian Infantry Corps, 38 Monk St., Ottawa, Ont.

Major B. R. James, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 362 Cage Ave., S., Hamilton, Ont.

Brig. W. C. Beamer, *OBE,* Canadian Army, 6812 Selkirk Dr., Bethesda, MD., U.S.A.

Brig. W. Mavor, *CBE, MC,* Canadian Army, Sparks St., Ottawa, Ont.

Col. C. A. Krug, Canadian Infantry Corps, Salem St., Sackville, N.B.

Lt.-Col. E. Brown, *MM, ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 11602-97th St., Edmonton, Alta.

Lt.-Col. R. F. Angus, *ED,* General List, 616 Belmont Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. T. F. Flahiff, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 76 De Bernieres Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

Major N. W. Dickson, *MC,* the Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers 1028 Park Blvd., Victoria, B.C.

Major E. I. C. Wagner, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1378 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Col. J. H. Jenkins, *OBE, ED,* Canadian Army, 17 Hutchison Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Col. E. C. Thorne. The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 205 Charlotte St., Ottawa, Ont.

Major M. E. Young, Canadian Army, 102 E., 52nd St., New York, U.S.A.

Brig. A. Theriault, *CBE,* Canadian Army. Artillery Park, Quebec, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. E. M. Drake, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 161 Ruskin St., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. Gen. D. E. Dewar, *CBE,* Canadian Army. 32 Broadway Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. J. F. A. Lister, *CBE,* Canadian Army, 499 Island Park Drive, Ottawa, Ont.

Major A. H. Neufeld, The Royal Canadian Medical Corps, 4600 Draper Ave., Montreal. Que.

Col. D. B. Martyn, *DSO, MC, VD,* General List, 168 Hyland Drive, Seattle, Washington, U.S.A.

Col. (A/Brig.) J. A. MacFarlane, *OBE, ED,* Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Apt. 407, 100 Oriole Parkway, Toronto, 12, Ont.

Col. J. T. Wilson, *OBE,* The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 178 Rideau Terrace, Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. R. E. A. Diespecker, *ED,* The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1170 Camrose Cres., Victoria, B.C.

Maj. Gen. A. E. Welford, *CBE, MM, ED,* Canadian Army, 60 Arlington Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Maj. Gen. H. W. Foster, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, Wolfville, N.S.

Brig. C. C. Mann, *DSO,* Canadian Army, 494 Lansdowne Rd., Rockcliffe, Ont.

Major W. C. Percy, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 390 Frank St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. C. T. Robertson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 9 Hurondale Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Major J. R. Low, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 3726 W. 27th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. E. R. Griffiths, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3814-7th St. W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. R. M. Learmouth, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 101 Frederick St., Oshawa, Ont.

Capt. L. B. Graham, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Box 7, Calgary, Alta.

Major A. D. Odell, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 213 Dufferin Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. P. L. Debney, *MM, ED,* The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 10123 Clifton Place, Edmonton, Alta.

The Silver Star Medal

Maj. J. W. Toogood, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Haro St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. (A/Maj.) F. J. Chauvin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 939 Tuscarora St., Windsor, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) E. H. Marriott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 632 Vernon Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. H. D. Beach, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Ernfold, Sask.

Lieut. H. J. B. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, Newbury, Ont.

Lieut. J. L. Cohen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 285 Queen St. E., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

Lieut. G. A. Gibson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 431 Concord Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. J. L. Herman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Camrose, Alta.

Lieut. B. A. Nunn, Canadian Infantry Corps, 41 Lorindale Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. A. M. Young, Canadian Infantry Corps, 733 Fleet Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

H.41406 Sgt. A. F. Richardson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Atikokan, Ont.

B.79431 L/Sgt. J. A. Bullions, Canadian Infantry Corps, 475 St. Clarens Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.8865 Tpr. O. N. Nesdoly, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 335 Ave. E., South, Saskatoon, Sask.

D.1560 Sgt. C. A. Saunders, *BEM,* Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4841 Verdun Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

D.138362 L/Sgt. J. F. Appleby, *MM,* Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Charles de Caplan, P.Q.

K.69853 Pte. G. E. Hayes, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2132-47th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

The Bronze Star Medal

Major W. H. P. David, Canadian Infantry Corps, 20 Morris St., Halifax, N.S.

A.152 Sgt. E. G. Richardson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 Peglar St., London, Ont.

H.65521 Pte. G. F. LeSage, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Fort William, Ont.

B.64683 Pte. R. Wadeson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 69 Timmins St., North Bay, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. G. McQueen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 505 Aberdeen St., Medicine Hat, Alta.

Capt. D. S. MacLennan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 98 Pembroke St. W., Pembroke, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) S. C. Tanner, General List, 206 Harbison Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. K. C. MacLean, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, St. Catharines St., Westmount, P.Q.

Capt. H. D. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 175-15th Ave. E., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. J. L. Smith, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3423 Hingston Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. H. C. Fair, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kingston, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. Runcie, *MC,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. J. B. Clement, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 5 Tullis Drive, Toronto, Ont.

H/Maj. J. R. A. J. Dalcourt, Canadian Chaplain Services, Louiseville, P.Q.

Maj. D. N. D. Deane-Freeman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1305 Frontenac Ave., Calgary, Alta.

Maj. A. S. Dewar, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 109 Ruby St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. (A/Maj.) R. L. Grout, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5196 Bestburg Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. R. R. Logie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chatham, N.B.

Maj. C. C. Misener, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Fenwick, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) D. J. Casey, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 116 Main St., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

Capt. J. G. A. P. Bertrand, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5442 Decarie Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. J. G. M. Clark, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 20 Strathearn Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. A. Cowan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 40 Dufferin Ave., Brantford, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) F. P. Davidson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 355 Riverside Dr., New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.

Capt. S. L. Erwin, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1506 Chicago Blvd., Detroit, Mich., U.S.A.

Capt. F. N. Hughes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 11319-107th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. E. M. Hutchinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 256 John St., Stratford, Ont.

Capt. A. L. Lee, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3025 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. W. Johnston, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4121 Wilson Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. J. A. Bauman, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 38 Playter Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. J. W. Chivers, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 255 Cameron St. N., Kitchener, Ont.

Lieut. R. P. Henderson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3108 Lewiston Ave., Berkley, Cal., U.S.A.

Lieut. C. A. Middleton-Hope, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 2061 St. Luke, Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. N. J. Paithouski, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 589 Vidal St. S., Sarnia, Ont.

D.98555 WO I (RSM) E. C. Harper, Canadian Provost Corps, 5482 Coolbrook Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

K.25201 WO I (RSM) F. A. MacVicar, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 966 13th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.

B.11 WO II (SQMS) K. E. Haines, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Point Anne, Ont.

B.77178 WO II (CSM) J. P. Spence, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

B.9930 S/Sgt. G. B. Stewart, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 29 William St., St. Catharines, Ont.

A.37405 Sgt. J. C. Aitken, Canadian Infantry Corps, 90 Northumberland St., Guelph, Ont.

F.6118 Sgt. A. L. Fitz-Randolph, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Port Mouton, N.B.

D.3854 Sgt. R. Lumsden, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1365 Bernard Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B.64232 Sgt. L. C. Warner, Canadian Infantry Corps, Port Dalhousie, Ont.

H.26309 Sgt. D. G. Welland, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, McCreary, Man.

B.67030 Sgt. E. W. Wrightman, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Newmarket, Ont.

M.63560 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) G. F. Johnson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 654 Harris Rd., New Westminster, B.C.

A.723 L/Sgt. G. H. Doescher, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1823 Broad St., Schenectady, N.Y., U.S.A.

F.54673 Cpl. J. B. MacNeil, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Reserve Mines, N.S.

F.56187 Cpl. L. W. Patterson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Tennecape, N.S.

D.129323 L/Cpl. J. D. M. Martel, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1400 Rue Galt, Montreal, P.Q.

L.19293 L/Cpl. J. Watson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Silver King Rd., Nelson, B.C.

B.22378 Gnr. H. J. Horning, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. No. 1, Ancaster, Ont.

H.20721 Pte. J. R. De Garmo, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

L.102702 Pte. H. Genge, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dafoe, Sask.

L.102978 Spr. C. J. Christenson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Ridgedale, Sask.

Capt. C. T. Robertson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 9 Hurondale Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt-Col. G. C. Corbould, *DSO, ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 503-6th Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

Major E. M. D. McNaughton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 28B Goulburn Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. J. H. Horton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Edmonton, Alta.

K.15094 Sgt. A. P. Knudsen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Box 336, Penticton, B.C.

L.12988 Sgt. P. Makurak, Canadian Provost Corps, Whitefox, Sask.

Medal of Freedom with Silver Palm

Capt. L. A. Dumais, *MC, MM,* General List, 1659 St. Luc St., Montreal 25, P.Q.

Lieut. R. J. M. Labrosse, *MC,* Canadian Intelligence Corps, 396 Daly Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. R. Vanier, *MM,* General List, Ottawa, Ont.

Medal of Freedom with Bronze Palm

Lt-Col. A. K. Robertson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Struan Lodge, Kaleden, B.C.

Lt-Col. M. L. Derome, *OBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 5272 Mentana St., Montreal, P.Q.

Major (A/Lt-Col.) C. F. Swannell, General List, 1255 Topaz Ave., Victoria, B.C.

Medal of Freedom

Lt-Col. T. L. Bullock, General List, 59 Montee, Ste. Marie, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.

Major (A/Lt-Col.) N. Ignatieff, *MBE,* The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 121 Carleton Rd., Rockcliffe, Ont.

FOREIGN AWARDS (CZECHOSLOVAKIA)

Order of the White Lion for Victory

General H. D. G. Crerar, *CH, CB, DSO,* Canadian Army, 477 Manor Rd., Rockcliffe, Ont.

Order of the White Lion (1st Class)

General H. D. G. Crerar, *CH, CB, DSO,* Canadian Army, 477 Manor Rd., Rockcliffe, Ont.

Order of the White Lion (2nd Class)

Lieut-Gen. J. C. Murchie, *CB, CBE,* Canadian Army, 452 Laurier Ave. E., Ottawa, Ont.

Order of the White Lion (3rd Class)

Brigadier J. A. De Lalanne, *CBE, MC,* Canadian Army, 633 Lansdowne Ave., Westmount, Que.

Brigadier W. H. S. Macklin, *CBE,* Canadian Army, 202 Cloverdale Rd., Rockcliffe, Ont.

Colonel S. Echenberg, *OBE, ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 86 Court St., Sherbrooke, Que.

Colonel J. H. Jenkins, *OBE, ED,* The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 28 Lakeside Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Order of the White Lion (4th Class)

Colonel G. S. Kinney, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 42 Park Ave., Apt. 2, Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut.-Col. A/Col. A. L. Delahaye, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 192A Sparks, St., Ottawa, Ont.

Major J. D. Gibson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4203 Oxford Ave., Montreal, Que.

War Cross 1939

General H. D. G. Crerar, *CH, CB, DSO,* Canadian Army, 477 Manor Road, Rockcliffe, Ont.

Lt.-Gen. J. C. Murchie, *CB, CBE,* Canadian Army, 452 Laurier Ave. E., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut.-Col. J. W. Weir, *OBE,* General List, 2519 West 1st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut-Col. V. McKenna, *MC, ED,* The Royal Canadian Artillery, 612 View St., Victoria, B.C.

The Military Cross

Brig. G. E. Beament, *OBE, ED,* Canadian Army, 9 Marlborough Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. W. B. G. Reynolds, General List, 95 Strathcona Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. D. D. Sweeting, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1162 Fort St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. (A/Maj.) T. J. E. McClelland, General List, 204 Percival Ave.. Montreal, W., P.Q.

The Medal for Merit (First Class)

Capt. I. H. Gullion, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1976 Drummond Rd., Niagara Falls, Ont.

FOREIGN AWARDS (POLISH)

Virtuti Militari (5th Class)

General H. D. G. Crerar, *CH, CB, DSO*, Canadian Army, 477 Manor Rd., Rockcliffe, Ont.

FOREIGN AWARDS (DUTCH)

Militaire Willems Orde, Degree of Knight of the Fourth Class

Maj. H. P. Falloon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 90 Hillfield Rd., London, NW 6, England.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) R. Caron, Canadian Infantry Corps, 17 St. Ursule, Quebec, P.Q.

Lieut. J. C. B. Forbes, Canadian Infantry Corps, 225 St. Jerome St., Matane, P.Q.

Lieut. K. C. Liddell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4250 Marcil Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. G. L. Mason, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11 St. Andrew's Rd., St. Vital, Man.

L.154040 Sgt. W. H. Kirk, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vernon, B.C.

F.60646 L/Cpl. J. W. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 1, Newport, P.E.I.

D.131732 L/Cpl. H. R. Myatt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2042 Oxford Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

F.82234 Gnr. J. E. Gillis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Howlan, P.E.I.

Bronze Cross

Major J. M. Cousins, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 417 Sheridan St., Peterborough, Ont.

Major H. M. Gandier, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Meaford, Ont.

Major C. B. Robertson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 36 St. Clair Ave. E., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. A. E. Baker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 127 Helendale Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. E. G. Barton, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 283 Helmcken Rd., Victoria, B.C.

Capt. G. H. Burke, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4508 West 14th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. K. S. D. Corsan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 866 Newport Ave., Victoria, B.C.

Capt. W. F. Davey, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 720 Parkdale Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. D. W. Francis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Whitewood, Sask.

Capt. N. T. Gray, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 356 E. 26th Ave., Vancouver, B.C. B.C.

Capt. D. W. McDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 51 Durril St., North Bay, Ont.

Capt. J. S. Nelles, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2912 Rae St., Regina, Sask.

Capt. F. C. Nelson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, R.R. No. 1, Smithville, Ont.

Capt. C. F. Oerton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 571 George St., Woodstock, Ont.

Capt. D. E. Stewart, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Woodstock, N.B.

Capt. W. D. Tipper, Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 West St., Huntsville, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) L.-P. Lambert, Canadian Infantry Corps, 216 Rue St. Laurent, Levis, P.Q.

Lt. (A/Capt.) J. D. Riddell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 97 Berkshire Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. S. Brody, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Woodstock, N.B.

Lieut. G. C. Edwards, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Melfort, Sask.

Lieut. R. E. Homer-Dixon, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. W. A. Lawson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chester, N.S.

Lieut. W. C. Long, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Clear Water, B.C.

Lieut. A. W. McLaughlin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Stanley, N.B.

Lieut. K. F. Prueter, Canadian Infantry Corps, Colborne St., Oakville, Ont.

Lieut. C. M. Sullivan, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 86 Mecklenburg St., Saint John, N.B.

Lieut. W. S. Wills, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Northport, Ont.

H.45623 WO I (RSM) W. D. Clark, Canadian Infantry Corps, 321 Dacre St., Port Arthur, Ont.

L.27140 WO I (RSM) W. A. Edwards, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1371 Donald St., North Battleford, Sask.

D.250 WO II (BSM) L. A. Archambault, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4919 Notre Dame St. E., Montreal, P.Q.

H.46055 WO II (CSM) J. V. Bennett, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

M.5059 WO II (SSM) C. Dobson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1201-20th Ave. N.W., Calgary, Alta.

M.35901 WO II (SSM) S. Dyson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 112 Victoria Rd., Nanaimo, B.C.

K.1116 WO II (SSM) E. H. Ewert, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 7811 Angus Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

A.63215 WO II (CSM) F. J. Fleming, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 384 London Rd., Sarnia, Ont.

H.19826 WO II (CSM) J. Forbes, Canadian Infantry Corps, Keewatin, Ont.

A.63329 WO II (CSM) O. J. Laramie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1416 Ouellette Ave., Windsor, Ont.

F.43555 WO II (CSM) E. E. Nauss, Canadian Infantry Corps, Mahone Bay, N.S.

E.0220 WO II (CSM) C. E. Ouellet, Canadian Infantry Corps, 231 St. Georges St., Levis, P.Q.

A.34934 WO II (SSM) I. Sargent, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Fergus, Ont.

G.47199 S/Sgt. (A/WO II, RQMS) M. J. Steele, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Bathurst, N.B.

A.22605 CQMS L. A. Belland, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1703 Benjamin Ave., Windsor, Ont.

K.47422 CQMS J. Drake, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1921 Whyte Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

B.73465 CQMS W. Fraser, Canadian Infantry Corps, 73 Oakwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.75954 CQMS. W. C. Skarott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 47 Ravina Cres., Toronto, Ont.

F.55579 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM.) R. Gillan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Florence, N.S.

D.83217 Sgt. (A/WO II, RQMS) R. S. Thurman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

G.22414 Sgt. H. J. Arseneau, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bathurst, N.B.

C.20691 Sgt. H. E. Bird, Canadian Infantry Corjs, 3 Bertrand St., Ottawa, Ont.

K.57063 Sgt. J. A. Bond, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1195 Palmer Rd., Victoria, B.C.

H.40784 Sgt. T. G. Brant, Canadian Infantry Corps, Markstay, Ont.

B.45175 Sgt. C. J. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, 173 Douro St., Stratford, Ont.

D.82797 Sgt. H. J. Caldwell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Matapedia, P.Q.

C.118516 Sgt. P. G. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hillier, Ont.

D.72027 Sgt. W. Clark, Canadian Infantry Corps, 251 Ardie Rd., Toronto, Ont.

F.34897 Sgt. D. A. Corkum, Canadian Infantry Corps, 14 Albert St., Dartmouth, N.S.

K.53959 Sgt. J. Hale, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Penticton, B.C.

E.21899 Sgt. T. Harper, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Bury, P.Q.

M.44890 Sgt. A. M. Holmes, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps. Sterco, Alta.

D.36532 Sgt. R. P. C. Jette, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Ville Annette, P.Q.

B.41247 Sgt. R. Johnson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Queenston, Ont.

A.28014 Sgt. R. J. Johnston, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 101 Victoria Rd., Guelph, Ont.

B.76245 Sgt. N. L. Kemp, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oakville, Ont.

H.26040 Sgt. A. J. Kirk, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 376 Sumack St., Toronto, Ont.

C.57565 Sgt. A. Lawton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oakleaf (Soperton), Ont.

D.105711 Sgt. E. J. LeBlanc, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Dalhousie, N.B.

B.76787 Sgt. E. W. Lewis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 92 Bedford Park, Toronto, Ont.

K.45218 Sgt. N. A. MacLellan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 273-21st Ave. E., Vancouver, B.C.

D.26883 Sgt. J. I. Muir, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 856½ St. Vallier St., Quebec, P.Q.

A.10064 Sgt. L. A. Nahmabin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sarnia Reserve, Ont.

B.112877 Sgt. R. R. Nethery, Canadian Infantry Corps, North Cobalt. Ont.

G.28017 Sgt. H. J. Newman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 250 Duke St., West Saint John, N.B.

A.17273 Sgt. J. W. Ollerenshaw, The Royal Canadian Artillery, East Confederation St., Sarnia, Ont.

D.56835 Sgt. D. Paquin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 89 St. Charles St. St. Therese De Bienville, P.Q.

M.44903 Sgt. W. G. W. Penney, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Calgary, Alta.

B.65684 Sgt. N. J. Perry, Canadian Infantry Corps, 73 Northbridge Ave., Toronto, Ont.

D.123532 Sgt. R. B. Quinnett, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 69-4th Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

B.51715 Sgt. E. J. Roberts, Canadian Infantry Corps, Church St., Oakville, Ont.

D.91478 Sgt. W. A. Rose, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 18 Maple St., Ville St. Pierre, P.Q.

M.35324 Sgt. P. A. Rylaarsdam, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vega, Alta.

F.40702 Sgt. J. E. Salsman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 416 Kempt Rd., Halifax, N.S.

M.55892 Sgt. C. R. Sharp, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 214-14th Ave., N.E., Calgary, Alta.

A.38238 Sgt. P. J. Steinman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Woodstock St., Tavistock, Ont.

K.85230 Sgt. E. A. Strom, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kyle, Sask.

K.53474 Sgt. D. A. Thibodeau, Canadian Infantry Corps, Plaster Rock, N.B.

B.37428 Sgt. L. R. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 4 Dundas, Ont.

C.33813 L/Sgt. E. R. Barber, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Haley Station, Ont.

L.1632 L/Sgt. R. J. Graham, Canadian Infantry Corps, Marsden, Sask.

L.28291 L/Sgt. A. J. Mishak, Canadian Infantry Corps, Camperville, Ont.

M.24212 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) S. W. Gouldie, Canadian Provost Corps, Carbon, Alta.

F.14235 Bdr. G. W. Bentley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 148 Cumberland St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

B.38763 Cpl. A. Burgin, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 54 Rosevear Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.18 Bdr. G. O. Christianson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Lethbridge, Alta.

P.40175 Cpl. J. C. Fooks, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 7 Cherokee Ave., Centre Island, Toronto, Ont.

D.51389 Cpl. D. A. Genest, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1656 Sanquinet St., Montreal, P.Q.

L.27120 Cpl. C. Gugins, Canadian Infantry Corps, Simpson, Sask.

H.77451 Cpl. L. E. Holmstrom, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 643 Langside St., Winnipeg, Man.

M.106087 Cpl. W. Lawrence, Canadian Infantry Corps, 9357-98A St., Edmonton, Alta.

H.41386 Cpl. R. A. Monaghan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Morden, Man.

B.55103 Cpl. H. Moss, Canadian Infantry Corps, 255 Birch St. N., Timmins, Ont.

M.41724 Cpl. A. T. Mould, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Coultus Lake, B.C.

G.14119 Cpl. W. O. Pearson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 340 King St., Fredericton, N.B.

B.68418 Cpl. J. W. Rees, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1066 Ellis Lane, Niagara Falls, Ont.

M.55253 Cpl. H. Roberts, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Stettler, Alta.

H.101331 Cpl. C. D. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, Black Hawk, Ont.

D.166485 Cpl. W. A. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lemesurier, P.Q.

K.51469 Cpl. A. A. Staub, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chief Lake, B.C.

B.105095 Cpl. A. H. Stroud, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dunbarton, Ont.

G.32678 Cpl. F. E. Webb, Canadian Infantry Corps, Tracy, N.B.

B.8068 L/Bdr. P. Beaver, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Wilsonville, Ont.

M.39016 L/Cpl. L. A. Dahms, Canadian Infantry Corps, Wetaskiwin, Alta.

C.53950 L/Cpl. H. J. K. Edwards, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lakefield, Ont.

H.101659 L/Cpl. F. Pressey, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, The Pas, Man.

B.40939 L/Cpl. K. E. Rowland, Canadian Infantry Corps, 18 Facer St., St. Catharines, Ont.

K.46848 L/Cpl. L. P. Rundvall, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ross Spur, B.C.

B.126608 L/Cpl. E. Santala, Canadian Infantry Corps, Nairn Centre, Ont.

M.67421 L/Cpl. E. Smashnuk, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bezanson, Alta.

M.103802 L/Cpl. B. Tangen, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Poplar Hill, Alta.

C.12483 L/Cpl. F. R. Weatherdon, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Carp, Ont.

H.102525 L/Cpl. J. White, Canadian Infantry Corps, 154 Jefferson Ave., West Kildonan, Man.

B.87309 L/Cpl. R. E. Wiebe, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Wessesley, Ont.

B.17645 L/Bdr. J. Windsor, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 8 Rebecca St., Oakville, Ont.

L.104277 Pte. (A/Sgt.) H. W. Lougheed, Canadian Infantry Corps, Wartime, Sask.

B.38032 Pte. (A/Cpl.) F. T. L. Casey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 16 Eastbourne Ave., Brantford, Ont.

M.101911 Tpr. J. D. Adair, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Campsie, Alta.

C.1330 Cfn. F. P. Archer, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 701 George St., Peterborough, Ont.

D.57365 Pte. G. Blain, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5518-9th Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

H.101553 Pte. A. Brauner, Canadian Infantry Corps, Birch River, Man.

B.143350 Pte. N. E. Fisher, Canadian Infantry Corps, 203 Livingstone Ave., Toronto, Ont.

M.35214 Pte. A. H. Fredine, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sylvan Lake, Alta.

H.67085 Gnr. L. H. Gray, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1839 William Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

H.43089 Pte. M. M. Gregor, Canadian Infantry Corps, South Gillies, Ont.

B.118695 Pte. R. F. Grow, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 4, St. Catharines, Ont.

K.41247 Gnr. D. P. Hamilton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 173 Glengarry Ave., Windsor, Ont.

K.13068 Gnr. C. E. Head, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3554 West-33rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

A.49633 Pte. A. J. Hiller, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1970 Westminster Blvd., Windsor, Ont.

C.10152 Pte. D. M. MacCuaig, Canadian Infantry Corps, Alexandria, Ont.

B.75337 Pte. J. L. McNickle, Canadian Infantry Corps, 16 Frichot St., Toronto, Ont.

K.46172 Tpr. G. Monich, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Vernon, B.C.

D.62461 Pte. G. Morley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Laprairie, P.Q.

B.38822 Pte. R. J. O'Leary, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bain Ave., Toronto, Ont.

H.36483 Spr. W. Owchar, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 831 Montrose Ave., East Kildonan, Man.

G.3109 Gnr. H. J. Porter, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 16 South St., Dartmouth, N.S.

H.101932 Pte. N. C. Renwick, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Goodlands, Man.

A.106855 Pte. G. L. Soper, Canadian Infantry Corps, 20 Maple St., St. Thomas, Ont.

G.50234 Pte. F. R. Tait, Canadian Infantry Corps, 80 Eastbourne Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

F.86870 Spr. A. J. Theriault, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Christmas Island, N.S.

E.106694 Pte. L. Turcotte, Canadian Infantry Corps, Val Brilliant, P.Q.

G.57558 Pte. E. Vienneau, Canadian Infantry Corps, Robertville, N.B.

H.103555 Rfn. O. F. Walsh, Canadian Infantry Corps, 261 Trinity St., Winnipeg, Man.

K.2004 Pte. J. M. Walton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fort Fraser, B.C.

B.66076 Rfn. C. Williams, Canadian Infantry Corps, 143 A. Gosburn Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C.63539 Gnr. R. A. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 339 London St., Peterborough, Ont.

Brig. J. N. Lane, *DSO*, Canadian Army, Halifax, N.S.

Lt.-Col. J. R. O. Counsell, *DSO*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 965 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. D. G. Crofton, *ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.M.D. No. 1, Ganges, B.C.

Lt.-Col. L. H. C. Payne, Canadian Infantry Corps, 223 Spadina Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. S. M. Lett, *DSO*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 87 St. Clements Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. G. D. deS. Wotherspoon, *DSO, ED*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 8 Edgewood Cres., Toronto, Ont.

Major D. G. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, Manor, Sask.

Maj. H. W. Caldwell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 14 Walker Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. D. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 179 College St., St. James, Man.

Maj. N. Hickling, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.

Maj. L. Lacroix, *MC*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 438½ St. Joseph St., Quebec, P.Q.

Maj. A. Landale, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 437 Monterey St., Victoria, B.C.

Maj. F. Lee, Canadian Infantry Corps, 717 7th Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask.

Maj. D. J. McCordic, Canadian Infantry Corps, 27 Wrenson Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. B. A. Oulton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cape Tormentine, N.B.

Maj. C. S. Platts, Canadian Infantry Corps, 205 Amherst Ave., St. James, Man.

Maj. M. L. Tucker, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 498 Lansdowne Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) G. E. Bergeron, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2007 rue Mansfield, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Maj.) J. D. Pickup, Canadian Infantry Corps, 116 Glenayr Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. G. A. Gallagher, Canadian Infantry Corps, Port McNicoll, Ont.

Capt. G. C. Goff, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Cliff Rd., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Capt. A. R. Hanna, Canadian Infantry Corps, Craik, Sask.

Capt. G. R. Kenney, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 63 Price St., London, Ont.

Capt. B. S. Lewis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 105 St. James St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. C. D. Muir, Canadian Infantry Corps, 428 Niagara St., Fort Erie, Ont.

Capt. R. W. Paterson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 423 Third Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. J. E. C. Soucie, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Moonbeam, Ont.

Capt. V. C. Stilwell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 305 Eugenie St., Norwood, Man.

Capt. W. H. Whiteside, Canadian Infantry Corps, Main St., Simcoe, Ont.

Capt. R. A. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, 153 Egerton St., London, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) C. J. Jeffrey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 129 Park Ave., Chatham, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. B. Menzies, Canadian Infantry Corps, 389 Queen St. S., Kitchener, Ont.

Lieut. S. A. Anderson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 311 Bowman Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. C. Burgoyne, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Plumas, Man.

Lieut. L. J. Chadwick, Royal Canadian Armour Corps, 4800 Cote Des Neiges Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. G. W. Grant, Canadian Infantry Corps, 52 Harriet St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. I. M. Gray, Canadian Infantry Corps, 24 Eastbourne Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. F. M. Groff, Canadian Infantry Corps, 391 Scarborough Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. P. M. Hedley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sherbrooke, N.S.

Lieut. J. F. Lambert, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. J. R. Martin, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 377 Brock St., Kingston, Ont.

Lieut. J. J. McKerrow, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 1056 William St., London, Ont.

Lieut. M. S. Muir, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 4, Norton, N.B.

Lieut. P. E. Piche, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1804 Notre Dame, Three Rivers, P.Q.

Lieut. G. G. Pitt, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 103 Paradise Row, Saint John, N.B.

Lieut. R. E. Purves, Canadian Infantry Corps, 25 Marlborough Rd., Port Arthur, Ont.

Lieut. J. S. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 468 Reid St., Peterborough, Ont.

Lieut. W. H. Sparrow, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3295 Cedar Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Lieut. D. J. Thomas, Canadian Infantry Corps, 20 Glen Elm Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. E. R. Thompson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Albany, P.E.I.

B.36951 WO II (CSM) G. W. A. Booker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 90 Haddon Ave., S., Hamilton, Ont.

C.40012 WO II (SSM) C. W. Brown, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 628 Gilmour St., Ottawa, Ont.

B.77106 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) M. Mooney, Canadian Infantry Corps, 15817 Littlefield St., Detroit. Mich., U.S.A.

B.52289 Sgt. C. A. Beck, Canadian Infantry Corps, 137 Main St., Humberstone, Ont.

A.50244 Sgt. J. E. Browell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 77½ Wigle St., Leamington, Ont.

D.150059 Sgt. A. R. Carriere, Canadian Infantry Corps, Magog, P.Q.

M.12601 Sgt. D. Ferguson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Provost, Alta.

H.9443 Sgt. J. Goodall, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lac Du Bonnet, Man.

C.103107 Sgt. T. H. Hamilton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Iroquois Falls, Ont.

H.26451 Sgt. J. Hyslop, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 5, Winnipeg, Man.

D.26934 Sgt. W. M. Irvine, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 10545 Blvd. Desormes, Montreal, P.Q.

C.9599 Sgt. R. Lalonde, Canadian Infantry Corps, L'Orignal, Ont.

D.13165 Sgt. A. Levasseur, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lac Megantic, P.Q.

A.49707 Sgt. E. H. Levitt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 264 Cameron St., Sarnia, Ont.

G.32351 Sgt. F. W. Lucas, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chipman, N.B.

F.45174 Sgt. W. L. MacKay, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. No. 4, River John, N.S.

G.18648 Sgt. J. A. Ouellet, Canadian Infantry Corps, Notre Dame du Lac, P.Q.

G.22212 Sgt. A. J. Payne, Canadian Infantry Corps, Campbellton, N.B.

P.3173 Sgt. C. Wilkinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.

L.1443 L/Sgt. W. K. Bergmann, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dundurn, Sask.

C.2631 L/Sgt. J. W. Bryan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 323 Dennis Ave., Peterborough, Ont.

B.24330 L/Sgt. G. R. Chard, Canadian Infantry Corps, 113 Vaughan Rd., Toronto, Ont.

A.5031 L/Sgt. F. W. Lloyd, Canadian Infantry Corps, 459A Roncesvalles Ave., Toronto, Ont.

L.103972 L/Sgt. J. C. P. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, The Pas, Man.

B.27677 L/Sgt. W. L. Manning, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Ailsa Craig, Ont.

B.142765 L/Sgt. T. P. Mulvihill, Canadian Infantry Corps, 85 Tower St., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

C.90054 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) P. J. Hart, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 215 Florence St., Ottawa, Ont.

E.10510 Cpl. W. Arseneault, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2050 Berri St., Montreal, P.Q.

A.82163 Cpl. S. E. Bremner, Canadian Infantry Corps, 110 Edward St., Kitchener, Ont.

B.270 Cpl. W. R. Copeland, Canadian Infantry Corps, 99 Gerrish St., Halifax, N.S.

B.41077 Cpl. T. Craigen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 12 Steiner St., Toronto, Ont.

H.26711 Cpl. H. Creek, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Rosewood, Man.

B.79105 Cpl. R. Curry, Canadian Infantry Corps, Zina St., Orangeville, Ont.

D.129186 Cpl. J. P. Daignault, Canadian Infantry Corps, 23371A Rosemount Blvd., Montreal, P. Q.

H.20117 Cpl. J. A. Elliott, Canadian Infantry Corps, Swan River, Man.

B.143862 Cpl. W. E. Firlotte, Canadian Infantry Corps, 14½ King St. W., Hamilton, Ont.

L.53642 Cpl. C. M. Foulds, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 1, Vawn, Sask.

L.101765 Cpl. A. L. Fraser, Canadian Infantry Corps, Carrot River, Sask.

K.37107 Cpl. J. P. Kennedy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3657 W. 29th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

L.84624 Cpl. C. H. D. McGregor, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 4925-7th Ave., Regina, Sask.

D.77494 Cpl. J. R. McKay, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 374 Willibrord Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

B.143355 Cpl. W. F. Moffat, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1121 Broadview Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.62895 Cpl. F. J. Nicol, Canadian Infantry Corps, Charlton Place, Ont.

M.105556 Cpl. W. Paradis, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ashmont, Alta.

M.7176 Cpl. A. W. Robinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11233-94th St., Edmonton, Alta.

M.60703 Cpl. W. J. H. Sherring, Canadian Infantry Corps, Frank, Alta.

L.106152 Cpl. C. V. Thomas, Canadian Infantry Corps, 73 Beechwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C.58524 L/Cpl. A. J. Dunn, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 76 Schofield Ave., Brockville, Ont.

B.54733 L/Cpl. C. A. Evans, Canadian Infantry Corps, 66 Queen St., Kirkland Lake, Ont.

K.69305 L/Cpl. J. A. McKay, Canadian Infantry Corps, Enderby, B.C.

B.138031 L/Cpl. G. S. R. McVay, Canadian Infantry Corps, 206 Howland Ave., Toronto, Ont.

K.50935 L/Cpl. L. G. Mitchell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 106 Templeton Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

G.416 Pte. (A/Cpl.) E. G. Harvey, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, R.R. No. 1, Petitcodiac, N.B.

D.16595 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. A. L. H. Martin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 273 St. Augustin, Montreal, P.Q.

D.3210 Pte. (A/Cpl.) A Sheppard, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 79 Labante Ave., Longueuil, P.Q.

L.154062 Pte. (A/Cpl.) M. W. Silvius, Canadian Infantry Corps, Malpole, Sask.

F.59685 Pte. W. J. Cousins, Canadian Infantry Corps, 51 Cornwall St., Amherst, N.S.

B.102081 Pte. E. J. Demers, Canadian Infantry Corps, Corbeil, Ont.

M.105172 Pte. D. Dodd, Canadian Infantry Corps, Arbury, Sask.

F.45690 Pte. P. E. Faulkenham, Canadian Infantry Corps, Parrsboro, N.S.

D.95733 Pte. I. Galganov, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4537 Park Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

F.31534 Pte. I. G. Gallant, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oyster Bed Bridge, P.E.I.

M.33971 Pte. W. A. Gilmour, Canadian Infanary Corps, R.R. No. 1, Mannville, Alta.

C.29945 Pte. H. P. Hackett, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 287 Beach Ave., Toronto, Ont.

B.64826 Rfn. J. W. L. Johnston, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hearst, Ont.

D.141924 Pte. M. Lacasse, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8113 Boyer, Montreal, P.Q.

G.5843 Pte. J. B. Lynch, Canadian Infantry Corps, 53 McKiel St., Fairville, N.B.

C.77534 Pte. M. Mines, Canadian Infantry Corps, 627 Beresford St., Montreal, P.Q.

B.45874 Pte. J. J. Murie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 280 Stanley Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

E.10216 Pte. R. Nadeau, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Alexandre St., Kamouraska, P.Q.

B.117326 Rfn. H. H. Nugent, Canadian Infantry Corps, 226 Tresane St., Oshawa, Ont.

E.11170 Pte. A. Racine, Canadian Infantry Corps, 20 Rue Julian, Quebec, P.Q.

H.40731 Pte. W. G. Reid, Canadian Infantry Corps, Onanole, Man.

K.71271 Pte. R. H. Rideout, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

M.45128 Tpr. G. Schmitz, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Youngstown, Alta.

L.56028 Gnr. A. W. Scott, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Palo, Sask.

B.42754 Pte. L. J. E. Wells, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1011 Burdett Ave., Victoria, B.C.

L.107008 Pte. S. Yakubowich, Canadian Infantry Corps, Yorkton, Sask.

Lieut. H. B. Spence, Canadian Infantry Corps, 84 Hillcrest Drive, Toronto, Ont.

Grand Officer of the Order of Orange-Nassau
(with Swords)

Lt.-Gen. G. G. Simmonds, *CB, CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj.-Gen. (A/Lt.-Gen.) C. Foulkes, *CB, CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, 100 Lisgar Rd., Rockcliffe, Ont.

Maj.-Gen. B. M. Hoffmeister, *CB, CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 4749 Belmont Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Brig. (A/Maj-Qen.) A. B. Matthews, *CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 3 Clarendon Cresc., Toronto, Ont.

Brig. (A/Maj.-Gen.) D. E. Dewar, *CBE,* Canadian Army, 32 Broadway Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Commander of the Order of Orange-Nassau
(with Swords)

Brig. S. F. Clark, *CBE,* Canadian Army, 30 Cooper St., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. G. R. D. Farmer, *CBE, ED,* Canadian Army, 129 Herkimer St., Hamilton, Ont.

Brig. D. G. J. Farquharson, *OBE,* Canadian Army, Toronto, Ont.

Brig. W. P. Gilbride, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, 7 Brock Ave. N., Montreal, West, P.Q.

Brig. G. Kitching, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, Montreal, P.Q.

Brig. H. V. D. Laing, *CBE, ED,* Canadian Army, 53 Cambridge St., Halifax, N.S.

Brig. J. F. A. Lister, *CBE,* Canadian Army, 2149 Granite St., Victoria, B.C.

Brig. C. C. Mann, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, R.R. No. 1 York Mills, Ont.

Brig. E. C. Plow, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, Kingston, Ont.

Brig. J. A. Roberts, *DSO,* Canadian Army, 150 Balmoral Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Brig. G. W. Robinson, Canadian Army, 277 Regent St., London, Ont.

Brig. N. E. Rodger, *CBE,* Canadian Army, 494 Lansdowne Rd., Rockcliffe, Ont.

Brig. P. A. S. Todd, *DSO, OBE, ED,* Canadian Army, 228 Rideau Terrace, Ottawa Ont.

Brig. W. B. Wedd *CBE DSO MC ED* Canadian Army, Park Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Brig. W. S. Ziegler, *DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, 10917-81st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Col. (A/Brig.) B. Matthews, *OBE,* Canadian Army, 123 Richview Ave., Forest Hill Village, Ont.

Col. O. H. Barrett, *OBE,* The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Toronto, Ont.

Col. P. C. Gaboury, *ED,* The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2634 Cote St. Catherine Rd., Montreal, P.Q.

Col. A. F. B. Knight, *OBE,* General List, 588 Greenwood Place, Winnipeg, Man.

Col. J. W. McClain, *OBE, ED,* General List, 29 Dunbar Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Col. H. L. Meuser, *OBE,* The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Lancaster, Ont.

Col. P. E. R. Wright *OBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 Rosedale Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj.-Gen. E. J. Renaud, *CB, CBE,* Canadian Army, Headquarters, Quebec Command, 3530 Atwater Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Brig. D. J. MacDonald, *CBE, DSO, MC,* Canadian Army, Four Winds Farm, Scarborough Junction, Toronto, Ont.

Brig. R. J. Orde, *CBE,* Canadian Army, 425 Daly Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. E. R. Suttie, *CBE, DSO, ED,* Canadian Army, Yarmouth, N.S.

Col. J. S. Adam, *OBE, ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 900 Hampshire Rd., Victoria, B.C.

Col. J. J. Hurley, *OBE, ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 104 Williams St., Brantford, Ont.

Brig. T. F. Flahiff, Canadian Army, 76 De Bernieres Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

Col. M. W. Kynch, *OBE, ED,* General List, 150 Argyle Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. G. P. Henderson, *OBE, ED,* Canadian Army, 4876 Grosvenor Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Brig. G. Walsh, *CBE, DSO,* Canadian Army, HQ Northwest Highway System, Whitehorse, Yukon.

Lt.-Col. (A/Col.) H. S. Griffin, *DSO,* The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5041 Glencairn Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. R. A. Bradburn, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 12312-10th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Lt.-Col. P. S. Cooper, *OBE,* General List, 117 Sunnyside Blvd, St. James, Man.

Lt.-Col. E. W. Cormack, *OBE, ED,* The Royal Canadian Artillery, Alix, Alta.

Lt.-Col. J. A. D. Craig, *MBE, ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 204 Heath St. W., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. F. W. Cranston, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Madawaska St., Arnprior, Ont.

Lt.-Col. T. L. Davies, *MBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 467 Oriole Parkway, Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. M. L. Derome, *OBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 5272 Mentona St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. K. D. Landell, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 974 St. Antoine St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. Lochead, *ED,* The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Hudson, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. W. S. Murdoch, *MBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 5-1535 W. 13th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt.-Col. G. F. C. Pangman, *OBE, ED,* General List, 45 Blair Rd., Galt, Ont.

Lt.-Col. F. L. Price, *ED,* General List, 135 Aberdeen St. Fredericton N.B.

Lt.-Col. W. C. Riley, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 33-A Middle Gate, Winnipeg, Man.

Lt.-Col. R. P. Rothschild, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 69 St. Jacques St., St. John's, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. E. G. Shannon, *OBE,* The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 170 Concord St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. T. E. Sisson, *OBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 8 Chippewa Cres., Centre Island, Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. E. M. Smith, *DSO,* Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 190 Carling Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. V. Stott, *DSO,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 3033-6th St. W., Calgary, Alta.

Lt.-Col. P. H. Tedman, *OBE,* The Royal Canadian Artillery, 67 Farnham Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. The Lord Tweedsmuir, *OBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, Elsfield Manor, Oxfordshire, Eng.

Officer of the Order of Orange-Nassau
(with Swords)

Lt.-Col. E. W. Whelpton, *MBE,* General List, 210 Poplar Plain Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. H. Williamson, *OBE,* General List, 325 Ave. E. South, Saskatoon, Sask.

Lt.-Col. E. M. Wilson, *DSO, ED,* Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 18 Duncannon Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) N. Cooper, *OBE,* Canadian Provost Corps, Walkerville, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) G. F. Levenston, *MBE,* Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 21 Claxton Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) G. I. Smith, *MBE,* General List, 51 Willow St., Truro, N.S.

Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) R. G. Young, Canadian Infantry Corps, Front St., Oakville, Ont.

H/Maj. G. R. Addie, Canadian Chaplain Services, 321 Main St., Cowansville, P.Q.

Maj. N. Allan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Edmundston, N.B.

Maj. J. E. Bright, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 52 Elmwood Ave., London, Ont.

Maj. W. H. Broughall, *MBE,* General List, 172 Bay St., S., Hamilton, Ont.

Maj. C. F. Carsley, *MBE,* General List, 652 Roslyn Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

Maj. J. H. C. Clarry, *MBE,* The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 81 Dunloe Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. J. L. Dampier, The Canadian Infantry Corps, 449 Dufferin Ave., London, Ont.

Maj. F. Deacon, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2 Elm Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. A. M. Irvine, *MBE,* General List, 243 York St., Cornwall, Ont.

Maj. W. H. Jardine, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1311-6A St. N.W., Calgary, Alta.

Maj. D. B. MacKenzie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3402 Pine Cres., Vancouver, B.C.

Maj. W. R. Martin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 35 Dunloe Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. J. O. Millard, Canadian Infantry Corps, 88 Willow St., Truro, N.S.

Maj. A. G. Minnes, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 701 St. Clair Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.

Maj. J. A. Morgan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 107 Windsor Cres., London, Ont.

H/Maj. A. B. J. O'Neill, Canadian Chaplain Services, 15 LeBreton St., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj. W. R. Peace, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 6 Lonsdale Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. S. Pollock, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Kinistino, Sask.

Maj. F. N. Ritchie, *MC,* Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 8 Redpath Place, Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. S. Robertson, General List, 191 Forrest Hill Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. G. R. H. Ross, *ED,* Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Wolfville, N.S.

Maj. A. J. R. Stethem, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 64 Nassau St., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. J. L. Stewart, *MBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 10 Shornecliffe Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. J. A. Tindal, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 49 Ridgway, London, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. C. Conochie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 34 John St., Galt, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) M. A. Frank, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. (A/Maj.) W. Kayes, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Cayuga, Ont.

Capt. H. T. Frizzell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kentville, N.S.

Major W. T. Barnard, *ED,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 Willow Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. H. A. Ansley, Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Billings Bridge, Ont.

Lt.-Col. H. W. Love, *OBE,* Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 330 Cooper St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. R. B. Manzer, *ED,* General List, 86 Burpee Ave., Saint John, N.B.

Lt.-Col. G. L. W. White, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3441 Peel St, Montreal, Que.

Maj. H. W. F. Appleton, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 223 Grenadier Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Maj. C. M. Devaney, *MBE,* General List, 9519 110A Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Maj. R. J. Gilmor, *MBE,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 214 Pitt St., Cornwall, Ont.

Maj. E. L. Hartley, *MBE, ED,* The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3357 W. 34th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Maj. M. W. Harshaw, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 27 Holten Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Maj. E. L. MacKay, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1126 W. 11th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Maj. D. A. Scholten, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Calgary, Alta.

Maj. N. D. Theobald, *MC,* Canadian Infantry Corps, 1045 Beach Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Lt.-Col. G. Weir, *OBE*, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 204-8th Ave., N.E., Calgary, Alta.

Lt.-Col. H. E. Chater, *OBE*, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 21 Hickory St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. P. Manion, General List, 8 Delaware Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. B. F. Neary, *MBE*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1228 Yates St., Victoria, B.C.

Lt.-Col. J. Portas, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, c/o Royal Bank of Canada, Sherbrooke St., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. H. J. Wickey, *ED*, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, Maple Leaf Apts., Corydon Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Maj. A. J. LeBlanc, *MBE*, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2920 Van Horne Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. O. J. A. Barter, *ED*, Canadian Infantry Corps, 206 Mills St., Horse Heads, New York, U.S.A.

Maj. C. Nyenhuis, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 4896 Mayfair Ave., NDG, Montreal, P.Q.

Maj. T. H. F. Torney, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1212 Redland Ave., Moose Jaw, Sask.

Maj. H. Ward, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2747 Fifth St., Victoria, B.C.

Maj. D. S. Yuile, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1509 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P. Q.

Knight Officer of the Order of Orange Nassau (with Swords)

Capt. J. E. C. Beatty, Canadian Infantry Corps, 295 North Christina St., Sarnia, Ont.

Capt. D. R. Brodie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 225 McLaren St., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. J. A. Cameron, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 65 Westgate St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. F. E. Cochran, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 37 Duggan Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. E. G. Coombe, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, R.R. No. 1, Cataraqui, Ont.

H/Capt. G. O. Cox, Canadian Chaplain Services, 235 Indian Grove, Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. O. Evans, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 203 Main St. W., North Bay, Ont.

Capt. M. A. Fitz-Gibbon, Canadian Provost Corps, 96 Niagara St., Fort Erie, Ont.

Capt. J. E. Forbes, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 325 Tower Rd., Halifax, N.S.

Capt. J. K. French, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1158 Park Dr., Vancover, B.C.

Capt. S. E. Griffin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. G. L. M. Hanssen, Canadian Forestry Corps, 2905 West 36th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. A. F. Johnson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 110 Wellesley Cres., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. J. F. L.-P. Laplante, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 7262 Christrophe Colomb, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. L. L. Leatherdale, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Fort Francis, Ont.

Capt. N. N. Levinne, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 112 Braemore Gdns., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. A. C. McCalllum, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2285 Woodlawn Cres., Victoria, B.C.

Capt. S. J. Matthews, *ED*, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 19-7th St. N.E., Portage La Prairie, Man.

Capt. R. J. Mawer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6137 Marguerite St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. D. M. McDonald, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 3775-S.W. Marine, Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. D. G. E. Molnar, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 1766-7th St. W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. R. A. Paterson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 49 Holmwood Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

Capt. A. K. Pousette, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 827 Grosvenor Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. F. F. Rejall, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 875 St. James St. W., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. C. A. Robson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 101-3rd St., New Westminster, B.C.

Capt. R. N. Shervil, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 20 Rathgar St., London, Ont.

Capt. W. J. Stevenson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 40 Markland St., Kingston, Ont.

Capt. R. A. Swanson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 506-11th St. E., Saskatoon, Sask.

Capt. W. G. Thomson, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, 609 Ashburn St., Wnnipeg, Man.

Capt. M. Victor, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 341 Salter St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. G. W. Weekes, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 45 Wineva Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. E. S. White, Canadian Infantry Corps, King George Hwy., Newcastle, N.B.

Capt. S. B. Williams, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 450 Holland Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. R. H. Young, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 2, Duncan, B.C.

Lt. (A/Capt.) W. G. Dennis, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 88 Church St., Moncton, N.B.

Lt. (A/Capt.) R. I. Lucker, *MC*, Canadian Provost Corps, 306 Earl St., Kingston, Ont.

Lt. (A/Capt) N. C. Phemister, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 26 Woodruff Ave., St. Catharines, Ont.

Lieut. R. J. Garneau, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 46 Ste. Genevieve Ave., Quebec, P.Q.

Lieut. R. E. Grieve, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 329 Cedar St., New Westminster, B.C.

Lieut. F. A. Hanning, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Manville, Alta.

Lieut. N. Lafrance, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 669 King Edward Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. A. G. MacAulay, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Glace Bay, N.S.

Lieut. M. J. Mason, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 436 Arlington Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. C. J. Russell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 162 Bowood Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. H. B. O. Robinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 395 W-34th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. P. Stratton, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 2715 Pt. Grey Rd., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. J. J. L. A. Gaumond, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 125 Park Ave., Quebec, Que.

Capt. C. Bridges, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 11244-101st St., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. M. M. Dixon, Canadian Intelligence Corps, R.R. 2, Georgetown, Ont.

Capt. B. W. Snyder, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1125 W. Pender, Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. M. A. Upham, *MBE*, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 73 Arthur St., Truro, N.S.

Lieut. F. Stojak, Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 4402-2nd Ave., Regina, Sask.

Capt. W. J. Thomson, Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 519 Burnell St., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. F. A. McMullen, Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Roomiklinger Blk., Lethbridge, Alta.

Capt. T. Millar, Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 105 Rideau St., Apt. 2, Ottawa, Ont.

Capt. J. F. Fry, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 368 Robie St., Halifax, N.S.

Capt. H. D. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 175-15th Ave. E., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. J. Winn, *MBE*, Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4310 Harvard Ave., Apt. 5, N.D.G., Montreal, Que.

Honour Medal in Gold in the Order of Orange Nassau

W.O. I (Comdr) J. M. Davies, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Saltcoats, Sask.

Knight 1st Class in House Order of Orange

Lieut. A. M. M. Dubois, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 5807 de St. Valier, Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. T. R. Tessier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1493 Bishop St., Montreal, 25, P.Q.

Honour Medal in Gold of the House Order of Orange

D.125514 Sgt. M. Heuff, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 106 Carling Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

K.56354 Sgt. W. Vandekamp, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Vancouver, B.C.

Honour Medal in Bronze of the House Order of Orange

C.75721 Pte. J. C. Mathie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 115 Hopewell Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Meritorious Conduct Cross

H.35851 WO I (RSM) R. G. Foster, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 21 Lipton St., Winnipeg, Man.

D.21091 WO I (SM) G. A. Griffiths, *MBE*, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 4199 Decarie Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.

C.15772 WO I (Condr) E. F. Saunders, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Carleton Place, Ont.

M.40954 WO II (Armt QMS) P. A. Baxter, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Islay, Alta.

B.83220 WO II (CSM) E. N. Long, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Crescent Valley, B.C.

B.6702 WO II (BSM) R. D. Reid, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 45 Marlborough Ave., Toronto, Ont.

U.1576 CQMS. R. G. Baizley, Canadian Provost Corps, R. F. D. 2, South Portland, Me. U.S.A.

C.37362 CQMS. G. L. Boal, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 152 Hinks St., Renfrew, Ont.

D.11006 S/Sgt. W. V. Doe, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 174 Dennison Ave., Granby, P.Q.

K.15036 S/Sgt. H. D. Greenwood, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 2174 York St., Vancouver, B.C.

K.15197 S/Sgt. J. N. Love, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2738 W-36th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

B.5827 S/Sgt. A. Scott, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, R.R. No. 1, Utterson, Ont.

C.2582 S/Sgt. W. E. Shore, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Shawville, P.Q.

H.24158 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) D. M. Clarke, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Winnipeg, Man.

L.101516 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) A. A. Pitzel, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1561 Frederick St., North Battleford, Sask.

K.47178 Sgt. (A/CQMS) G. E. Randall, Canadian Infantry Corps, Glenavon, Sask.

B.52165 Sgt. E. H. Barradell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 171 Harmony Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

C.38017 Sgt. W. E. Bayford, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 93 McDonald St., Arnprior, Ont.

M.63021 Sgt. R. Cowan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 10904-126th St., Edmonton, Alta.

B.52633 Sgt. E. W. Deffett, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, R.R. No. 1, Milliken, Ont.

A.59652 Sgt. L. J. Ernewein, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Formosa, Ont.

K.70584 Sgt. S. R. Gillespie, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Vancouver, B.C.

D.116284 Sgt. R. G. Hammond, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 276 Elm St., St. Lambert, P.Q.

K.92630 Sgt. S. B. Hill, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2058 W-2nd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

B.75578 Pipe Maj. A. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1 Ben. Lamond Dr., Toronto, Ont.

B.34535 L/Sgt. H. Alford, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 150 Leenster Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

C.31482 L/Sgt. E. H. Reid, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 14 Glenelg St. E., Lindsay, Ont.

H.93314 L/Sgt. V. G. Ward, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 203 Belvedere St., Winnipeg, Man.

M.11840 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. C. Hadden, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 11 Kennedy St., Winnipeg, Man.

L.41042 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) E. W. Kunderman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2719 Ontario St., Vancouver, B.C.

C.31491 Cpl. F. P. Recoski, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Barry's Bay, Ont.

D.114872 Cpl. R. J. Wayte, The Royal Canadian Service Corps, 448 Manning Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

B.92272 L/Cpl. C. A. Fetterley, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Sand Lake, Ont.

D.128660 L/Cpl. J. S. Morrison, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Wakefield, P.Q.

H.38805 L/Cpl. A. Sigurdson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Sandy Hook, Man.

L.9382 L/Cpl. S. T. Skibinski, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Weekes, Sask.

D.63347 L/Cpl. Y. P. Taylor, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1843 Beaudry St., Montreal, P. Q.

C.32091 Pte. G. W. Allen, Canadian Infantry Corps, Prescott, Ont.

B.127651 Spr. G. E. Mason, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 140 Albany Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

FOREIGN AWARDS (LUXEMBOURG)

Chevalier in the Grand-Ducal Order of the Couronne de Chene

Maj. D. F. Mantle, General List, 3841 S.E. Marine Drive, Fraser Arm, Burnaby, B.C.

Medaille Couronne de Chene (gold) and Croix de Guerre 1940-1945

B.31333 S/Sgt. N. C. Lee, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 40 Wood St., Islington, Ont.

Medaille Couronne de Chene (silver) and Croix de Guerre 1940-1945

L.12105 Sgt. J. W. Lightfoot, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1373 King St., Regina, Sask.

L.25495 Sgt. G. J. McLeod, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Swift Current, Sask.

B.56494 Sgt. C. R. Pogue, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, R.R. No. 2, Fenelon Falls, Ont.

M.16707 Sgt. D. M. Shaw, Canadian Infantry Corps, Beaver Crossing, Alta.

G.19351 Sgt. J. C. Whitehead, Canadian Forestry Corps, Woodstock, N.B.

A.54605 L/Sgt. W. H. E. Warren, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 358 Wellington St., Ingersoll, Ont.

Medaille Couronne de Chene (bronze) and Croix de Guerre 1940-1945

D.137745 Pte. J. H. E. R. Martel, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1504 Aylwin St., Montreal, P.Q.

A.82075 Pte. J. H. Tice, Canadian Infantry Corps, R.R. 2, Norwich, Ont.

FOREIGN AWARDS (CHINESE)

Special decoration of the Cloud Banner with Collar and Sash

Maj.-Gen. G. B. Howard, *CBE,* Canadian Army, 309 Stewart St., Ottawa, Ont.

Maj.-Gen. J. V. Young, *CB, CBE,* Canadian Army, Ancaster, Ont.

Brig. W. Mavor, *CBE, MC,* Canadian Army, Roxborough Apts., Ottawa, Ont.

Brig. L. Patrick, *CBE,* The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 1228 Prospect Ave., Calgary, Alta.

Brig. O. M. M. Kay, *CBE, ED,* Canadian Army, Winnipeg, Man.

Special Decoration of the Cloud Banner with Sash

Lt.-Col. A. M. McCrimmon, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 74 Elm Ave., Toronto, Ont.

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE

Name—Rank—Corps—Address.

Victoria Cross (Posthumous)

J87544 P/O Mynarski, A. C. (deceased), 846 Manitoba Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Military Cross

J94368 F/L Brooks, H., 410 Belanger St., Montreal, P.Q.

Distinguished Flying Cross

J36325 F/L Biggs, H. D., Wingham, Ont.

J22689 F/L Greene, J. J., 9 Relmar Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J13718 F/L Hunter, R. H., 10819-107th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Member of the Order of the British Empire

C3175 S/L Martin, B. W., 154 Albert St., Kingston, Ont.

J5481 F/L Floody, C. W., 531 Brunswick Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J15080 F/L Noble, C. D., *DFC,* R.R. No. 5, Brighton, Ont.

J40826 F/O Riley, G. C., Hudson Heights, P.Q.

Air Force Cross

J4821 S/L Bell, J. F. M., *DFC,* Thames Cottage, Horsefair Lane, Cricklade, Wiltshire, Eng.

British Empire Medal

J96155 F/O Lacharite, A. R., 54 Murray St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

J96294 P/O Warren, J. L. N., Pointe Au Pic, Murray Bay, P.Q.

R112639 Sgt. McIntosh, A. L., Palmerston, Ont.

Mention in Despatches

C94088 S/L Donaldson, M. W., 924-7th Ave., S., Lethbridge, Alta.

C97000 S/L Jackson, D. J. G., 10323-120 St., Edmonton, Alta.

J4882 F/L Asselin, J. E. T., 27 Rosemount Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

J16937 F/L Bragg, J. P., Portugal Cove Rd., St. John's, Nfld.

J15051 F/L Fleming, J. P., Box 1115, 41½ eGorge St., Smiths Falls, Ont.

J38645 F/L Gordon, J. R., 18 McPherson Ave., Islington, Ont.

C94065 F/L Plant, J., Port Moody, B.C.

C97024 F/L Taylor, J. E., 134-17th Ave., N.E., Calgary, Alta.

J20076 F/L Watson, J. A., (deceased), 66 Beulah Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

J96116 F/O Bonter, K. C., 118 Vaughan Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J96008 F/O Carpenter, P. R., 1203 Walton St., Houston, Tex., U.S.A.

J27234 F/O Ramsey, C. J. P., (deceased), Ailwin Farms, Bedford, P.Q.

J96010 F/O Roan, J. G., 20 North Broadway, White Plains, N.Y., U.S.A.

P96344 F/O Warner, E. E., 185 S. 2nd E., Payson, Utah, U.S.A.

J18378 P/O Balcombe, A. A. (deceased), 29 Sussex Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J96534 P/O Hyde, K. T., Cardston, Alta.

J96703 P/O Smart, L. C., Leduc, Alta.

R74966 WO. I Low, H. P., (deceased), 1931 West 49th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

R79670 WO I Smith, R. C. (deceased) Box 131, Kamsack, Sask.

R184955 F/S Richardson, H. F. (deceased) Centreton, Ont.

King's Commendation

J27622 F/O Harmon, L. M., Box 560, Banff, Alta.

J43816 F/O Mackie, E. J., St. Walburgh, Sask.

UNITED STATES AWARDS

Legion of Merit (Degree of Commander)

C39 A/C/M Breadner, L. S., *CB, DSC,* Kirk's Ferry, P.Q.

C11922 A/M Leckie, R., *CB, DSO, DSC, DFC,* 303 Acacia Ave., Rockcliffe Park, Ont.

C132 A/V/M Campbell, H. L., *CBE,* 212 Rideau Terrace, Apt. 1, Ottawa.

C317 A/V/M Curtis, W. A., *CBE, DSC, ED,* 692 Echo Drive, Ottawa, Ont.

C50 A/V/M De Niverville, J. L. E. A., *CB,* 81 Frank St., Ottawa, Ont.

C56 A/V/M Heakes, F. V., *CB,* 4646 W. 3rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

C33 A/V/M Howsam, G. R., *CB, MC,* 357 Somerset St. E., Ottawa, Ont.

C7 A/V/M Lawrence, T. A., *CB,* 94 Cambridge St., Winnipeg, Man.

C60 A/V/M McEwen, C. McK., *CB, MC, DFC,* Apt. 8, 4605 Cote Des Neiges, Montreal, P.Q.

C31 A/V/M Stevenson, L. F., *CB,* 5845 McDonald St., Vancouver, B.C.

C686 A/V/M Sully, J. A., *CB, AFC,* Goderich, Ont.

C41 A/V/M Walsh, G. V., *CB, CBE,* 130 MacLaren St., Ottawa, Ont.

C10 A/C Tackaberry, S. G., *CBE,* 11 Inglewood Place, Ottawa, Ont.

Legion of Merit (Degree of Officer)

C34 A/V/M Guthrie, K. M., *CBE,* 205 Dromore Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

C71 A/V/M Slemon, C. R., *CB, CBE,* 92 Lisgar Rd., Ottawa, Ont.

C1232 G/C Davidson, C. A., *OBE,* 9903-105th St., Edmonton, Alta.

C3699 G/C Hall, G. E., *AFC, ED,* 498 Queens Ave., London, Ont.

C409 G/C Hanna, W. F., *CBE,* 23 Madawaska Drive, Ottawa, Ont.

C564 G/C McFarlane, W. J., Port Dover, Ont.

C602 G/C Patriarche, V. H., *OBE, AFC, ED,* 10303-123rd St., Edmonton, Alta.

C1216 G/C Smith, F. H., *OBE.*

C1138 G/C Smith, R. M., Hillcrest Farm, Foster, Brome Lake, P.Q.

C938 W/C Beddall, J. I. M., *MBE,* 960 Anderson Crescent, West Vancouver, B.C.

C4407 W/C Franks, W. R., *OBE,* 71 Crescent Rd., Toronto, Ont.

C557 W/C MacPherson, E. G., 10216-120th St., Edmonton, Alta.

C1412 W/C Patrick, K. R., *OBE,* 5044 Victoria Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

C3354 W/C Smith, E. E., *MBE,* 1803 Lawrence St., N.E., Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

C2080 W/C Walmsley, J. L., 135 Botsford St., Moncton, N.B.

C1903 W/C Webb, P. L. W., *MBE,* 121 Range Rd., Ottawa, Ont.

C9946 S/L Bronfman, G., 3617 Westmount Bldg., Montreal, P.Q.

J7770 S/L Lowe, F. F., 526-3rd Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

C1890 S/L McDonald, D. S. D., *MBE,* Metcalfe Rd., Gloucester County, Ont.

C3239 S/L Willis, P. E., 40 East Gate, Winnipeg, Man.

Distinguished Flying Cross

J38965 F/L Elliott, D. M., Howich, Ont.

Air Medal

J14453 F/L Wallace, J. M., *DFC,* 10 Garden St., Halifax, N.S.

Bronze Star Medal

C3170 W/C Gooderham, D, *OBE,* 85 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.

C53455 S/L Willis, D. A., *DFC,* North Gower, Ont.

J15052 F/L Jones, W. L. C., "The Hillhouse", Parkton, Maryland, U.S.A.

Medal of Freedom

C12111 S/L Alexander, J. R., 568 Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

NETHERLANDS AWARDS

Knight Officer of the Order of Orange-Nassau with Swords

C1884 S/L Irwin, H. D., 1672 St. Luke St., Montreal, P.Q.

Officer of the Order of Orange-Nassau with Swords

C11164 W/C McCreary, J. F., 3 Eastview Crescent, Toronto, Ont.

C1147 W/C Rickard, H. P., 316 Bloor St. E., Toronto, Ont.

Flying Cross

J15160 F/L Ruttledge, A. J. de L., *DFC,* Simcoe, Ont.

J16644 F/L Walker, H. A., *DSO, DFC,* Hartington, Ont.

FRENCH AWARDS

Legion of Honour

C4 A/M Johnson, G. O., *CB, MC,* 118 Acacia Ave., Rockcliffe Park, Ont.

Croix de Guerre with Silver Star

J12694 F/L Blinkhorn, J. G., 124-5th Ave., S.W., Dauphin, Man.

J27671 F/O Smith, H. V., *DFC,* Ste 7, Aynsley Court, Winnipeg, Man.

Croix de Guerre with Palm

J22963 F/L King, J. A., *DFC,* 812 Manning Ave., Toronto, Ont.

CZECHOSLOVAKIAN AWARDS

Czechoslovak Order of the White Lion II Class

C39 A/C/M Breadner, L. S., *CB, DSC,* Kirk's Ferry, P.Q.

C11922 A/M Leckie, R., *CB, DSO, DSC, DFC,* 303 Acacia Ave., Rockcliffe, Ont.

C50 A/V/M De Niverville, J. L. E. A., *CB,* 81 Frank St., Ottawa, Ont.

Czechoslovak Order of the White Lion III Class

C132 A/V/M Campbell, H. L., *CBE,* 212 Rideau Terrace, Ottawa, Ont.

C33 A/V/M Howsam, G. R., *CB, MC,* 357 Somerset St. E., Ottawa, Ont.

Czechoslovak Order of the White Lion IV Class

C2340 W/C Gelinas, J. L. P. A., *MBE,* 1321 Sherbrooke St. W., Apt. E61, Montreal, P.Q.

C452 W/C Jacobi, G. W., 68 Lakeview Ave., Toronto, Ont.

C2782 S/L McCrea, F. W., 66 Portland Ave., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

C4096 S/L Sparling, S. E., 29 Renfrew Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Czechoslovak War Cross 1939

C132 A/V/M Campbell, H. L., *CBE,* 212 Rideau Terrace, Ottawa, Ont.

C127 A/C Wray, L. E., *OBE, AFC,* 480 Cloverdale Rd., Rockcliffe, Ont.

C52847 F/L Lewis, J. H. C., 220 Stewart St., Apt. 3, Ottawa, Ont.

Czechoslovak Medal of Merit First Class

J5088 S/L Walsh, E. H. M., 486 Cole Ave., Highland Park, Ottawa.
J17397 F/L Roy, P. J., *DFC,* 158 Daniel St., Arnprior, Ont.
J10614 F/L Wright, G. G., *AFC,* 5160 Queen Mary Rd., Montreal, P.Q.
J43245 F/O Hlady, M., Rama, Sask.

Czechoslovak Medal of Merit Second Class

7839 Cpl. Stoker, G. J. S., 425 Arlington Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
R105610 Cpl. Turner, D. G., R.R. No. 2, Westlock, Alta.
R223976 LAC Martin, C., Edwards, Ont.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE ORDER

C1467 W/C Gordon, R. A., *DFC,* Boycaygeon, Ont.
J3103 S/L MacFadyen, D. A., *DFC,* 29 Chestnut Pard Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J6389 S/L McQuoid, D. J., *DFC,* Summerberry, Sask.
C983 G/C Newson, W. F. M., *DFC,* 1092 Transit Rd., Victoria, B.C.
C1492 W/C Sparks, B. N. G., 1867 Chilver Rd., Windsor, Ont.

MILITARY CROSS

J96709 P/O Bastable, V. J., 345 Brooklyn St., Winnipeg, Man.

AIR FORCE CROSS

J23595 F/L Alliston, E. A., 25 St. Hubert Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J6860 S/L Calvesbert, P. S., 95 Oak St., Brantford, Ont.
J5488 S/L Clark, F. P., 96 Murphy St., Trenton, Ont.
J16320 F/L Curtis, J. R., Box 244, Ponoka, Alta.
J6710 S/L Davis, W., 1070 St. David St., Victoria, B.C.
C26200 F/L Farrell, N. B., 267 Argyle Ave., Apt. 2, Sherbrooke, P.Q.
C1352 W/C Fumerton, R. C., Fort Coulonge, P.Q.
J18972 F/O Gordon, T. H., 10277-92nd St., Edmonton, Alta.
J4895 W/C Harvey, R. J., 1676 W. 10th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
C805 W/C Hiltz, G. A., 228 Saunders St., Fredericton, N.B.
C1092 S/L Jordan, J. J., 51 Roslyn Apts., Roslyn Rd., Winnipeg.
J6942 S/L McCallum, J. D., 711 Windermere Ave., Toronto 9, Ont.
C140 A/V/M Plant, J. L., *CBE,* 429 Chapel St., Ottawa, Ont.
J7007 S/L Watts, J. W., 2500 College Ave., Regina, Sask.
C855 W/C Wickett, J. C., % Dr. G. E. Hall, 498 Queens Ave., London, Ont.
J6811 S/L Young, J. H., Mt. Pleasant, Brant Co., Ont.

DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS

J12544 F/L Acheson, J. W., 27 South Kingsway, Toronto, Ont.
J87008 F/O Alderdice, W. W., New Liskeard, Dist. Temiskaming, Ont.
J3745 S/L Aldred, J. W., Port Perry, Ont.
J9680 F/L Aldrich, J. G., 328-4th Ave., N.E., Calgary, Alta.
J87340 F/L Alger, C. T., 393 McIntyre St. W., North Bay, Ont.
J14769 F/L Allan, L. A., Granada Apts., Giles Blvd., Windsor, Ont.
J10784 F/L Anderson, A. E., Sardis, B.C.
J53199 P/O Anderson, G. D., 108 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Man.
J21153 F/L Anderson, G. S. L., Mount Forest, Ont.
J19611 F/O Anderson, J. A. J. C., 2044 Grey Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J35506 F/O Anderson, R. T., Welsford, N.B.
J92444 P/O Andrew, R., Pickering, Ont.
J41123 F/L Andrew, R. A., West Coules, Alta.
J28296 F/L Archer, G. W., Rosedale Ave., Bartonville, Ont.
J16569 F/L Ardeline, P., 411 Concession St. E., Hamilton, Ont.
J35566 F/O Armitage, R. M., 83 Gibson St., Parry Sound, Ont.
J22801 F/L Armstrong, N. H., 325 West 25th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J93515 P/O Arvanetes, G., 1342 Van Horne Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
R222529 WO 2 Ash, E. J., Viking, Alta.
J17234 F/L Atkin, G. C., 9 East Drive, Toronto 9, Ont.
J19610 P/O Awrey, D. M., 1162 Chilver Rd., Windsor, Ont.
J38725 F/O Bacon, J. A., Rock Island, P.Q.
C85784 F/O Baczinski, M., 506-20th St., Brandon, Man.
J90510 F/L Bain, J. K., Elderbank, Halifax, N.S.
J36619 F/O Baird, E. M., Nakusp, B.C.
J45298 F/L Baird, J. D., 1195 E. 54th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J29073 F/L Baker, G. S., Matador, Sask.
J94878 P/O Baldwin, C. E., Glen Bain, Sask.
J23096 F/L Baldwin, W. G., 1440 Giles Blvd., Windsor, Ont.
C841 W/C Ball, F. W., 711 Second St. S., Kenora, Ont.
J91082 F/L Ballard, A. W., 456 Symington Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J16228 F/L Barnes, L. G., Manyberries, Alta.
J5289 F/L Barnett, C. D., Hillsboro, Albert Co., N.B.
J35650 F/L Bawtree, L., Enderby, B.C.
J89371 F/O Beale, J. A., 221 Queen St., Ottawa, Ont.

Distinguished Flying Cross

J17568 F/L Beals, A. W., 36 Victoria St., Truro, N.S.
J27161 F/L Beaton, J., 1659 Aird Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J16378 F/L Beaupre, H. H., 68 Moore Ave., Waterloo, Ont.
J89749 F/O Beilhartz, H. J. G. Shellbrook, Sask.
J9180 S/L Bennett, G. W., Box 86, Spencerville, Ont.
J36690 F/O Bennett, L. G. H., 117 Willow St., Paris, Ont.
J24757 F/L Benoit, F. J., 2332 Wilson Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J36896 F/O Beriault, V. E. A., 2208 Belgrave Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J27716 F/L Bertran, R. F., Stevensville, Ont.
J89536 F/L Best, R. V., The Alders, Ganges, B.C.
J27814 F/L Bews, A. R. A., Eatonia, Sask.
J37377 F/L Black, R. L., Brussels, Ont.
J93285 F/O Black, S., 495 Jarvic Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J87293 F/O Blair, G. C., Oakville, Man.

J25534 F/L Bolender, W. L., 37 William St., Elmira, Ont.
J22984 F/L Bond, F. E., Coaldale, Alta.
J40829 F/O Borkowitz S., 42 Major St., Toronto, Ont.
J12490 F/L Borthwick, R. M., 2170-51st Ave., W., Vancouver, B.C.
J8377 S/L Bossenberry, A., Grand Bend, Ont.
J16958 F/L Boudreau, J. H., Box 554, Campbellton, N.B.
J93544 P/O Bourdon, J. V. M., 1668 Cuvillier St., Montreal, P.Q.
J93002 F/O Bouvier, L. W., 417 Ave. K., North, Saskatoon, Sask.
J44069 F/L Boyd, J. E. D., Clarkson, Ont.
J38337 F/O Boyer, J. C. P., St. Remi, Napierville, P.Q.
J14133 F/L Bracken, H.D., Borden, Sask.
R260308 WO. 2 Bradner, R. J., 2 Earl Haig Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J19529 F/O Bradshaw, M. W., 508 Victoria Rd., Nanaimo, B.C.
J85520 P/O Brock, R. G., 110 Williamson Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J94387 F/O Brophy, B. J., Harrisons Corners, Ont.
C94009 F/O Brown, J., 11 Beal Terrace, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Eng.
J13826 F/L Brown, N. H. 3756 McGill, St., Vancouver, B.C.
J26449 F/L Brunton, M. L., Kincardine, Ont.
J38297 F/O Brush, G. C., General Delivery, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
J36355 F/L Bryns, F., Moulinette, Ont.
J37811 F/O Bumstead, W. R. Meaford, Ont.
J27119 F/O Bush, E. F., 73 Fairlawn Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J26039 F/L Butler, A. R. H., 17 Park Place, St. Catharines, Ont.
C854 F/L Butts, R. A., Sydney Mines, N.S.
J9178 F/L Buttle, T. W., 284 Rutland St., Winnipeg, Man.
R264874 WO. 2, Byers, A. N. C., Box 451, Lunenburg, N.S.
J38751 F/O Caldwell, D. M., Huntingdon, P.Q.
J23966 F/L Calhoun, M. B., 134-2nd St., St. Lambert. P.Q.
J45828 F/O Campbell, C. S. H., 737-14th Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.
C89509 F/L Campbell, G. A., 133 Broadway Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
R218396 WO. 2 Campbell, S. F., Zealandia, Sask.
J37888 F/O Carlson, C. L., 4th Ave. E., Watrous, Sask.
J26979 F/L Carlyle, K. A., 373 Waverley, Winnipeg, Man.
J24042 F/L Caron, W. M., Midway, B.C.
J27266 F/O Carr, J. A., 3119 Royal Oak Ave., New Westminster, B.C.
C88282 F/O Carter, Y. K., 195 Cooper St., Ottawa, Ont.
J12030 F/L Cartmell, J. H., R.R. No. 2, Chilliwack, B.C.
J35769 F/O Casey, J. M., Milltown, N.B.
J89617 F/L Cathrea, H. W., Meadow Lake, Sask.
C88573 F/L Chabot, S. G. E., 315 Merton St., St. Lambert, P.Q.
R85522 WO. 2 Chapman, J. R., 79 Curtis St., St. Thomas, Ont.
J87585 F/O Charbonneau, J. D. M. R., 1442 St. Clement St., Montreal, P.Q.
J92831 F/O Chorny, W., Ranfurly, Alta.
J90841 F/L Clarahan, L. E., Olds, Alta.
J86332 F/L Clark, A. T., 82A-10th Ave., Lachine, P.Q.
R200657 WO. 2 Clarke, O. S. T., 120 Markland Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
J85333 F/O Clarkson, P., 4408 Kensington Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J25884 F/L Clegg, C. F., 772 Dundas St., London, Ont.
J8783 F/L Clement, G. F., R.R. No. 7, St. Mary's Ont.
C288 S/L Clement, R. J., Ste. 5, 812 Grosvenor Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J17296 F/L Cochran, C. K., 7442-21 A St. S.E., Calgary, Alta.
J21551 F/L Coderre, M. A., Apt. 103, 110 Tyndalle Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J14087 F/L Coghlan, T., 325 S. Brodie St., Fort William, Ont.
R117346 WO.1 Collings, B. B., Chapleau, Ont.
J5819 S/L Collins, C. C., 1721-12th St. W., Calgary, Alta.
J12810 F/L Collins, F. A., 325 Temple Cresc., North Vancouver, B.C.
J93319 F/O Colquhoun, A. B., Parry Sound, Ont.
J86186 F/O Conner, D. D., 10 Lloyd St., Ottawa, Ont.
J16812 S/L Conquist, C. W., 57 Kennedy St., Winnipeg, Man.
J85106 F/L Cooke, A. G., 905 Palerston Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J36361 F/L Cooke, J. G. R., 42 Sheridan Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J89624 F/O Cooper, A. J., 883 Lansdowne Ave., Toronto 4, Ont.
J6642 F/L Cooper, J. H., Qu'Appelle, Sask.
J90328 F/O Cope, R. A., Albert St., Forest, Ont.
J29983 F/O Corsbie, J. H., Doe River, B.C.
J36272 S/L Coulter, J. L., 120-4th Ave. W., Rosetown, Sask.
J40407 F/O Couse, M. A., 810 King St. E., Hamilton, Ont.
J10871 F/L Cousins, G. T., Ste. 10, Ashland Court, Winnipeg, Man.
R188530 WO.2 Coville, H. L., 40 James St. W., Brockville, Ont.
R212916 WO Coyne, E. K., 78 Mavety St., Toronto, Ont.
J19870 P/O Creighton, A. D., 616 Duke St., Saskatoon, Sask.
J93353 P/O Crew, J. A., 512 California Ave., Windsor, Ont.
C24436 F/L Cronyn, P. H., 190 Regent St., London, Ont.
J86827 F/O Cross, J. S., R.R. No. 1, Grafton, Ont.
J37520 F/O Crossey, R. E. F., 4500 Girouard Ave., Apt. 12, Montreal, P.Q.
J26093 F/L Crowther, R. M., 9640-108A Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
J22339 F/L Cruickshank, A. S., 1088 Eglington Ave. W., Toronto, Ont.
J19790 F/L Cuming, H. N., 133 Seven Oaks Ave. W., Kildonan, Man.
J94265 P/O Cyr, M., 26 York St., Ottawa, Ont.
J5314 F/L Dale, H. W., 2156 Osler St., Regina, Sask.
J19324 F/L Della Stua, A., *DFM*, 1097 Dufferin St., Toronto, Ont.
J27693 F/O De Marco, N., 156 Airdrie Rd., Leaside, Toronto, Ont.
J39952 F/O Denbeigh, G., 500 Willard Ave., Toronto, Ont.
C1341 W/O Denison, R. L., 230 York Apts., Regina, Sask.

VICTORIA
PUBLIC LIBRARY

J22538 F/L Deutscher, J. C., Odessa, Sask.
J18666 F/L Dobbyn, J. L., Dand, Man.
J40411 F/O Doll, L. E., 97 Bedford Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J94157 P/O Dowling, F. D., 4 Alice Ave., St. Catharines, Ont.
J86143 P/O Downer, W. W., R.R. No. 2, Midland, Ont.
J44132 F/O Drew, W., 63 Patricia Blvd., Timmins, Ont.
J24224 F/L Deyden, R. P., 2202A Cypress St., Vancouver, B.C.
J35871 F/L Duggan, J. P., 434 Pall Mall St., London, Ont.
J92590 F/O Dumka, C. W., 407 Centre St., Calgary, Alta.
J10895 F/L Duncan, I. G., Box 88, Keewatin, Ont.
J12881 F/L Dunfield, J. W., Ste. 302, 1000 W. 10th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J24067 F/L Durocher, A. E., Eagle River, Ont.
J94313 P/O Edge, L. S., Cochrane, Alta.
J28122 F/L Edmonds, W. B., 206 Glencairn Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J17773 F/O Farmer, H. H., 12 Avondale Ave., Stratford, Ont.
J18452 F/O Fee, K. R., % J. McKay, Govan, Sask.
J17623 F/O Ferguson, J. A., 380 Van Norman St., Port Arthur, Ont.
J38737 F/O Fernihough, R. J., 240 Sherman Ave. S., Hamilton, Ont.
J85610 P/O Fernyhough, W., 422 Boleshine Rd., Victoria, B.C.
J21259 F/L Filer, D. E., R.R. No. 1, Bartonville, Ont.
J25226 F/L Finch, E. T., 272 Wellington St., Brantford, Ont.
J41420 F/O Finkelstein, S. I., 282 Dufferin Ave., Brantford, Ont.
J19708 F/O Finner, F. S., 17 North Scott St., Trenton, Ont.
J17279 F/L Finnerty, G. P., Rosetown, Sask.
J28322 F/O Fiset, G. C., 875 Stuart Ave., Outremont, Montreal.
J19844 F/L Fisher, G. H., Box 355, Watrous, Sask.
J18586 F/O Flewwelling, P. H., Bridgetown, N.S.
J169879 F/L Flynn, R. R., Box 265, 208 River Ave., Dauphin, Man.
J35573 F/L Foderingham, W. C., 115 Felvrigg Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J12203 F/L Folsom, C., 8223 Topton Way, Claton, Miss., U.S.A.
J85863 F/O Foord, A. V., Instow, Sask.
J88121 F/L Forbes, T. S., Saanichton, Vancouver Island, B.C.
J40485 F/O Fotheringham, A. M., 4534 Prince Albert S., Vancouver, B.C.
J90419 P/O Frame, J. H., Senate, Sask.
J7446 W/C France, K. A., Box 177, Kelowna, B.C.
J29665 F/O Fraser, D. J., 47 Hume St., London, Ont.
J90980 P/O Freeman, G. C., 1343 E. 14th St., Vancouver, B.C.
J27550 F/O Fuller, R. N., Cookshire, P.Q.
J27002 F/L Gagnon, J. A. E., Box 356, Bromptonville, P.Q.
J89417 F/L Galarneau, H. P., 450 Queens Ave., London, Ont.
J35181 F/O Galbraith, L. I., 3244 Adanac St., Vancouver, B.C.
J20725 F/L Gall, R., 11334-66th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J88748 F/O Gallicano, J. N., 346 Point Grey Rd., Vancouver, B.C.
J90056 F/L Garden, H., Enfield, Hants City, N.S.
J12968 F/L Gardner, E. H., 1013 Ave. A. North, Saskatoon, Sask.
J25073 F/O Gautschi, N. V., 2732-1st St., Vancouver, B.C.
J19036 F/O Gemmel, J. L., 481 Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J93592 P/O Gerrie, G. C., 198 Maple Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
J20950 F/L Gieselman, L. E., Humboldt, Sask.
J28872 F/O Gildner, E. N., R.R. No. 4, Glasgow Rd., Kitchener, Ont.
J88981 F/O Gillespie, M. G. M., 70 Appleton Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J10269 F/L Gilliatt, G. S. S., Annapolis Royal, N.S.
J11211 F/L Gillin, R. C., R.R. No. 6, Brantford, Ont.
J23896 F/L Gilmore, J. D., 120 Dawlish Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J12233 F/L Gienesk, J., 398 Lloyd St., Sudbury, Ont.
J36924 F/O Gonor, A., Ste. 12, Flora Court, Winnipeg, Man.
J92360 F/O Gordon, J. A., Wallaceburg, Ont.
J93342 F/O Gordon, J. R., Schreiber, Ont.
J38721 F/O Gordon, J. S., 38 Sanderstead Ave., Toronto, Ont.
C1467 W/C Gordon, R. A., Bobcaygeon, Ont.
J23070 F/L Gould, R. M., 144 Bertrand St., St. Boniface, Man.
J89847 F/O Gow, L. D., 26 Marcia St., Trenton, Ont.
J27655 F/L Gracie, J. P., Sceptre, Sask.
J87582 F/O Graham, G. V., R.R. No. 4, London, Ont.
J18510 F/L Granger, H. C., 87 Durham St., Kingston, Ont.
J10965 F/L Grant, J., 644 Cormorant St., Victoria, B.C.
J9548 S/L Green, A. P., Alberton, P.E.I.
J11327 S/L Green, R. W., Grandview, Man.
J36624 F/L Greenslade, T., Rose Lynn, Alta.
J39936 F/O Greiner, C. W. L., Vantage, Sask.
J94423 F/O Gribling, R. G., 826 McElwee Rd., Chilliwack, B.C.
J27514 F/L Griffin, D., R.R. No. 2, Duncan, Vancouver Is., B.C.
J26944 F/O Groves, T. A., Wetaskiwin, Alta.
J35652 F/O Guthman, M. G., Ladner, B.C.
J20938 F/L Hall, J. M., 177 Aubrey St., Winnipeg, Man.
J36204 F/O Hamm, C. W., 466 Morton St., Toronto, Ont.
C799 W/C Harnett, T. P., 1385 Main St., Moncton, N.B.
J27516 F/L Harper, E. D., 32nd Road, R.R. No. 1, Haney, B.C.
J24956 F/L Harrison, H. W., 11067-82nd Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
R98864 WO.1 Harrins, W., R.R. No. 1, Naicom, Sask.
J93873 P/O Hayden, W. V., 140 Hepbourne St., Toronto, Ont.
J89186 F/O Heaven, C. E. G., 106 Borland St., Orillia, Ont.
J23082 F/L Heaven, E. A., P.O. Box 13, Grand Forks, B.C.
J36298 F/O Hebert, C. E. R. Y., 6852 Fabre St., Montreal, P.Q.
J35270 F/O Hemming, C. G., Box 324, Dartmouth, N.S.

J14638 F/L Hempsall, L. C., 4363 James St., Vancouver, B.C.
J14688 F/L Henry, R. J., 823-15th St., Saskatoon, Sask.
J10764 F/L Herring, A. M., 44 Marina Ave., Long Branch, Ont.
J10354 F/L Hewson, B. G., M.401 Maryland St., Winnipeg, Man.
J28887 F/O Hickman, W. R., 4485-W. 6th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J37137 F/L Hill, D. G., Box 783, Welland, Ont.
J14031 F/L Hingston, H. W., 699 Grosvenor Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
J22411 F/O Hinscliffe, A., 626 Devonshire Rd., Windsor, Ont.
J35553 F/O Holland, W. J., 59 St. Georges Crescent, Goderich, Ont.
J37655 F/O Holmes, W. W., 108 Myrtle St., Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
J26099 S/L Holmes, P. D., 336 Newport Ave., Victoria, B.C.
J10491 S/L Horan, F. J., 521-1st St., S., Kenora, Ont.
J27674 F/O Howard, J. W., 76 Highcroft Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J43199 F/L Hudson, D. E. T., 400 Woodbine Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J35092 F/O Hudson, D. H., Morton, Ont.
J37175 F/O Hunter, H. E., 141 Colborne St., Kingston, Ont.
J44128 F/O Hunting, P. R., 4 Belgrave Sq., Scunthorpe, Lincs., England.
J26230 F/L Hurlbut, E. E., Fort Saskatchewan, Alta.
J87286 F/O Isenberg, M., 778 College St., Toronto, Ont.
J89857 F/L Jackson, I. B., 1 Doncaster Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J87404 F/O James, R. V., 384 Highfield St., Moncton, N.B.
J80845 F/L James, T. F. A., Ste. 21, Dalkeith Apts., Winnipeg, Man.
J96470 F/O Joel, W. V., 137 West-6th St., Vancouver, B.C.
J27306 F/O John, J. E. L., Glenelda, Sidney, B.C.
J27585 F/O Johnson, R., 523-15th St., Prince Albert, Sask.
J37138 F/L Johnston, J. H., Nashwasksis, N.B.
J37161 F/O Joyner, R. C., 228 Oakwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J13465 F/L Johnston, J. P. S., Box 245, Arnprior, Ont.
J12342 S/L Jones, A. A., 3666 Marine Drive, West Vancouver, B.C.
J18919 F/L Jordan, N., 301 Poplar Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
C18841 F/O Joy, W. N., 232 Queen St., North Bay, Ont.
J38070 F/L Kane, R. G., Alliance, Alta.
J94427 P/O Katrichak, J., Michel, B.C.
J18810 F/L Kearl, E. E., Cardston, Alta.
J38108 F/O Keeper, G. J., 934 Balmoral Rd., Victoria, B.C.
J38387 F/O Lemdroce, R. J., 416 Beverly St., Winnipeg, Man.
J16875 F/L Kennedy, W. W., 102 Merrick St., Toronto, Ont.
J22963 F/L King, J. A., 812 Manning Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J10566 F/L Kinnear, S., 289 Beresford Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J36333 F/O Kitbon, M. W., 121 Livingstone Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J5133 S/L Knight, J. F., Du Maurier Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
J36814 F/O Kooyman, B., 244 Fortier Ave., North Kildonan, Man.
J23941 F/L Lafferty, W. G., 213 Collingwood, St., Kingston, Ont.
J37744 F/O Laforce, J. A. P., 611 St. Jean St., Quebec, P.Q.
J29856 F/O Laidlaw, M. S., 13 Allan Park Cresc., Edinburgh, Scotland.
J4115 F/L Lamb, J. D., 2375 W. 51st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J94197 P/O Langley, F. P., 13 Gwynne Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J39010 F/O Lapointe, L. P. H., % Queens Hotel, 621 Barker St., Nelson, B.C.
J94838 P/O Larrimore, J. L., Coleman, Alta.
J89934 F/L Laviolette, J. A., Echo Bay, B.C.
J3105 S/L Leeper, J. F., 204 John St., Arnprior, Ont.
J35651 F/O Legros, C. B., 404 Tache Ave., St. Boniface, Man.
J39009 F/O Leigh, H. A., 3437 Kingsway, Vancouver, B.C.
J37333 F/O Lineham, G. W., Okotoks, Alta.
J86937 F/O Linton, W. B., Islay, Alta.
J43798 F/O Little, M. W., 11031-15th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
J21422 F/L Little, S. W., Agincourt, Ont.
J41636 F/O Logan, A. S., Lyons Brook, Pictou Co., N.S.
J90554 F/L Low, R. A., 223-9A St., N.W., Calgary, Alta.
J92082 F/O Lukinuk, T. A., 10615-103rd St., Edmonton, Alta.
J85500 F/O Lussier, K. E., 63 Blackburn Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J88870 F/O MacDonald, D., 205 Mayfair Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J26713 F/O MacDonald, D. M., 45 Laurier Drive, Trail, B.C.
J86993 F/O MacDonald, N. D., 15 Theresa St., London, Ont.
J88565 F/O MacGregor, I. M., Wetaskiwin, Alta.
J36233 F/O MacKerrow, R. E., Kleinburg, Ont.
J88245 F/O Makie, A. M., 66 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.
J35524 F/O MacLeod, A. J., 60 Howe St., Sydney, N.S.
J24399 F/L MacLeod, J. L., 127 Nelson St., Kingston, Ont.
J89274 F/L MacMillan, R. P., 1010 Queen's Ave., Victoria, B.C.
J89665 F/O MacNair, K. A. C., R.R. No. 1, Didsbury, Alta.
J16607 F/L Madill, B. D., North Edmonton, Alta.
J14417 F/L Magee, D. T., Box 343, Souris, Man.
J25694 F/L Mahon, H. H. S., 1234 Lajoie Ave., Outremont, P.Q.
J91184 F/O Major, J. F. O., Osseo, Ont.
J28802 F/O Manion, W. J., 93 Sweetland Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J85595 P/O Mamm, E. J., 1404 McTavish St., Regina, Sask.
J19153 F/O Maneix, J. B., Meota, Sask.
C795 S/L Marcou, H. F., 483 Grosvenor Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
J29775 F/L Mark, W. M., 257 St. Clements Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J36615 F/L Marlow, G. C., c/o Canadian Bank of Commerce, London, Eng.
J36873 F/O Marritt, E. E., Keswick, Ont.

J39925 F/O Martin, R. W., 327 Wellington Ave., Windsor, Ont.
J38182 F/O Massie, J. C., 9 Main St., Toronto, Ont.
J39318 F/O Matthews, A. S., R.R. No. 5, Strathroy, Ont.
J25970 F/L Mavaut, P. R., 1466 Mansfield St., Montreal, P.Q.
J89628 F/O Maxwell, R. B., 66 Glen Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J86046 P/O McCaffrey, J. H. A., Box 555, Melville, Sask.
J87303 F//L McClenahan, W.A., 1330-15th Ave., Regina, Sask.
J19331 F/O McCrindle, J., 28 Fawcett Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J38157 F/L McCurdy, R. W., 100 Broadway Blvd., Montreal E., P.Q.
J25218 F/L McCutcheon, E. B., 8550 Heather St., Vancouver, B.C.
J28191 F/O McDonald, J. O., Ste. 28, Lovat Apts., Winnipeg, Man.
J38408 F/O McGeough, J. H., 114 Imperial St., Toronto, Ont.
J19168 F/O McGillivray, R. L., 1115 Comox St., Vancouver, B.C.
J90582 F/O McGrath, M. K., R.R. No. 1, Bartonville, Ont.
J37482 F/L McGuire, J. S., 598 Indian Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J92110 F/O McGuire, L. J., 1603 Pillette Rd., Windsor, Ont.
J93213 F/O McHardy, I. M., 2545 Scenic Ave., Oakland, Calif., U.S.A.
J87373 F/O McIlhone, N. J., 780 Rockland Ave., Outremont, P.Q.
J40022 F/O McIntosh, E. R., Grande Prairie, Alta.
J18054 F/O McKay, W. H., 16 Clovelly Ave., Tyllwyn, Ebbie Vale, Man.
J26541 F/O McKinlay, J. A., 5630 Balaclava St., Vancouver, B.C.
J39906 F/O McKinnon, D. L., 4304 St. Antoine, Montreal, P.Q.
J4423 S/L McKnight, R. E. C., Minett, Muskoka, Ont.
J16138 F/L McLaughlin, M. W., 12204-82nd St., Edmonton, Alta.
J38771 F/O McLean, W. G., Moorepark, Man.
J29796 F/L McLeod, W. D., 467 Charlotte St., London, Ont.
J28227 F/O McMath, M., Bradner, B.C.
J11320 F/L McNeil, H. E., R.R. No. 2, Drayton, Ont.
J26236 F/L McPhail, H. D., Bankend, Sask.
J10147 F/L McPherson, I. E., 956 Esquimalt Rd., Victoria, B.C.
C7125 F/O McQuaid, T. J., 2059 Robinson St., Regina, Sask.
J41634 F/O Melbourne, F. E. 176 Holmwood Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J38282 F/O Mellard, J. V., 46 Arkledun Ave., Apt. 103, Hamilton, Ont.
J90454 F/O Michie, L. G., 58 Brookfield St., Toronto, Ont.
R167681 WO. 2 Middleton, H. I., Pense, Sask.
J11239 F/L Miller, G., 1 Mallory Gardens, Apt. 8, Toronto, Ont.
J40184 F/O Miller, J. A. F., 361 Wilbrod St., Ottawa, Ont.
J92066 F/O Miller, J. B., 2174 Hamilton St., Regina, Sask.
J8654 S/L Miller, W. E., Hagersville, Ont., R.R. No. 2.
J45535 F/O Mitchell, A. D., 6010 Durocher Ave., Apt. 3, Outremont, P.Q.
J20559 F/L Mitchell, W. R., Oakville P.O., Ont.
J43667 F/O Mizzen, C. A., 88 Forward Ave., London, Ont.
J21848 F/L Moffat, L. C., 1925-1st Ave. E., Prince Albert, Sask.
J13370 F/L Montgomery, A. N., 185 Close Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R131045 WO. I Montgomery, R. J., 15 Aikman Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
J90558 F/O Moreau, J. G. A., 45 Beaty Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J89374 F/O Morgan, L. F., 609-30th Ave., Calgary, Alta.
J36951 F/L Morris, A. E. L., 281 Cypress Drive, Languna Beach, Calif.
J6182 S/L Moshier, G. W., 168 Roseberry St., Campbellton, N.B.
J35812 F/O Moss, F. H. D., 10148-119th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J37890 F/O Mosure, E. M., Burquirlam P.O., New Westminster, B.C.
J28665 F/L Mulholland, W. J., 42 Brookfield Rd., York Mills, Toronto, Ont.
J92267 P/O Murray, J. R., 236 Snowdon Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J36314 F/O Murray, T. R., 30 Victoria Ave., Galt, Ont.
J12040 F/L Murton, A. H., 17 Lisgar Rd., Ottawa Ont.
J37704 F/O Mutchler, W., 70 Dufferin Ave., Sherbrooke, P.Q.
J43898 F/O Naiman, A. I., 425 Grace St., Toronto, Ont.
J89837 F/O Nash, R. C., Box 243, Cumberland, B.C.
J36913 F/O Neale, H. W., 9640-105th St. Edmonton, Alta.
J26257 F/L Nelson, D. S., 87 Morgan St., Tonawanda, N.Y., U.S.A.
C95194 P/O Netrefa, A. M., St. Walburg, Sask.
J22881 F/L Nicol, G. C., 2122 Old Orchard Ave., Montreal, 28 P.Q.
J85080 F/O Neilsen, C. M., 3519-147th St., Flushing, N.Y. U.S.A.
J30311 F/O Nobert, A., Gravelbourg, Sask.
J35372 F/L Nobes, W. O., 4848 Westmount Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J14566 F/L Northern E., 1014 Woodbine Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J17977 F/O O'Brien, J. M. P., 309 Moffatt Ave., Verdun, P.Q.
J93523 P/O Oehm, W. F., Box 323, St. Mary's, Ont.
J30273 F/O Ogle, W. M., 278 Kenilworth Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J43684 F/L Oldham, R., c/o S/L Parry, Templestowe, Banbury Rd., Bicester, Oxen, England.
J28859 F/L Olsen, T. C., 34 Donino Ave., York Mills, Toronto, Ont.
J37069 F/L O'Neill, B. H., 449 Esplanade, Sydney, N.S.
J26673 F/L Osborn, W. W., 9 Eagles Hill, Hespeler, Ont.
J10416 F/L Parker, C. H., 983 Sherburn St., Winnipeg, Man.
R146583 WO.1 Parker, D. G., 165 Church St., Belleville, Ont.
J35014 F/L Paterson, R. P., 1536 Angus St., Regina, Sask.
J89787 F/O Patterson, E., Gore St., Perth, Ont.
C35269 F/L Patterson, N. E., 27 First St., Welland, Ont.

R77617 WO.2 Patterson, T., Turin, Alta.
J18009 F/O Peacock, W. G., Everett, Ont.
J35727 F/L Pearson, A. L., 3340 Cedar Hill Rd., Victoria, B.C.
C26196 F/L Pearson, H. W., 1325 Coy Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.
J21611 F/L Pearson, W. E., 6543 Vine St., Vancouver, B.C.
J15773 F/L Percival, G. W., 17 Chestnut St. E., St. Catharines, Ont.
J36485 F/L Perrier, J. G. F., 133 Montreal Rd., Eastview, Ont.
J36603 F/O Peters, W. D., 362 Hyland Ave., Sudbury, Ont.
J38956 F/O Philp, O. B., Ste. 8C, Debary Apts., 626 Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J35762 F/O Pittman, H. J., 4466 Oxford Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.
J28633 F/L Pitu, C. L., Wolfe Creek, Alta.
J18616 F/O Platana, D. D., 2357 Hamilton St., Regina, Sask.
J11966 F/L Playford, J. D., 55 Watson Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J89324 F/O Plishka, W. M., Myrnam, Alta.
J25926 F/L Poag, J. H., 5 Beulah Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
J35385 F/L Poirier, J. E. G., Box 24, New Carlisle, P.Q.
J37724 F/O Pollock, J., 94 Houghton Ave., S. Hamilton, Ont.
J19169 F/L Powdrill, R., Ste. 5, Imperial Apts., Moose Jaw, Sask.
J25756 F/L Pratt, D. O., 989 Jessie Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J19317 F/O Price, S., 195 Church St., Brockville, Ont.
J36386 F/O Quarnstrom, R. G., Norquay, Sask.
J12473 F/L Quinn, G. S., Box 232, Prince George, B.C.
J94177 P/O Ranlyck, P. W., c/o Mrs. Harris, 3833 Dominion St., New Westminster, B.C.
J9872 F/L Raynes, D. F., Bounty, Sask.
R163730 WO.2 Reid, D. M., 625 Park Place, St. Paul, Minn., U.S.A.
J90338 F/O Reid, M. G., Minski, Ont.
J36186 F/L Reid, R. G., Falconbridge, Ont.
J91122 F/O Rhodes, R. W. A., 194 Dowling Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J40058 F/O Riches, J. R., Aberdeen, Sask.
J24425 F/L Ridge, R. C., 5 Hogarth Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J40371 F/O Riley, W. F., 75 Grenadier Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J40055 F/O Roberts, L. R., 1102-15th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
J17046 F/L Roberts, W. M., MacGregor, Man.
J87248 F/O Robertson, T. M., 265 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.
J8211 F/L Robertson, W. S., Scarboro, Ont.
J29650 F/L Robers, A. W., 104 Blenheim Place, Westmount, P.Q.
J17219 F/L Rolls, W. E., 32 Rowanwood Ave., Toronto 5, Ont.
J93408 P/O Roney, R. H. M., 446 Albert St. E., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
J92065 F/O Ronnebeck, R.D., 513-2nd Ave., S., Kenora, Ont.
C94589 P/O Roper, H. W., 50 Gerrard St. E., Toronto, Ont.
J37009 F/O Ross, A. D., Kincaird, Sask.
J16986 F/L Ross, A. L., Box 203, Holland, Man.
J85482 F/O Ross, J. T., 106 Lincoln St., Jersey City, N.J., U.S.A.
J13048 F/L Rothenbush, J. W., 1431 W. 53rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J21910 F/L Rotstein, L. A., 1131 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J19707 F/O Rowan, F. H., 122 Front St. S., Orillia, Ont.
J94592 P/O Ruddy, L. P., 652 Gladstone Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J10118 S/L Rue, D. R. H., 206 Balfour Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J20593 F/L Russell, J. A., 921 Greenwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R256267 WO.2 Ruthig, V. M., 273 Brunswick St., Stratford, Ont.
J37727 F/O Rymer, D., 116 Tamarack St., Timmins, Ont.
J11033 F/L Salo, T. A., 751 Delta Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J36850 F/O Sargent, J. H., New Hazelton, B.C.
R163670 W/O Saruk, M. A., Alvere, Sask.
J29097 F/L Schenk, W. G., 153 Waterloo St., Kitchener, Ont.
J43626 F/O Schmidt, P. F. L., 390 Montrose Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J12865 F/L Schroeder, W. L., R.R. No. 2, Centralia, Ont.
J17242 F/L Schubert, T. E., Otter Lake Rd., Armstrong, B.C.
J26748 F/O Scott, M. N., Innisfail, Alta.
J13483 F/L Seton, H. W., 117 Brook Ave. S., Montreal, P.Q.
J17715 F/O Shaughnessy, P., 400 Kensington Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
J14304 F/L Shaw, E. H., Nanton, Alta.
J14871 F/L Sheppard, T. X., 137 Arlington Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J87336 F/L Sherlock, G. T., 1937 Robinson St., Regina, Sask.
J17048 F/L Sherrett, R. J., 625-1st Ave. S., Kenora, Ont.
J17892 F/L Short, C. H., 94 Huntley St., Toronto, Ont.
J85564 F/L Simonson, L. O., 344 Roseberry St., St. James, Man.
J9849 S/L Simpson, H. A. L., 2755 Yonge St., Apt. 222, Toronto, Ont.
R215338 WO.2 Simpson, I. R., 1170 Barclay St., Vancouver, B.C.
C35386 F/L Simpson, W. G. R., 1251-5th Ave., A. South, Lethbridge, Alta.
J39135 F/L Skinner, S., 11448-93rd St., Edmonton, Alta.
J664 F/L Smith, F. E. W., 3775 W. 37th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J93927 P/O Smith, G., Box 27, Galahad, Alta.
J19332 F/O Smith, J. K., 62 Victor Ave., Toronto 6, Ont.
J19490 F/O Smith, W. B., 691 Markham St., Toronto, Ont.
J10553 S/L Smith, W. J., 1584 Hampshire Rd., Victoria, B.C.
J18361 F/L Smith, W. R., 130 Keewatin Ave., Toronto 12, Ont.
J35822 F/O Smithman, E. L., 822 Dublin St., New Westminster, B.C.
J19459 F/L Smyth, E. R., Box 136, Trochu, Alta.
J87861 F/L Sorenson, S. P., Box 323, Rouleau, Sask.
J24664 F/L Sowerby, C. E. R., 546 Ingersoll St., Winnipeg, Man.
J86086 F/L Spankie, E., % J. Spankie, 617-16th Ave. N.E., Calgary, Alta.
J85771 F/O Spence, A. L., 2337 Howard Ave., Windsor, Ont.
J5820 F/L Sproule, F. H., 5557 Larch St., Vancouver, B.C.

J92555 F/O Stafford, R. E., 202 Madeline Dr., Pasadena, Calif., U.S.A.
J24643 F/L Stelfox, H. B., Rocky Mountain House, Alta.
J93450 F/O Stepenoff, A. C., 1019-19th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
R212120 WO.1 Stewart, E. A., R.R. No. 2, Tofield, Alta.
J94630 P/O Storry, G. P., Box 369, Qu'-Appelle, Sask.
J93380 P/O Storsater, R. G., 889 Valour Rd., Winnipeg, Man.
C1495 S/L Stroud, J. M., 81 Dunsmure Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
J89793 F/O Sulpher, F. M., Box 90, Renfrew, Ont.
J38728 F/O Sutherland, W. R., Bradford, Ont.
J90135 F/O Talbot, M. R., 383 Langside St., Winnipeg, Man.
J86964 F/L Tarling, D. E., 21 Marchmount Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J88844 F/O Teit, S. O. V., Merritt, B.C.
J27415 F/O Tessier, J. W. L., 110 Foundry St., Lachute, P.Q.
J89485 F/O Thompson, R. T., Imperial, Sask.
J93112 F/O Thompson, W. E. P., 8 Wilfred Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J27620 F/O Thrasher, J. A., 165 Ruttan St., Port Arthur, Ont.
J38347 F/O Tigchelaar, A. E., 56 Main St., Dundas, Ont.
J92642 F/O Tilston, N., 265 Normanhurst Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
J7041 F/L Todd, R. K., 5556-7th Ave., Rosemount, Montreal, P.Q.
J28659 F/L Topliss, H. G., Box 1243, Rossland, B.C.
J22854 F/L Traynor, C. J., 812-7th Ave. E., Owen Sound, Ont.
J88131 F/O Tunis, W. E., 8 Paisley Ave. N., Hamilton, Ont.
C4456 F/O Turner, S. D., 2320-8th St., Calgary, Alta.
J35759 F/L Vipond, J. F., 794 Carlaw Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R205256 WO.2 Wade, G., 651 Minto St., Winnipeg, Man.
J19913 F/O Wagner, E. N. D., 1337 Graveley St., Vancouver, B.C.
J38247 F/O Walker, J. E., 16 Randolph Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J11051 F/L Walker, R. T., 1001 N. 10th St., Duncan, Okla., U.S.A.
J38431 F/O Wallis, S. R., 609-10th St. E., Lethbridge, Alta.
J93876 P/O Walwyn, C. J., Lipson, Sask.
J88115 F/O Ward, D. M., 10 Kirkalta Apts., Edmonton, Alta.
J12627 F/L Watson, F. F., 299 Lake St., Peterborough, Ont.
J6206 S/L Watson, T. W., 1209 MacKay St., Montreal, P.Q.
J93891 P/O Waugh, J. H., Wilmot Valley, P.E.I.
J92181 F/O Welsman, W. W., 83 Brooke Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J39914 F/O West, J. W., Hopewell Hill, N.B.
J15005 F/L Whalen, J. H., 2995 W. 1st Ave., Ste. 4, Vancouver, B.C.
J38314 F/O Whiteman, A. G., Neepawa, Man.
J18776 F/O Whitney, J. L., Eriksdale, Man.
J37080 F/O Whitten, L. N., 1175 Wolseley Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J40060 F/O Whittles, H. M., 11038-86th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
J29129 F/L Whynacht, K. A., Vogler's Cove, Lunenburg Co., N.S.
J6184 S/L Wilkie, H. W., 221 Canice St., Orillia, Ont.
J93718 P/O Wilkins, J., 11932-102nd St., Edmonton, Alta.
J35339 F/L Wilkinson, E. C. S., Box 401, Napanee, Ont.
J4867 F/L Williams, C. F., 75 James St., Ottawa, Ont.
J12038 F/L Winmill, A. E., 12 Wilson St., Lachute Mills, P.Q.
J36872 F/O Wissler, G. H., Elora, Ont.
J36252 F/O Wygle, B.S., Crossfield, Alta.
J40475 F/O Wynne, J., 618 Coxwell Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R189484 WO. 2 Yard, W. L., Princeton, B.C.
J37734 F/O Yeaman, J. K., 22 High Park Gardens, Toronto, Ont.
J14819 F/L Young, D. B., 1764 Westbrook Cresc., Vancouver, B.C.
J92888 P/O Young, G. M., 1650 Aird Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J37737 F/O Young, H. R., 212 Erskine Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Bar to Distinguished Flying Cross

J16350 F/L Angus, T. A., 219 St. Helen's Ave., Toronto, Ont.
C89543 F/L Batchelor, A. W., 629 John St., Victoria, B.C.
J86510 F/L Boyd, F. L., 4454 Oxford Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.
C89533 S/L Brown, J. C. R., 849 Broadview Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J26394 S/L Brownell, G. J., Port McNicoll, Ont.
J22379 F/L Caine, J. T., General Delivery, South Edmonton, Alta.
J22090 /L Campbell, T., 90 Pears Ave., Toronto 5, Ont.
C89569 W/C Comar, J., 2315 Eglington Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J5083 S/L Coons, H. L., Collins Bay, Ont.
J16384 F/L Cuelenaere, M. R. C., 220 Williams Rd., Chilliwack, B.C.
J27305 F/L Dixie, J. P., 4036 Imperial St., New Westminster, B.C.
J11502 F/L Duchesnay, A. A. H. J. N. A., 263 Fraser St., Quebec, City, P.Q.
J17017 F/L Duncas, E. G., Miami, Man.
J24375 F/L Edwards, W. F., 10945-90th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
J11442 S/L Ellwood, G. B., 253-5th Ave., Portage la Prairie, Man.
J9069 S/L Fairbanks, D. C., 424 East State St., Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.
J15734 S/L Falls, F. M., 3740 The Boulevard, Westmount, P.Q.
J28917 F/O Ferguson, R. M., Erin, Ont.
J11188 F/L Forrest, H. L., 3855 Glen Dr., Vancouver, B.C.
J10133 W/C Ganderton, V. F., Leduc, Alta.
J12273 F/L Gibbons, N., 2355 Marine Dr., W., Vancouver, B.C.
J17352 F/L Hammond, A. B., 5854 McLynn St., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.
J15661 S/L Hudson, J., 2012 Oak Bay Ave., Victoria, B.C.
J27719 F/L Kyte, M.S., 503 Lauder Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J8812 F/L McDougall, T. R., 373 Klock Ave., North Bay, Ont.
J17272 F/L Naylor, W. K., Coleman, Alta.
J3202 S/L Neilly, L. G., Gilford, Ont.
J16193 S/L Newitt, R. M., 1537 Haro St., Vancouver, B.C.
J15600 S/L Peterson, H. V., 2517-16A St. E., Calgary, Alta.

J10982 W/C Hawson, B. F. N., 51 Robinson St., Hamilton, Ont.
J10676 F/L Rolfe, V., 1185 George Ave., Windsor, Ont.
J5690 F/L Smith, F. D., 932 W. 19th Ave., Calgary, Alta.
J15959 F/L Smith, K.C.A., 438-6th St., Saskatoon, Sask.
J10122 F/L Vann, G. C. J., Box 886, Flin Flon, Man.
C89534 F/L Williams, L. H., 1715 Donald St., Fort William, Ont.

George Medal

J37488 F/O Baillie, J. J., 369 Victoria Park Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J24596 F/L Varden, D. P., Box 104, Merrickville, Ont.
J36349 F/O McLean, H. V., 3 Smirle Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
K255545 F/S Carlson, A. B., R.R. No. 1, Saanichton, B.C.
R90414 Sgt Cockaday, A. J., 188 Albion St., Brantford, Ont.
R252961 F/S Dixon, J. D., 6 Dawson St., Waratah, N.S.W., Australia.
R188791 F/S Donovan, I. I., Box 759, 144 Pine St., Collingwood, Ont.
R250812 Sgt. Edwards, F., 5 Amherst Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R109350 Sgt. Edwards, J. H., Cranbrook, B.C.
R168908 F/S Fertich, F. O., Box 1369, Rossland, B.C.
R218578 F/S Fisher, J. W., 239 LaRose Ave., The Pas, Man.
R71729 Sgt. Giles, R. G., 26 Dawson St., Dartmouth, N.S.
R257869 F/S Groulx, E., Garson, Ont.
R219718 F/S Hamilton, F. R., Waubaushene, Ont.
R193797 F/S Hickey, K. A., R.R. No. 1, Highland Creek, Ont.
R133105 F/S Jones, D. E., 3813 Patterson Ave., Burnaby, New Westminster, B.C.
R269907 F/S Kuchma, W., Steveston, B.C.
R220942 F/S Leprich, J. O., Box 582, Hanover, Ont.
R218209 F/S McGill, J. E., 417-5th Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask.
R213856 F/S McMurchy, G. A., 278-2nd Ave. E., Swift Current, Sask.
R269111 F/S McNamara, J. G., 54 West St., Thorold, Ont.
R203649 F/S Moffatt, R. W., 2336 Victoria Ave., Regina, Sask.
R149600 F/S Nordbye, G. L., Box 12, Silverton, B.C.
R275522 F/S Oxenbury, J. F., 164-1st St., Ocean Falls, B.C.
R188018 F/S Potter, M. A., Warkworth, Ont.
R214651 F/S Ridley, F. G., High St., Nevin, North Wales.
R213931 F/S Stapleton, J. A. P., Glen Bain, Sask.
R271382 F/S Waddell, W. H., 723 Carlaw Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R265535 WO.2 Woytowich, W., Alvena, Sask.

Officer of the Order of the British Empire

C775 W/C Birchall, L. J., Quinte Hotel, Belleville, Ont.

Member of the Order of the British Empire

J4737 F/L Ash, W. F., 3515 Edgewater St., Dallas, Texas, U.S.A.
J23407 F/L Higgins, P. N., 220 Methow St., Wenatchee, Wash., U.S.A.

British Empire Medal

R79722 Sgt. Jamieson, T. D., 1012 Haro St., Vancouver, B.C.
R275318 AC.1 Nightingale, W. F., 14 Palmerston Ave., Brantford, Ont.

Mentioned in Despatches

R60701 Sgt. Allen, N. G., 13011-121st St., Edmonton, Alta.
J20843 F/L Anderson, L. H., Box 28, Blackie, Alta.
R82220 Sgt. Argue, A. L., Pakenham, Ont.
J19798 F/L Arthur, R. J., 34 Tulip St., Dartmouth, N.S.
J7641 F/L Aylsworth, A. B., St. George, Ont.
C48210 P/O Bain, K., Argyle St., Yarmouth, N.S.
R53385 Sgt. Baker, C. A., 44 Hunter St., Toronto, Ont.
R95022 Cpl. Batten, F. L. C., 38-9th St., Brandon, Man.
R73065 Sgt. Bedford, C. F., 36 Sydney St., St. John, N.B.
R64450 Sgt. Berryman, E. H. J., 31 West Ave. South, Hamilton, Ont.
R76479 Sgt. Blanchard, R. A., Box 653, Kentville, Kings Co., N.S.
R65602 Sgt. Bowins, C. H., 145 Parkmount Rd., Toronto, Ont.
R104832 WO.2 Brown, A. W., 4016 Beaconsfield Ave., N.D.G., Montreal.
R67580 Sgt. Brown, G. A., 751 Huron Line, Windsor, Ont.
J96304 P/O Brown, M. W., 32 Parkway Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R64513 Sgt. Cassaboom, H. D., Tinerton, Digby Co., N.S.
R89818 Sgt. Charlwood, D. W., Crescent Mansions, Princess Cresc., Brighton, England.
R124136 F/S Cheremkora, J., 335 Aberdeen Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J25257 F/O Clark, G. R., P.O. Box 41, Ninga, Man.
10212A F/S Coat, W. G., 74 Cheever St., Hamilton, Ont.
R68056 Sgt. Cook, W. H., 1118 Kensington Rd., Ste. 3, Calgary, Alta.
R63687 WO. 1 Cooper, A. D., 190 Portland St., Dartmouth, N.S.
R61317 Sgt. Dale, H. A., Tweed, Ont.
6535 Sgt. Dale, J. E., 87 Russel Rd., Eastview, Ont.
R108725 WO. Dean, C.A., 34 Juliet Crescent, Toronto, Ont.
J12624 F/L Dearing, P F., 121 Inkerman St., London, Ont.
R84027 Sgt. Deverell, G. A., Mount Forest, Ont.
J10719 F/L Dewis, M. W., Canmore, Alta.
R128363 W/O Dickinson, J. C., 329-19th St., W., Prince Albert, Sask.
R65077 Sgt. Digout, E. A., French Cove, Richmond Co., N.S.
R90552 Sgt. Dodgson, J. G., 65 Princess St. W., North Bay, Ont.
R81057 F/S Dore, B. V., 505 Catharine St., Victoria, B.C.
R107352 Sgt. Dowler, G. D., 703-4th Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask.
J11632 F/L Dyck, M. M., 376-W. 20th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J15306 F/L Early, A. A., 2029 Iroquois St., Windsor, Ont.
R58405 Sgt. Eckstrand, L. P., Stockholm, Sask.
J41453 F/O Empringham, L. G., 79 Cameron Cresc., Leaside, Ont.

R63688 Sgt. Fair, A. K., R.R. No. 5, Guelph, Ont.
C1462 S/L Farrel, D. W., 3449 Ontario Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
R52194 Sgt. Faux, A. W., 202 Centre St., St. Thomas, Ont.
R63692 Sgt. Finch, R. V., 521 Victoria St., Point Edward, Ont.
J15051 F/L Fleming, J. P., Box 1115, 41½ George St., Smith Falls, Ont.
J22448 F/O Freeman, H., 25 Rothesay Apts., Winnipeg, Man.
R109259 Sgt. Gibson, G. R. M. 80 Worsley St., Barrie, Ont.
R166811 WO. 2 Gormely, W., Bella, Bella, B.C.
J13979 F/O Gray, R. B., 337 Home St., Winnipeg, Man.
R63643 Sgt. Greenfield, K. R., 151 Horton St., London, Ont.
R119027 Sgt. Hall, K. W., 43 St. Lennards Cres., Lawrence Park, Toronto, Ont.
R95873 F/S Hawkins, H. R., 584 Chapel St., Ottawa, Ont.
C9221 F/L Hodgson, J. B., 508 Grosvenor Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
R86935 Sgt. Hooson, T. E., 11119-60th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J87265 P/O Hughes-Games, N. E., Kelowna, B.C.
J10650 F/O Hunter, B. F., c/o J. Cecil Mill, Kensington, P.E.I.
R79722 Sgt. Jamieson, T. D., Gull Lake, Sask.
J12494 F/L Knevchtel, E. E., Box 37, Winslow, Wash., U.S.A.
R104784 W/O Lamontagne, J. G. G. C., 550 McEachran St., Outremont, P.Q.
R82596 Sgt. Leblanc, J. C. M., 40 St. Marie St., Hull, P.Q.
R251419 WO. 2 Lepp, G., Box 112, St. Davids, Ont.
J86407 P/O MacEwen, G. F., Morell, P.E.I.
R116105 W/O McMacken, G. R., 290 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.
C89501 S/L McVeigh, C. N., 11 Hillview Dr., Hucclecote, Glouc., Eng.
C8043 F/L Mills, C. A., Box 326 Strathroy, Ont.
J46893 F/O Morasse, J. A. P. E., 1255 Main St., Moncton, N.B.
R157271 W/O Motriuk, S. A., 49 Cobourg St., Winnipeg, Man.
J23249 F/O Mulvihill, K. P., 299 Lilac St., Winnipeg, Man.
J14862 F/L Mungall, R. H., Union Mills, N.B.
J25444 F/O Nelson, K. L., R.R. No. 1, Box 52, Ponoka, Alta.
R107859 F/S Newman, W. A., West Bend, Sask.
J15498 F/O Otten, J. F., 47 Quebec St., Kingston, Ont.
R122035 Sgt. Pearson, A. T., R.R. No. 3, 2252 Maddaugh Rd., Cloverdale, B.C.
C1397 S/L Poag, W. F., Listowel, Ont.
J9668 F/O Porter, C. E., Manson Creek, via Port St. James, B.C.
R141955 Sgt. Bradley, S.A., Fort Saskatchewan, Alta.
J49680 P/O Regan, W. H., Cayuga, Ont.
J12050 F/L Richardson, R. H., 55-6th St., N.W., Portage la Prairie, Man.
J22752 F/L Scott, D. R., Queen Charlotte City, B.C.
R70157 Sgt. Scott, D. S., Almonte, Ont.
J8831 S/L Shellard, D. C., 1520 Argyle Ave., W., Vancouver, B.C.
J13946 F/L St. Aubin, J. T. W., 1153 Wayburn Ave., Grosse Pointe Park, 30, Mich, U.S.A.
R167225 F/S Tilander, E.N.C., 46 Lyon Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J38195 F/O West, J. C., Baker's Inn, Yarmouth, N.S.
R104679 Sgt. Wilcox, G. L. M., 119 Second Ave., Sherbrooke, P.Q.

King's Commendation

J50658 P/O Bryden, J. T., Box 296 N. Sydney, N.S.
J3731 F/L Evans, C. J., 25 Park Rd., Brantford, Ont.
R164309 WO. 2 Smith, S. F., 1180 Howard Ave., Windsor, Ont.
C5777 S/L Wiseman, J. A., 702 Parkdale Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

UNITED STATES AWARDS

Distinguished Flying Cross

J17875 F/L Anderson, T. M., 847 Carrie St., Esquimalt, B.C.
J17126 P/O Rennie, H. T., Elora, Ont.

FRENCH AWARDS

Croix de Guerre

J11140 F/L Bitz, F. J., 3329 W. 3rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J86423 F/O Harrington, E. J., 74 Hearn Ave., Guelph, Ont.
J23797 F/L Mackenzie, B. M., Stettler, Alta.
J20106 F/L Stewart, D. G., Ste. 24, 101 E. 7th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J23698 F/L Umpherson, W. E., Poland, Ont.
J43316 F/O Wallace, R. A., 589 Oliver Rd., Port Arthur, Ont.
C12586 F/L Walz, D. M., General Delivery, Moose Jaw, Sask.

NETHERLANDS AWARDS

Flying Cross

J22239 F/L Bassarab, R. N., 384 Barrie St., Kingston, Ont.
J23054 F/L Churchill, R. E., 9824-92nd Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

END OF SESSION

VICTORIA
PUBLIC LIBRARY